

8

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON
URBAN AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT
(1996-97)**

ELEVENTH LOK SABHA

**MINISTRY OF RURAL AREAS & EMPLOYMENT
(DEPARTMENT OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT)**

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS—1997-98

EIGHTH REPORT



सत्यमेव जयते

**LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI**

April, 1997/Vaisakha, 1919 (Saka)

EIGHTH REPORT

STANDING COMMITTEE ON
URBAN AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT
(1996-97)

(ELEVENTH LOK SABHA)

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS — 1997-98

MINISTRY OF RURAL AREAS & EMPLOYMENT
(DEPARTMENT OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT)

Presented to Lok Sabha on 22.4.1997

Laid in Rajya Sabha on 22.4.1997



LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI

April, 1997/Vaisakha, 1919 (Saka)

C.U. & R.D. No. 039

Price : Rs. 22.00

© 1997 BY LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT

Published under Rule 382 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha (Eighth Edition) and Printed by Jainco Art India, 13/10, W.E.A., Saraswati Marg, Karol Bagh, New Delhi-110005.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE	(iii)
INTRODUCTION	(v)
CHAPTER I Introductory	1
CHAPTER II Analysis of Demands for Grants & Plan Budget for the year 1997-98 of the Department of Rural Development	3
CHAPTER III Rural Water Supply Programme	6
CHAPTER IV Central Rural Sanitation Programme	14
CHAPTER V National Social Security Programme	17
CHAPTER VI Land Records	20
CHAPTER VII Training & Research	23
CHAPTER VIII Panchayat Development & Training	24
CHAPTER IX Roads in Special Problem Areas	25
CHAPTER X CAPART	27
CHAPTER XI National Institute of Agricultural Marketing	29
CHAPTER XII Distribution of Ceiling Surplus Land	30
ANNEXURE I 	31
APPENDIX I 	34

STANDING COMMITTEE ON URBAN & RURAL DEVELOPMENT
(1996-97)

Shri Sontosh Mohan Dev — *Chairman*

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

2. Shri Nand Kumar Sai
3. Shri Shivraj Singh Chauhan
4. Shri Lalmuni Chaubey
5. Shri Prahalad Singh Patel
6. Shri Chitrasen Sinku
7. Smt. Ketki Singh
8. Shri Sankar Prasad Jaiswal
9. Shri Chintaman Vanaga
10. Shri Ashok Singh
11. Shri Kishanlal Diler
12. Shri J.P. Aggarwal
13. Shri Sarat Pattanayak
14. Shri Joyanta Bhattacharya
15. Dr. B.N. Reddy
16. Shri Dilip Singh Bhuria
17. Shri Maruti Patil D. Shelke
18. Shri C. Narayanaswamy
19. Shri Basavaraj Rayareddi
20. Shri Subrata Mukherjee
21. Shri T. Govindhan
22. Shri L. Balaraman
23. Shri Ramakant Yadav
24. Shri D. Venugopal

25. Shri Chhayana Patrudu
26. Shri Anant G. Geete
27. Shri B. Dharma Biksham
28. Shri Ram Sajivan
29. Shri Surjit Singh Barnala
30. Shri Jai Parkash

Rajya Sabha

31. Shri Thennala Balakrishna Pillai
- *32. Shri Sushil Barongpa
33. Shri V. Rajeshwar Rao
34. Shri Radhakrishan Malviya
35. Shri Sitaram Kesri
36. Shri O.P. Kohli
37. Shri Suryabhan Patil Vahadane
38. Shri Jagdambi Mandal
39. Shri Bhagaban Majhi
40. Shri Nilotpal Basu
41. Shri V. Rajan Chellappa
42. Shri Solipeta Ramachandra Reddy
- @43. Shri Joy Nadukkara

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri S.N. Mishra — *Additional Secretary*
2. Smt. Roli Srivastava — *Joint Secretary*
3. Shri G.R. Juneja — *Deputy Secretary*
4. Smt. Sudesh Luthra — *Under Secretary*

* Nominated *w.e.f.* 5.11.96 *vice* Shri Ajit P.K. Jogi ceased to be Member of the Committee.

@ Ceased to be Member of the Committee consequent on his retirement from Rajya Sabha *w.e.f.* 21.4.1997.

INTRODUCTION

1. I, the Chairman of Standing Committee on Urban and Rural Development (1996-97) having been authorized by the Committee to submit the Report on their behalf, present the Eighth Report on Demands for Grants (1997-98) of the Department of Rural Development of the Ministry of Rural Areas & Employment.

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

3. The Committee took evidence of the representatives of Ministry of Rural Areas & Employment (Department of Rural Development) on 3rd April and 4th April, 1997.

4. The Report was considered and adopted by the Committee at its sitting held on 20th April, 1997.

5. The Committee wish to express their thanks to the Ministry/ Department for placing before them the requisite material in connection with examination of the subject.

6. The Committee wish to express their thanks to the officers of the Ministry/Department who appeared before the Committee and placed their considered views. They would like to place on record their sense of deep appreciation for the invaluable assistance rendered to them by the officials of the Lok Sabha Secretariat attached to the Committee.

NEW DELHI;
April 21, 1997
Vaisakha 1, 1919 (Saka)

SONTOSH MOHAN DEV,
Chairman,
Standing Committee on Urban and Rural
Development.

CHAPTER I

Introductory

Rural India which encompasses three-fourth of the population of the country is represented by vulnerable sections of the society. The development of rural areas and population has been the Central concern of development planning in India in the 8th & 9th Plan. The onerous task of alleviation of poverty and ushering in economic progress and social transformation has been entrusted mainly with the Ministry of Rural Areas & Employment.

1.2 The Department of Rural development implements the following major programmes/schemes to achieve the objectives.

1. Rural Water Supply Programme
2. Rural Sanitation Programme
3. Land Reforms
 - (a) Distribution of Ceiling Surplus Land
 - (b) Strengthening of Revenue Administration and Updating of Land Records
 - (c) Computerisation of Land Records
4. National Social Assistance Programme (NSAP)
5. Roads in Special Problem Areas
6. National Institute of Rural Development (NIRD)
7. Establishment/Strengthening of State Institutes for Training in Rural Development (SIRDs)
8. Establishment Strengthening of Extension Training Centres (ETCs)
9. Organisation of training Courses, Seminars and Workshops
10. Council for Advancement of People's Action and Rural Technology (CAPART)

1.3 In line with the objectives of reaching out to the last and most disadvantaged sections of society and towards the fulfilment of the Directive Principles in Article 41 and 42 of the Constitution on 15th August, 1995, *viz.*, National Social Assistance Programme (NSAP) was launched. The programme consists of three components National Old Age Pension Scheme (NOAPs), National Family Benefit Scheme (NFBS) and National Maternity Benefit Scheme (NMBS).

1.4 The detailed Demands for Grants of the Ministry were laid in Parliament on 30th July, 1996.

1.5 In the present Report, the Committee have restricted its examination to only major issues related to Rural Water Supply and Sanitation, Land Records, Training, NSAP, CAPART, NIRD, Roads in Special Problem Areas in the context of Plan budget and demands for Grants for the ensuing year *i.e.* 1997-98.

CHAPTER II

Analysis of Demands for Grants and Plan Budget for the year 1997-98 of the Department of Rural Development of the Ministry of Rural Areas and Employment.

