

NINETEENTH REPORT
STANDING COMMITTEE ON
URBAN AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT
(2001)

(THIRTEENTH LOK SABHA)

MINISTRY OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT
(DEPARTMENT OF LAND RESOURCES)

DEMAND FOR GRANTS
(2000-2001)

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

Presented to Lok Sabha on 19.4.2001

Laid in Rajya Sabha on 19.4.2001



LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI

April, 2001/Chaitra, 1923 (Saka)

COMMITTEE