2.1 Overall Performance

Budget Estimate 1995-96	Rs. 1814.06 Crores
Actual Expenditure 1995-96	Rs. 1556.11 Crores
Budget Estimate 1996-97	Rs. 2195.00 Crores
Actual Expenditure 1996-97	Rs. 1794.24 Crores
Proposed Outlay 1997-98	Rs. 9896.32 Crores
Budget estimates 1997-98	Rs. 2195.00 Crores
%age hike in BE 1997-98 over BE 1996-97	0%

2.2 8th Plan Outlay

Plan Schemes outlay 1992-97	Rs. 6433.54 Crores
Likely Expenditure 1992-97	Rs. 5668.51 Crores
Proposed outlay for 9th Plan	Rs. 46953.00 Crores

A statement showing BE, RE and Actuals during 1995-96, 1996-97 and 1997-98 has been given at *Annexure I*.

2.3 The Committee note with concern the *status quo* in the outlay of 1997-98 as compared to that of the years 1996-97. They note that the outlay for 1997-98 does not cover even the percentage hike due to inflationary trends. They further note an alarming feature that emerges out of the data given at Para 2.1 above. The accepted outlay during 1997-98 by the Ministry of Finance is much lesser *i.e.* around 20% of the proposed outlay by the Department. It is also observed that not only the outlay sanctioned is inadequate keeping in view the challenges of rural poverty and entire gamut of improvement in the overall quality of life, but the scarce resources as sanctioned for different rural development schemes are not fully utilised. The Committee visualize that underspending of funds earmarked for rural

development schemes is the major area of concern. They in their 1st Report on Demands for Grants 1996-97 had expressed their concern towards the non-utilisation of funds and urged the Department to ensure 100% utilisation of funds. It is noted that there is no such improvement in the spending position and the feature of underspending reoccurrence during 1996-97. The Committee would like an explanation of the Government on this account.

2.4 It is also observed that the Department could not get the proposed amount under the respective schemes due to underspending of funds allocated in the previous year. In other words ineffective implementation of the schemes is responsible for not getting sufficient funds for the various schemes of Rural Development. The Committee note that the Department could not feel contended by merely allocating the State's share for respective schemes to States/UTs. Rather the schemes should be properly monitored and it should have been ensured that funds for Centrally sponsored schemes are utilised by various State Governments for the specific purpose these are meant for. They would like the Department to review their programmes/schemes so as to have first hand knowledge of the weaknesses responsible for the poor implementation of the schemes.

The Committee would like an explanation of the Government in this regard. It is strongly recommended to have a full proof mechanism incorporated in the guidelines to ensure effective implementation of the programmes/schemes and cent percent utilisation of funds.

2.5 It is observed that implementation of respective schemes of Rural Development is slow because the implementing personnel do not have the technical expertise required for proper planning, to make projects and calling tender of small, medium and big nature. Besides the implementing agency lack of the required infrastructure such as road roller, water pumps etc. It is recommended that to improve the implementation of the programmes, personnel responsible for the implementation should be given the proper technical training and the required infrastructure should also be provided.

2.6 Further, it is found that because of paucity of funds required for various programmes, the staff of respective State Departments like PWD, PHA, R&D, etc. are sitting idle. The services of such persons should be adequately used by transfer on deputation basis

as BDO for implementing rural development schemes to improve the implementation position.

2.7 It is also recommended that the maintenance of assets created under different programmes should be the responsibility of the respective Panchayats.

2.8 It is recommended that intensive programmes for sensitizing the local community and the target groups be undertaken on large scale.

2.9 People's participation in the implementation of the schemes be enhanced. This can be done through involvement on much larger scale of elected representatives (MPs/MLAs/MLCs) and representative institutions (Panchayats) in the implementation process.

2.10 Committees of beneficiaries be formed at the grass root level and such Committees be associated with the implementation process.

2.11 The Panchayati Raj System in view of 73rd Amendment of the Constitution of India can be effective if there is all round empowerment of Panchayats. Besides devolution of financial powers, there is need to empower Panchayats with regard to administrative, Planning, technical angle. The Committee urge that it is high time to evaluate the functioning of Panchayats with regard to each and every aspect *viz.*, the status of election, devolution of power, financial, administrative, etc.

2.12 The Committee note that no rural programme can be successfully implemented without people's involvement. It is recommended that necessary steps should be taken for effective people's participation in all the rural development schemes.

CHAPTER III

Rural Water Supply Programme

Demand No. 71

Major Head:— 2215, 3601, 3602

3.1 Provision of safe drinking water in rural areas is one of the high priority programmes as water is one of the basic need of the human beings as well as of the cattle. However, 8th Plan emphasized the importance of provision of drinking water in all habitations with no sources or partially covered during the 8th Plan.

3.2 The Department in the written note have stated the following features of the planning for the Ninth Five Year Plan:

- (a) Coverage of all the remaining not covered habitations and partially covered (getting less than 10 lpcd) habitations by 1997-98.
- (b) Coverage of the remaining partially covered habitations by the year 2000 AD.
- (c) Tackling the problem of quality of drinking water for the habitations seriously affected with excess fluoride and arsenic in drinking water.
- (d) Conservation of water and recharge of aquifers including rejuvenation, construction and improving the well tried successful traditional structures like dug wells, tanks, cornies etc. with appropriate innovation to improve the supply of quality water.
- (e) Transfer of ownership of the assets and responsibility for maintenance and repairs to the local community and Panchayati Raj Institutions, availability of training personnel, etc. This will be ensured by imparting well structured need based training to the beneficiaries, local technicians, local artisans, field level departmental functionaries and local panchayat functionaries. The effective role of the village level institutions like water and sanitation committees, grass root

level voluntary organization will be encouraged in effective operation and maintenance.

As and when the entire State is covered with safe drinking water facilities at the present norm of 40 lpcd within the distance norm of 1.6 km, the revised norm of 55 lpcd will be adopted for planning and formulation of the schemes. The distance norm will also be reduced to 500 metres in the plains and 50 metres vertical distance in hill areas.

3.3 It has also been stated in the written note that the coverage of rural population with regard to Water Supply Programme is 84.23%.

3.4 Position under ARWSP Central Sector

		1992-93 to 1995-96
Allocation		Rs. 4230.00 Crores
Expenditure by Ministry		Rs. 4047.251 Crores
Expenditure reported by States/UTs implementing agency		Rs. 3296.161 Crores
Position under MNP		
Total Provision		Rs. 3898.250 Crores
Expenditure		Rs. 3714.066 Crores
		1996-97 (Rs. in crores)
Outlay	Release	Expenditure
ARWSP 1110	937.41 (upto Jan. 97)	456.12
MNP 1375.78		527.30 (Upto Dec. 96)
Budget Estimates 1996-97		Rs. 1110 Crores
Outlay during 1997-98		Rs. 1302 Crores
(around 17.3% hike in BE 1997-98 over BE 1996-97).		

States/UTs are required to allocate equal amount under MNP for ARWSP. However, from the data furnished above it could be concluded that expenditure met by the Ministry is lesser than the allocation.

Further, expenditure reported by the States/UTs implementing agencies is lesser than the allocated outlay by the Department. As regards achievement against target, physical achievement has been shown almost 100%.

3.5 The quarterly norm for physical and financial achievement is as under as stated by the Department in the written note :

1st quarter	15%	Due to time taken in receipt of funds by the implementing agencies.
2nd quarter	20%	Being a rainy season.
3rd quarter	30%	The working season in many States picks up after the rain and reaches the peak in the last quarter. The second instalment of funds is also released during this period after the first half-year.
4th quarter	35%	

3.6 In the written note it has been mentioned that there is nil expenditure in the case of Andaman and Nicobar Islands, Dadra & Nagar Haveli, Lakshadweep, Delhi, Pondicherry from the Central Sector. It has also been stated that the provision under the State sector in such States/UTs was considered adequate keeping in view the targets for the year 1996-97.

3.7 The Secretary, Department of Rural Development during the course of oral evidence while explaining the projected requirement by the year 2006 as per the recent survey stated:—

“Most of the States have done this exercise. The present position is that as on 1.4.96 the number of NCHs is reported to be 1,47,614 and that of PCHs is shown to be 4,25,000. We thought that even though this shows an increase in the quantum of work to be done, the programme has to meet the requirement of the people. Therefore, the figures we now show will be larger than what we have been showing earlier on the basis of the earlier survey”.

3.8 The Committee would like to express their doubts about the claim of the Government of 84.23% of rural population having access to safe drinking water. They feel that the reality at the

grass root level is quite different. It is observed that Government should verify their claim and would like the explanation of the Government in this regard.

3.9 The Committee appreciate the gesture of the Government to enhance the outlay from Rs. 1110 crores to Rs. 1302 crores during 1997-98. The percentage hike is around 17.3%. Still they feel that the outlay is insufficient to address to the problem of water supply in rural areas specifically in view of the revised increased number of partially covered habitation *i.e.* 4,25,000 and not covered habitation 1,47,614 as on 1.4.96 as per the recent survey (as mentioned by the Secretary, Government during the course of oral evidence). They would like to recommend that sufficient funds should be earmarked during Ninth Plan under Rural Water Supply Programme to achieve the laudable objective of the Government to cover all the remaining not covered habitations and partially covered habitations by 2000 AD.

3.10 The Committee further note that not only inadequate funds are allocated for the said programme, but also the funds are not utilised fully by State Governments which adversely affects the implementation of the Programme. During 1996-97 (upto January 97) out of Rs. 1110 crores outlay Rs. 937.41 crores could be released by Central Government out of which expenditure reported (upto *i.e.* December 1996) is Rs. 456.12 crores. They fail to understand how the Department could utilize the remaining around 60% funds during the last two months. During 8th Plan period out of Rs. 4047.251 crores released, the expenditure reported by States/UTs is Rs. 3296.161 crores. It is disturbing to note that 18% of the outlay is lying unutilised with the State Government/UT Administration during the 8th Plan. They note that underutilisation does not only affect the implementation of the programme for which funds are sanctioned but also have far reaching effect on the other programmes for which the scarce resources could have been utilised. This speaks well of the lack of planning and monitoring on the part of the Government. It is noted by the Committee that the norms of 35% of the funds during the 4th quarter as per the guidelines of the Government are itself responsible for under-utilisation of funds. Bulk of funds are released during the fag end of the year which causes diversion of funds by State Government for other purposes. The Committee strongly recommend that Government should further strengthen the monitoring system and review the programme to know the reasons for the under-utilisation of funds by State Governments. Government

should not be contended with issuing merely instruction to State Governments rather it should be strictly monitored on regular intervals. Strict action should be taken against the defaulter State Government/UT Administration. They would also like to urge that the faulty norm of releasing 35% of the outlay during the 4th quarter should be reviewed by the Government and guidelines be revised accordingly.

3.11 The Committee also find that State Governments are not contributing equal matching share under MNP. Another surprising feature noted by the Committee is that while some of the State Governments are not contributing equal matching share under MNP the other State Governments/UT Administration like Andaman & Nicobar, Dadra & Nagar Haveli, Lakshadweep, Pondicherry and Delhi are deprived of the Central funds and the argument furnished by the Government is that the respective State funds commensurate the targets fixed by such State Governments. The Committee would like to be apprised of, by the Government on this account.

Maintenance & Sustainability of Assets Created under Rural Water Supply Programme

3.12 As per the written note furnished by the Government 10% of plan funds are earmarked for maintenance of assets created under the programme. In addition to this the States/UTs do provide funds under the Non-plan provision to meet the expenditure for the maintenance of assets. The major items for which maintenance amount is spent by the State Governments have been stated as below:

Spare Parts, cost of repairs, payment to the handpump mistris/mechanics/operators-Chemicals, commodities etc. electricity charges for plan schemes.

3.13 The Committee note that the major areas of concern are the maintenance and sustainability of assets created under the programme. The water level in many areas is going down. The peak summer months of May and June adversely affect the rural population since the hand-pumps go dry.

3.14 The Secretary during evidence while agreeing to the concern expressed by Members of the Committee towards maintenance and sustainability of assets stated :—

“We ensure sustainability of source which we create. In this connection, I would like to submit that we have recommended

to the States to set up a Scientific Source Finding Committee in which apart from the engineers of the State Governments and the Geo Hydrologists, the Central Ground Water Pump, CSIR lab and any other person whom they think that he can be of help in this regard, can be involved. For example, Remote Sensing representative can also be there. They can also give very good information about the hard rock areas which constitute 2/3rd of the country. So, the Scientific Source Finding Committees are working. The other remedy lies in, number (1) conservation of water, as has also been said by one of the hon. Members."

Explaining the need for conservation of water and watershed approach the Secretary further stated:

"So, the real remedy lies in, number (1) conservation of water, water table should not fall. Water balance is extremely important. In this regard a law has also been enacted by the State Government of Maharashtra. So, in the meeting of Committee of Chief Ministers, it was recommended that other States should also enact a law in this regard. This point has been raised on a number of times in our Empowered Committee also and we are saying that extraction of water needs to be regulated.

The second remedy is to ensure that the maximum amount of rain water goes into the ground and for that, the general approach is : (1) of developing the watershed particularly in these areas which are peninsular, where hard rock is there. This is an extremely expensive exercise and without the involvement of the people, the watershed development programme really cannot succeed. It is a slow process and it involves social attitude, social participation, maximum availability of manpower. We have mentioned it in our guidelines also. Whether the drinking water is there, in one of the most important factors. Therefore, greater priority is given to the development of watershed, and water and social management works where the water scarcity is experienced particularly during the summer months."

3.15 The Committee feel that Government should not be contended by providing a source of drinking water to a habitation to have the claims to provide access to their population. Rather all out efforts are needed for the maintenance and sustainability of the assets. They note that with the 73rd Constitutional Amendment, Panchayats can plan an important role in this regard. It is also felt

that the major limitation of the Panchayat is the financial constraint. For achieving better result by Panchayats, there is the need for their capacity building. It is recommended that Government should make a study to explore ways to make panchayats financially strong and the result of such study should be placed before the Committee. They also observe that by linking Rural development programmes like TRYSEM, the better maintenance of assets can be ensured.

3.16 The Committee feel that falling down of water table is the major area of concern. They would like that Government should seriously draw some action plan with regard to conservation of water and watershed management to tackle this problem.

Quality Problem and R&D under Rural Water Supply Programme

3.17 The Department in the written note have furnished the following data with regard to the quality problem :

Total Number of Habitations	13.24 lakhs
Excess fluoride	28348
Excess Arsenic	427
Excess Salinity	5573.9
Excess Iron	58325
Total	142839

3.18 As per the written note of the Department the quality affected habitations are being taken up for coverage under the ongoing as well as the new projects to be approved under the Sub-Mission Programmes within the Ninth Plan outlay which is yet to be finalised. All the States have been requested to prepare a list of quality affected habitations in order of priority and action plan thereof for 1997-98 onwards.

3.19 The amount earmarked and spent by the Ministry under the Sub-Mission is as under :

(Rs. in crores)		
	Provision	Release
1995-96	135.00	116.43
1996-97	100.20	102.00

3.20 The Committee note with concern the data with regard to quality affected habitation *i.e.* around 1.42 lakhs habitations out of the total habitation of 13.24 lakhs (*i.e.* about 11%). They also observe that ground reality may be more than the official data given by the Department. It is recommended that Government should make sincere efforts to address to problem of the quality affected habitations. It should be ensured that the funds earmarked under the Sub-mission programme are spent for the purpose. The Committee also urge that the efforts to take benefit of the latest technology adopted by the advanced countries like Israel should be taken.

CHAPTER IV

Central Rural Sanitation Programme (CRSP)

Major Head : 7

Demand No. : 2215, 3601 & 3602

4.1	8th Plan Outlay	Rs. 380.00 crores
	Total Expenditure 1992—97	Rs. 234.59 crores
	BE 1996-97	Rs. 60 crore
	BE 1997-98	Rs. 100 crores
	Proposed outlay during Ninth Plan	Rs. 3150 crore

4.2 As per the written note furnished by the Department only 10.46% of rural households have been reported to have access to sanitation facility.

4.3 When asked the Strategy for Ninth Plan, the Department in the written replies have mentioned that the proposed strategy during Ninth Plan is to provide required hygienic facilities to each and every rural human which can be provided over a period of time which may extended to Tenth Five year Plan, primarily by making rural sanitation a people's self help movement fully backed up by Government (as facilitator) supported IEC intensive campaign alternate system and increased outlays.

4.4 When expressed concerns for low priority given to sanitation programme, the Secretary, during the course of oral evidence stated :

“With regard to sanitation, we have relatively a very modest programme in the field of sanitation. We have an allocation of only Rs. 60 crore. Out of that Government started toilets for the poor. Only 2.73 per cent of the rural population has been provided such toilets. In the past there were not many takers for this programme. Now the demand is picking up very fast. In States like Uttar Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh and Andhra Pradesh there is

a good demand for this programme. Under this programme out of the total cost 80 per cent is given by the Government as a grant and the balance money the beneficiary has to provide on his own. The utilization of the funds under this programme has been full. As I said, the States are demanding much more money than what we have been able to provide. In 1997-98 we are trying to do something more. The allocation has been increased from Rs. 60 crore to Rs. 100 crore. But even with this money not much can be done. We are trying to do our best."

4.5 The Committee note with concern the inadequate attention given to the sanitation programme by Central as well as State Governments. It is really regretted to note that as per official data only 10.96% of rural population could have access to sanitation facility when the country is celebrating its 50th year of Independence. It is noted that Government have proposed coverage of each and every individual by the completion of Tenth Plan. The Committee fail to understand how the objective would be achieved with the very slow progress seen in half of the century as per official data.

4.6 The Committee feel that to make the programme a success there is an urgent need to create awareness amongst the rural masses. The spread of epidemics like Cholera, Plague and Dengue in recent years speaks volume about of the least attention paid to sanitation all over the country. It is further, noted with regret that the meagre resources allocated during 8th Plan for the programme couldn't be utilised fully by the Department. Out of Rs. 380.00 crores allocated outlay during 8th Plan, total expenditure has been stated as Rs. 234.59 crore.

4.7 In view of what has been stated in paras above the Committee would like to recommend :—

- (i) sufficient funds should be provided during Ninth Plan under Rural Sanitation Programme by Central Government. Further States should also be directed to provide sufficient funds under MNP to achieve the target of providing access to hygienic surrounding to each and every individual in the country.**
- (ii) the Committee note that providing small dose of funds is not sufficient. Rather it should be ensured that the funds earmarked for the programme are fully utilised for the purpose.**

- (iii) before proposing funds, the Department should chalk out the action plan regarding how the funds could be utilised. State Governments are also required to make the similar action plans.**
- (iv) to make the programme really effective, adequate attention should be paid to publicity campaign through media and NGOs.**
- (v) Rural Sanitation Programme should not be meant to provide latrines to the selected areas/beneficiaries. To have the tangible impact it is required that Government should evolve the holistic approach. The Committee during the 16th Report 1995-96 and 1st Report 1996-97 had recommended that the programme should be launched in a holistic manner so as to benefit all categories of people. They would like to reiterate their earlier recommendation. In line with the objective of providing a holistic approach, they would like that emphasis should be given to model villages.**
- (vi) The implementation of the respecting programme by best performing model villages should be circulated to other villages to motivate them.**

CHAPTER V

National Social Security Programme

Demand No. : 71

Major Head : 2235

5.1 The National Social Assistance Programme has been conceived to provide a national minimum level of social assistance to the destitute and those below the poverty line throughout the country. The programme is meant to supplement the expenditure incurred by the States/UTs on social security schemes. The introduction of the programme at National level is a significant step towards fulfilling the directive principles enshrined in Articles 41 and 42 of the Constitution recognizing the concurrent responsibility of the Central and State Government in the matter. The programme at present provides (i) old age pension to destitute persons of 65 years and above under National Old Age Pensions Scheme (NOAPS), (ii) Family benefit to households below poverty line on the death of the principal breadwinner of the family under National Family Benefit Scheme (NFBS) and (iii) maternity benefit to women of 19 years and above who belong to households below poverty line upto the first two live births under National Maternity Benefit Scheme (NMBS).

5.2 National Social Assistance Programme Outlay

BE 1995-96	Rs. 550 crores
BE 1996-97	Rs. 932 crores
BE 1997-98	Rs. 700 crores
Funds Released (1995-96)	
National Old Age Pension Scheme	216.70
National Family Benefit Scheme	105.06
National Maternity Benefit Scheme	58.88
Total	380.65

(1996-97) (Till January, 1997)	
National Old Age Pension Scheme	197.09
National Family Benefit Scheme	61.94
National Maternity Benefit Scheme	41.01
Total	299.15

(On a specific query it has been reported by the Department that upto 28.3.97 Rs. 548.28 crores have been accorded sanction).

5.3 When asked about the reasons for releasing substantial amount Rs. 249.13 crores *i.e.* more than 45% of the total funds during last two months of the year, the Department have stated that most of the States/ UTs could report substantial expenditure only after January 1997 leading to the late release of funds.

Ninth Plan Proposed Outlay—Rs. 8953.79 crores

5.4 The Qualifying Financial achievements for 3 schemes under NSAP

	Rs. in crores	
	1995-96	1996-97
National Old age Pension Scheme	480.20	483.44
National Family Benefit Scheme	250.19	251.24
National Maternity Benefit Scheme	136.54	137.90
Total	866.83	872.58

Numerical Ceiling

National Old Age Pension Scheme	Beneficiaries
	5371600
National Family Benefit Scheme	456800
National Maternity Benefit	4596700

5.5 The Committee note with concern the shortfall in expenditure during 1995-96 and 1996-97. During 1995-96, Rs. 380.65 crore could be released out of the outlay of Rs. 550 crores. Similarly during 1996-97 till January, 1997 only Rs. 299.15 crores could be released. Another alarming situation is noted by the Committee that around 45% of the outlay is released by Centre during the last 2 months of the financial year. It is further observed by the Committee that outlay during 1997-98 has been reduced from Rs. 932 crores during 1996-97 to Rs. 700 crores during 1997-98.

5.6 The Committee observe that on one side allocation is being reduced and on the other side the funds are not being utilised properly. They are disturbed to note that the funds are released during the fag end of the year which give an opportunity to State Governments to divert money for other purposes.

5.7 It is noted that a good start with the laudable objective of helping the rural poor has been made by the Government. However, the poor implementation of the programme would deprive the needy persons of the benefits given by the Government. They would like that all out efforts should be made to help the respective beneficiaries. They strongly recommend that the Programme should be widely publicised by media on TV, Radio and Rural Newspapers and by displaying at the important places in the village like Panchayat Office. The Committee hope that Central and State Governments would gear up the Centre and State machinery for the better implementation of the programme.

5.8 As regards timely release of money by the Central Government, the Committee during their 1st Report had recommended that the benefits under the programme should be given timely to the beneficiaries and to ensure that certain additional funds should be available with the State Government so as to release the money as and when the demand comes from the beneficiaries. It is noted that funds are not released timely by the Central Government to States. The Committee would like to reiterate their earlier recommendation for compliance by the Government.

CHAPTER VI

Land Records

A. Centrally Sponsored Scheme for Strengthening of Administration and Updating of Land Records (SRA & ULR)

Major Head : 71

Demand No. : 2506

6.1 The scheme was started in the 7th Plan to provide financial assistance to States for early completion of survey and settlement operations, pre-service and in-service training of revenue, survey and settlement staff, induction of new technology in the work of preparation, maintenance and updating of land records, selective strengthening of revenue machinery at various levels etc.

8th Plan outlay	Rs. 175.00 crores
BE 1995-96	Rs. 18.58 crores
BE 1996-97	Rs. 19.14 crores
Total outlay 8th Plan (1992-97)	Rs. 112.53 crores
Likely expenditure	Rs. 98.00 crores
BE 1997-98	Rs. 18.80 crores
Proposed outlay	Rs. 325.00 crores

6.2 The Committee note that

- (i) the actual releases during the 8th Plan are lesser than the allocation;
- (ii) there is shortfall in expenditure as compared to the actual allocation;
- (iii) inadequate funds are allocated for the scheme in view of the magnitude of the problem of updating of land records.

6.3 It was observed that the Standing Committee in their 26th Report (1995-96) and 1st Report (1996-97) had examined the subject in detail and found that inadequate attention has been given to the updating of base land records of rural areas. It was recommended to enhance the outlay in view of the magnitude of the problem. It was also recommended in the 1st Report that instead of spreading the amount throughout the country, the Department should choose some of the model districts/villages where performance has been very good and the best performance should be circulated to the poor performing villages/districts to make them conscious about the importance of updation of Land Records. The Committee find that in spite of the strong recommendation made in the said Reports, funds instead of increased they have decreased from Rs. 19.14 crores during 1996-97 to Rs. 18.80 crores during 1997-98. The Committee would like to reiterate their earlier recommendation made in 1st and 26th Reports as quoted above and would like that Government should provide sufficient funds for the scheme. Besides the implementation of the programme should further be strengthened to ensure 100% utilisation of earmarked funds.

B. Computerisation of Land Records

Demand No. : 71

Major Head : 2506

6.4 As a programme, during 1988-89, pilot project for Computerisation of Land Records were taken up as a sub-scheme of Agrarian Studies. Upto the year 1992-93, 21 projects on computerisation of Land Records were taken up. Since 1993-94, the programme was separated from the Scheme of Institution for Agrarian Studies and came under the category of a Central Sector Scheme.

6.5 Under the Scheme one-third of the estimated project cost is being released as first instalment and the release as well as quantum of funds for second and subsequent instalments depend on the utilisation position of the earlier releases.

Eighth Plan Outlay	—	Rs. 65 crores
BE 1992-93	—	Rs. 5 crores
Actual expenditure	—	Rs. 0.09 crores (1.80%)
BE 1993-94	—	Rs. 8 crores

Actual expenditure	—	Rs. 9.02 crores (112.75%)
BE 1994-95	—	Rs. 12 crores
Actual expenditure	—	Rs. 10.70 crores (89.17%)
BE 1995-96	—	Rs. 20.67 crores
Actual expenditure	—	Rs. 20.257 crores
BE 1996-97	—	Rs. 20.67 crores
Actual expenditure	—	Rs. 20.36 crores
BE 1997-98	—	Rs. 20.67 crores
Proposed Outlay during 9th Plan	—	Rs. 378.90 crores

6.6 As per the written information furnished by the Department out of 523 Districts in the country 323 Districts have so far been covered under the 8th Plan.

6.7 The Committee would like to recommend that Government should allocate the sufficient funds for the Computerisation of Land Records so that the scheme is effectively implemented in all the Districts of the country. They would also like to emphasise that Department should ensure that the funds allocated are utilised properly for the purpose.

CHAPTER VII

Training & Research

Major Head : 71

Demand No.

7.1 The implementation of various poverty alleviation programmes is a very challenging task which calls for an efficient and motivated stream of Government as well as Non-government Functionaries. Further for establishing Panchayati Raj as per Constitution 73rd amendment it is imperative to empower the elected representatives at all levels with the necessary knowledge and skills so as to enable them to perform their Constitutional obligations.

7.2 To handle the stupendous challenging task there is National Institute of Rural Development (NIRD) at the apex (Centre level), 25 State Institutes of Rural Development (SIRD) at the State level, and 85 Extension Training Centres (ETCs) at the sub-regional level.

Outlay for 1997-98

NIRD	Rs. 5 crores
SIRD	Rs. 3.25 crores
ETC	Rs. 3 crores
OTC	Rs. 1 crore
Total	Rs. 12.25 crores
9th Plan Outlay NIRD & SIRD	Rs. 75 crores
ETC	Rs. 114 crores

7.3 The Committee during their 1st Report on demand for Grants 1996-97 had recommended to enhance the outlay to the respective training institutes keeping in view the need of training to be imparted to the implementing personnel of various rural development programmes. It is noted with concern that although rural development schemes have been increased but the outlay for training is the same. It is strongly recommended that sufficient funds should be provided to the respective training institutes during the 9th Plan.

CHAPTER VIII

Panchayat Development & Training

Demand No. : 71

Major Head : 2575

8.1	8th Plan outlay	Rs. 10 crores
	Total allocation during 8th Plan (1992-97)	Rs. 13 crores
	Likely Expenditure (1992-97) (BE-1997-98)	Rs. 8.76 crores Rs. 3 crores
	Proposed outlay	
	Ninth Plan	Rs. 100 crore

8.2 The Committee during their 1st Report on Demands for Grants 1996-97 had recommended to step up the outlay for Panchayat Development and Training. It is noted with concern that *status quo* has been maintained during 1997-98. In view of the 73rd Amendment, devolution of power to Panchayat have been made. But due to financial constraints they are not able to discharge their constitutional obligations. They note that capacity building of Panchayats is the major area of concern. In view of this it is strongly recommended that the allocation for the Panchayat Development and Training should be substantially stepped up as proposed by the Department to Planning Commission.

CHAPTER IX

Roads in Special Problem Areas

Demands No. : 71

Major Head : 3601

9.1 The Scheme for construction of roads in dacoity prone areas of Uttar Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh and Rajasthan was started in 1985-86. The main thrust of the Scheme is to provide better communication and help economic development of the dacoity infested areas. The Scheme is funded by the Government of India and the concerned State Governments in the ratio of 50:50.

8th Plan outlay	Rs. 20 crores
Outlay 1992-93	Rs. 2 crores
1993-94	Rs. 2 crores
1994-95	Rs. 2 crores
1995-96	Rs. 2 crores
1996-97	Rs. 2 crores
Actual allocation during 8th Plan	Rs. 10.00 crores
Likely Expenditure	Rs. 7.71 crores
Proposed outlay 9th Plan	Rs. 8.00 crores

9.2 The Committee during their 1st Report on Demands for Grants 1996-97 had noted the unsatisfactory performance of the Scheme in three States viz. Uttar Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh and Rajasthan and recommended to review and restructure the programme with a view to give emphasis to connect all unconnected villages of such nature in the country besides the

mentioned three States. They note with concern that during 9th plan the outlay has been decreased from Rs. 20 crore during 8th Plan to Rs. 8 crore during 9th Plan. No specific explanation with regard to continuing the Scheme with such a marginal amount has been given. The Committee would like the explanation of the Government with regard to :—

- (i) the decreased outlay during 9th Plan under the Scheme.
- (ii) the action taken on the recommendation of the Committee in their 1st Report to review and restructure the Scheme.

CHAPTER X

Council for Advancement of People's Action & Rural Technology

Major Head : 71

Demand No. :

10.1 Council for Advancement of People's Action and Rural Technology (CAPART) came into existence in September, 1986 by merging People's Action for Development (India) PADI and Council for Advancement of Rural Technology (CART) for the promotion of voluntary action in the field of rural development and propagation of rural technologies. With this end in view, CAPART provides financial assistance to VOs for taking up need-based rural development projects on certain prescribed norms.

10.2 During the 8th Plan the amount of funds released by this Ministry to CAPART and the amount of funds utilised by CAPART are as under :—

	Rs. in crores		
Year	Approved BE	Amount Released by the Ministry to CAPART	Amount Spent by CAPART
1992-93	29.20	42.40	38.47
1993-94	50.92	62.01	62.54
1994-95	72.50	72.50	49.54
1995-96	75.01	48.73	57.10
1996-97	70.50	*	

*Final figures not yet available

10.3 There are eleven main schemes which are being implemented by this Council

1. Promotion of Voluntary Action in Rural Development.
2. Organization of beneficiaries.

3. Assistance to CAPART
4. Jawahar Rozgar Yojana
5. Indira Awaas Yojana
6. Accelerated Rural Water Supply Programme
7. Central Rural Sanitation Programme
8. Integrated Rural Development Programme
9. Development of Women and Children in Rural Areas
10. Million Wells Scheme
11. Training of Panchayati Raj functionaries.

10.4 From 1.4.1987 and up to 30.9.1996, CAPART has sanctioned 15087 projects to more than 5000 voluntary agencies with assistance of Rs. 427.90 crores.

10.5 Keeping in view the increased involvement of voluntary organisations in rural development the Committee would like that the allocation for CAPART should be substantially stepped up. Besides increasing the outlay the Committee desire that to provide greater accountability, transparency and coordination amongst voluntary organization and the District Administration and Panchayat Raj Institution should be developed. It is also noted by the Committee that huge funds allocated to NGOs are being misutilised. They would like that appropriate full proof monitoring mechanism should be evolved to check the misuse of the funds by NGOs.

CHAPTER XI

National Institute of Agricultural Marketing

Demands No. : 71

Major Head : 2435

11.1	Outlay 8th Plan	Rs. 150.00 crores
	Allocation during 8th Plan	Rs. 43.52 crores
	Likely Expenditure	Rs. 23.73 crores
	Ninth Plan outlay	Rs. 641.31 crores

11.2 The National Institute of Agricultural Marketing (NIAM), Jaipur undertakes research, survey and training in agricultural marketing and consultancy service. The Standing Committee in their 16th Report 1995-96, 1st Report 1996-97 had recommended that NIAM should be kept under Ministry of Agriculture as the area of activity falls under the purview of that Ministry. But it is noted with concern that no action has been taken on the recommendation of the Committee. They would like to reiterate their recommendation strongly and would urge that it should be complied with without any further delay.

CHAPTER XII

Distribution of Ceiling Surplus Land

12.1 The Committee note that under the programme 'Distribution of Ceiling of Surplus Land', the data with regard to Ceiling Surplus Land by States is monitored. However, the nomenclature states as if the distribution of Ceiling Surplus Land is undertaken under the programme. They would like that the nomenclature should be suitably revised in line with the objective and status of the programme.

NEW DELHI;
April 21, 1997
Vaisakha 1, 1919 (Saka)

SONTOSH MOHAN DEV,
Chairman,
Standing Committee on Urban and Rural
Development.

ANNEXURE I

Ministry of Rural Areas and Employment Department of Rural Development

Sl. No.	Name of the Schemes	1995-96		1996-97		1997-98		% hike over B.E. 1996-97		
		B.E.	Actual	B.E.	R.E.	Proposed Outlays	B.E.			
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
T.M. Division										
1.	Rural Water Supply Programme	1110.00	1110.00	1040.71	1110.00	1095.00	1094.40	4427.00	1302.00	17.30
2.	Rural Sanitization	60.00	60.00	59.30	60.00	60.00	60.60	400.00	100.00	66.67
Administration Division										
3.	Grants to National Institute of Rural Development	5.00	5.00	5.73	5.00	5.00	5.00	15.00	5.00	0.00
4.	Strengthening of State Training Centre	3.25	3.25	3.25	3.25	4.00	4.00	15.00	3.25	0.00
5.	Assistance to C.A.P.A.R.T.	12.00	12.00	7.00	12.00	12.00	12.00	4.00	12.00	0.00
6.	Org. of Training Courses, Seminars & Workshop	0.50	0.50	0.15	0.50	0.25	0.12	0.60	0.50	0.00

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
7.	Strengthening of Ext. Training Centre	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.13	30.00	3.00	0.00
	L.R. Division									
8.	Assistance to Assignees of Ceiling Surplus Land	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.00
9.	Grants-in-aid to Institute for Agrarian Studies	0.67	0.67	0.25	0.67	0.67	0.19	1.00	0.68	1.49
10.	Computerisation of Land Records	20.00	20.00	20.02	20.00	20.00	20.17	83.60	20.00	0.00
11.	Strengthening of Revenue Machinery & updating	18.80	18.80	18.58	18.80	18.80	19.14	80.00	18.80	0.00
12.	National Commission on Revitalisation of Rev. Ad	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.00
13.	Organisation of Rural Poor	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Media Division									
15.	Communication Cell	4.00	9.00	7.12	4.00	4.00	4.00	6.00	4.00	0.00
16.	Promotion of Voluntary Scheme	10.00	6.00	2.90	10.00	10.00	10.00	11.00	10.00	0.00
17.	Organisation of Beneficiaries	3.50	3.50	0.88	3.50	3.50	3.50	3.00	3.50	0.00
	Monitoring Division									
18.	Panchayat Development and Training	3.00	7.00	2.97	3.00	3.00	3.00	20.00	3.00	0.00

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
19.	Roads in Special Problem Areas	2.00	2.00	0.52	2.00	2.00	0.52	3.00	2.00	0.00
20.	N.S.A.P.	0.00	550.00	381.01	932.00	550.00	545.29	1790.76	700.00	-24.89
	Marketing Division									
21.	Agricultural Marketing	7.25	3.31	2.72	7.25	6.47	6.18	6.36	7.25	0.00
22.	Provision for new Schemes							3000.00	0.00	
		1263.00	1814.06	1556.11	2195.00	1797.72	1794.24	9896.32	2195.00	0.00

APPENDIX I

STATEMENT OF OBSERVATIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS

Sl. No.	Para No.	Recommendation
1	2	3
1.	2.3	<p>The Committee note with concern the <i>status quo</i> in the outlay of 1997-98 as compared to that of the year 1996-97. They note that the outlay for 1997-98 does not cover even the percentage hike due to inflationary trends. They further note an alarming feature that emerges out of the data given at Para 2.1 above. The accepted outlay during 1997-98 by the Ministry of Finance is much lesser <i>i.e.</i> around 20% of the proposed outlay by the Department. It is also observed that not only the outlay sanctioned is inadequate keeping in view the challenges of rural poverty and entire gamut of improvement in the overall quality of life, but the scarce resources as sanctioned for different rural development schemes are not fully utilised. The Committee visualize that underspending of funds earmarked for rural development schemes is the major area of concern. They in their 1st Report on Demands for Grants 1996-97 had expressed their concern towards the non-utilisation of funds and urged the Department to ensure 100% utilisation of funds. It is noted that there is no such improvement in the spending position and the feature of underspending reoccurrence during 1996-97. The Committee would like an explanation of the Government on this account.</p>

1	2	3
2.	2.4	<p>It is also observed that the Department could not get the proposed amount under the respective schemes due to underspending of funds allocated in the previous year. In other words ineffective implementation of the schemes is responsible for not getting sufficient funds for the various schemes of Rural Development. The Committee note that the Department could not feel contended by merely allocating the State's share for respective schemes to States/UTs. Rather the schemes should be properly monitored and it should have been ensured that funds for Centrally sponsored schemes are utilised by various State Governments for the specific purpose these are meant for. They would like the Department to review their programmes/schemes so as to have first hand knowledge of the weaknesses responsible for the poor implementation of the schemes.</p> <p>The Committee would like an explanation of the Government in this regard. It is strongly recommended to have a full proof mechanism incorporated in the guidelines to ensure effective implementation of the programmes/schemes and cent percent utilisation of funds.</p>
3.	2.5	<p>It is observed that implementation of respective schemes of Rural Development is slow because the implementing personnel do not have the technical expertise required for proper planning, to make projects and calling tender of small, medium and big nature. Besides the implementing agency lack of the required infrastructure such as</p>

1

2

3

road roller, water pumps etc. It is recommended that to improve the implementation of the programmes, personnel responsible for the implementation should be given the proper technical training and the required infrastructure should also be provided.

4. 2.6 Further, it is found that because of paucity of funds required for various programmes, the staff of respective State Departments like PWD, PHA, R&D, etc. are sitting idle. The services of such persons should be adequately used by transfer on deputation basis as BDO for implementing rural development schemes to improve the implementation position.
5. 2.7 It is also recommended that the maintenance of assets created under different programmes should be the responsibility of the respective Panchayats.
6. 2.8 It is recommended that intensive programmes for sensitizing the local community and the target groups be undertaken on large scale.
7. 2.9 People's participation in the implementation of the schemes be enhanced. This can be done through involvement on much larger scale of elected representatives (MPs/MLAs/MLCs) and representative institutions (Panchayats) in the implementation process.
8. 2.10 Committees of beneficiaries be formed at the grass root level and such Committees be associated with the implementation process.
-

1	2	3
9.	2.11	<p>The Panchayati Raj System in view of 73rd Amendment of the Constitution of India can be effective if there is all round empowerment of Panchayats. Besides devolution of financial powers, there is need to empower Panchayats with regard to administrative, Planning, technical angle. The Committee urge that it is high time to evaluate the functioning of Panchayats with regard to each and every aspect <i>viz.</i>, the status of election, devolution of power, financial, administrative, etc.</p>
10.	2.12	<p>The Committee note that no rural programme can be successfully implemented without people's involvement. It is recommended that necessary steps should be taken for effective people's participation in all the rural development schemes.</p>
11.	3.8	<p>The Committee would like to express their doubts about the claim of the Government of 84.23% of rural population having access to safe drinking water. They feel that the reality at the grass root level is quite different. It is observed that Government should verify their claim and would like the explanation of the Government in this regard.</p>
12.	3.9	<p>The Committee appreciate the gesture of the Government to enhance the outlay from Rs. 1110 crores to Rs. 1302 crores during 1997-98. The percentage hike is around 17.3%. Still they feel that the outlay is insufficient to address to the problem of water supply in rural areas specifically in view of the revised increased number of partially covered habitation <i>i.e.</i> 4,25,000 and</p>

1

2

3

not covered habitation 1,47,614 as on 1.4.96 as per the recent survey (as mentioned by the Secretary, Government during the course of oral evidence). They would like to recommend that sufficient funds should be earmarked during Ninth Plan under Rural Water Supply Programme to achieve the laudable objective of the Government to cover all the remaining not covered habitations and partially covered habitations by 2000 AD.

13.

3.10

The Committee further note that not only inadequate funds are allocated for the said programme, but also the funds are not utilised fully by State Governments which adversely affects the implementation of the programme. During 1996-97 (upto January 97) out of Rs. 1110 crores outlay Rs. 937.41 crores could be released by Central Government out of which expenditure reported (upto i.e. December 1996) is Rs. 456.12 crores. They fail to understand how the Department could utilize the remaining around 60% funds during the last two months. During 8th Plan period out of Rs. 4047.251 crores released, the expenditure reported by States/UTs is Rs. 3296.161 crores. It is disturbing to note that 18% of the outlay is lying unutilised with the State Government/UTs Administration during the 8th Plan. They note that under utilisation does not only affect the implementation of the programme for which funds are sanctioned but also have far reaching effect on the other programmes for which the scarce resources could have been utilised.

1

2

3

This speaks well of the lack of planning and monitoring on the part of the Government. It is noted by the Committee that the norms of 35% of the funds during the 4th quarter as per the guidelines of the Government are itself responsible for under-utilisation of funds. Bulk of funds are released during the fag end of the year which causes diversion of funds by State Government for other purposes. The Committee strongly recommend that Government should further strengthen the monitoring system and review the programme to know the reasons for the under-utilisation of funds by State Governments. Government should not be contended with issuing merely instruction to State Governments rather it should be strictly monitored on regular intervals. Strict action should be taken against the defaulter State Government/UT Administration. They would also like to urge that the faulty norms of releasing 35% of the outlay during the 4th quarter should be reviewed by the Government and guidelines be revised accordingly.

14.

3.11

The Committee also find that State Governments are not contributing equal matching share under MNP. Another surprising feature noted by the Committee is that while some of the State Governments are not contributing equal matching share under MNP the other State Governments/UT Administration like Andaman & Nicobar, Dadra & Nagar Haveli, Lakshadweep, Pondicherry and Delhi are deprived of the

1

2

3

Central funds and the argument furnished by the Government is that the respective State funds commensurate the targets fixed by such State Governments. The Committee would like to be apprised of, by the Government on this account.

15. 3.13 The Committee note that the major areas of concern are the maintenance and sustainability of assets created under the programme. The water level in many areas is going down. The peak summer months of May and June adversely affect the rural population since the hand-pumps go dry.

16. 3.15 The Committee feel that Government should not be contended by providing a source of drinking water to a habitation to have the claims to provide access to their population. Rather all out efforts are needed for the maintenance and sustainability of the assets. They note that with the 73rd Constitutional Amendment, Panchayats can play an important role in this regard. It is also felt that the major limitation of the Panchayat is the financial constraint. For achieving better result by Panchayats, there is the need for their capacity building. It is recommended that Government should make a study to explore ways to make panchayats financially strong and the result of such study should be placed before the Committee. They also observe that by linking Rural Development Programmes like TRYSEM, the better maintenance of assets can be ensured.

17. 3.16 The Committee feel that falling down of water table is the major area of concern.

1

2

3

They would like that Government should seriously draw some action plan with regard to conservation of water and watershed management to tackle this problem.

18.

3.20

The Committee note with concern the data with regard to quality affected habitation *i.e.* around 1.42 lakhs habitations out of the total habitation of 13.24 lakhs (*i.e.* about 11%). They also observe that ground reality may be more than the official data given by the Department. It is recommended that Government should make sincere efforts to address to problem of the quality affected habitations. It should be ensured that the funds earmarked under the submission programme are spent for the purpose. The Committee also urge that the efforts to take benefit of the latest technology adopted by the advanced countries like Israel should be taken.

19.

4.5

The Committee note with concern the inadequate attention given to the sanitation programme by Central as well as State Governments. It is really regretted to note that as per official data only 10.96% of rural population could have access to sanitation facility when the country is celebrating its 50th Year of Independence. It is noted that Government have proposed coverage of each and every individual by the completion of Tenth Plan. The Committee fail to understand how the objective would be achieved with the very slow progress seen in half of the century as per official data.

20.

4.6

The Committee feel that to make the programme a success there is an urgent need

1

2

3

to create awareness amongst the rural masses. The spread of epidemics like Cholera, Plague and Dengue in recent years speaks volume about of the least attention paid to sanitation all over the country. It is further, noted with regret that the meagre resources allocated during 8th Plan for the programme couldn't be utilised fully by the Department. Out of Rs. 380.00 crores allocated outlay during 8th Plan, total expenditure has been stated as Rs. 234.59 crore.

21.

4.7

In view of what has been stated in paras above the Committee would like to recommend :—

- (i) Sufficient funds should be provided during Ninth Plan under Rural Sanitation Programme by Central Government. Further States should also be directed to provide sufficient funds under MNP to achieve the target of providing access to hygienic surrounding to each and every individual in the country.
- (ii) The Committee note that providing small dose of funds is not sufficient. Rather it should be ensured that the funds earmarked for the programme are fully utilised for the purpose.
- (iii) Before proposing funds, the Department should chalk out the action plan regarding how the funds could be utilised. State Governments are also required to make the similar action plans.

1

2

3

-
- (iv) To make the programme really effective, adequate attention should be paid to publicity campaign through Media and NGOs.
 - (v) Rural Sanitation Programme should not be meant to provide latrines to the selected areas/beneficiaries. To have the tangible impact it is required that Government should evolve the holistic approach. The Committee during the 16th Report 1995-96 and 1st Report 1996-97 had recommended that the Programme should be launched in a holistic manner so as to benefit all categories of people. They would like to reiterate their earlier recommendation. In line with the objective of providing a holistic approach, they would like that emphasis should be given to model villages.
 - (vi) The implementation of the respecting programme by best performing model villages should be circulated to other villages to motivate them.

22.

5.5

The Committee note with concern the shortfall in expenditure during 1995-96 and 1996-97. During 1995-96, Rs. 380.65 crore could be released out of the outlay of Rs. 550 crores. Similarly during 1996-97 till January, 1997 only Rs. 299.15 crores could be released. Another alarming situation is noted by the Committee that around 45% of the outlay is released by Centre during the last 2 months of the financial year. It is further observed by the Committee that outlay during 1997-98 has been reduced

1**2****3**

- from Rs. 932 crore during 1996-97 to Rs. 700 crores during 1997-98.
23. 5.6 The Committee observe that on one side allocation is being reduced and on the other side the funds are not being utilised properly. They are disturbed to note that the funds are released during the fag end of the year which give an opportunity to State Governments to divert money for other purposes.
24. 5.7 It is noted that a good start with the laudable objective of helping the rural poor has been made by the Government. However, the poor implementation of the programme would deprive the needy persons of the benefits given by the Government. They would like that all out efforts should be made to help the respective beneficiaries. They strongly recommend that the Programme should be widely publicised by media on TV, Radio and Rural newspapers and by displaying at the important places in the village like Panchayat Office. The Committee hope that Central and State Governments would gear up the Centre and State mechnery for the better implementation of the programme.
25. 5.8 As regards timely release of money by the Central Government, the Committee during their Ist Report had recommended that the benefits under the programme should be given timely to the beneficiaries and to ensure that certain additional funds should be available with the State Government so as to release the money as and when the demand comes from the beneficiaries. It is noted that funds are-not released timely by the Central Government to States. The

1**2****3**

Committee would like to reiterate their earlier recommendation for compliance by the Government. (iii) inadequate funds are allocated for the scheme in view of the magnitude of the problem of updating of land records.

26.**6.2**

The Committee note that

- (i) the actual releases during the 8th Plan are lesser than the allocation;
- (ii) there is shortfall in expenditure as compared to the actual allocation;
- (iii) inadequate funds are allocated for the scheme in view of the magnitude of the problem of updating of land records.

27.**6.3**

It was observed that the Standing Committee in their 26th Report (1995-96) and 1st Report (1996-97) had examined the subject in detail and found that inadequate attention has been given to the updating of base land records of rural areas. It was recommended to enhance the outlay in view of the magnitude of the problem. It was also recommended in the 1st Report that instead of spreading the amount throughout the country, the Department should choose some of the model districts/ villages where performance has been very good and the best performance should be circulated to the poor performing villages/ districts to make them conscious about the importance of updation of land Records. The Committee find that in spite of the strong recommendation made in the said Reports, funds instead of increased they have decreased from Rs. 19.14 crores during 1996-97 to Rs. 18.80 crores during 1997-98.

1

2

3

- The Committee would like to reiterate their earlier recommendation made in 1st and 26th Reports as quoted above and would like that Government **should provide** sufficient funds for the scheme. Besides the implementation of the programme should further be strengthened to ensure 100% utilisation of earmarked funds.
28. 6.7 The Committee would like to recommend that Government should allocate the sufficient funds for the Computerisation of Land records so that the scheme is effectively implemented in all the Districts of the country. They would also like to emphasise that Department should ensure that the funds allocated are utilised properly for the purpose.
29. 7.3 The Committee during their 1st Report on demand for Grants 1996-97 had recommended to enhance the outlay to the respective training institutes keeping in view the need of training to be imparted to the implementing personnel of various rural development programmes. It is noted with concern that although rural development schemes have been increased but the outlay for training is the same. It is strongly recommended that sufficient funds should be provided to the respective training institutes during the 9th Plan.
30. 8.2 The Committee during their 1st Report on Demands for Grants 1996-97 had recommended to step up the outlay for Panchayat Development and Training. It is noted with concern that status quo has been maintained during 1997-98. In view of the 73rd Amendment, devolution of power to Panchayat have been made. But due to

1

2

3

financial constraints they are not able to discharge their constitutional obligations. They note that capacity building of Panchayats is the major area of concern. In view of this it is strongly recommended that the allocation for the Panchayat Development and Training should be substantially stepped up as proposed by the Department to Planning Commission.

31.

9.2

The Committee during their 1st Report on Demands for Grants 1996-97 had noted the unsatisfactory performance of the Scheme in three states viz. Uttar Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh and Rajasthan and recommended to review and restructure the programme with a view to give emphasis to connect all unconnected villages of such nature in the country besides the mentioned three States. They note with concern that during 9th Plan the outlay has been decreased from Rs. 20 crores during 8th Plan to Rs. 8 crore during 9th Plan. No specific explanation with regard to continuing the Scheme with such a marginal amount has been given. The Committee would like the explanation of the Government with regard to :

- (i) the decreased outlay during 9th Plan under the Scheme.
- (ii) the action taken on the recommendation of the Committee in their 1st Report to review and restructure the Scheme.

32.

10.5

Keeping in view the increased involvement of voluntary organisations in rural development the Committee would like that the allocation for CAPART should be substantially stepped up. Besides increasing the outlay the Committee desire that to

1

2

3

provide greater accountability, transparency and coordination amongst voluntary organization and the District Administration and Panchayat Raj Institution should be developed. It is also noted by the Committee that huge funds allocated to NGOs are being misutilised. They would like that appropriate fullproof monitoring mechanism should be evolved to check the misuse of the funds by NGOs.

33.

11.2

The National Institute of Agricultural Marketing (NIAM), Jaipur undertakes research, survey and training in agricultural marketing and consultancy service; The Standing Committee in their 16th Report 1995-96, 1st Report 1996-97 had recommended that NIAM should be kept under Ministry of Agriculture as the area of activity falls under the purview of that Ministry. But it is noted with concern that no action has been taken on the recommendation of the Committee. They would like to reiterate their recommendation strongly and would urge that it should be complied with without any further delay.

34.

12.1

The Committee note that under the programme 'Distribution of Ceiling of Surplus Land', the data with regard to Ceiling Surplus Land by States is monitored. However, the nomenclature states as if the distribution of Ceiling Surplus Land is undertaken under the programme. They would like that the nomenclature should be suitably revised in line with the objective and status of the programme.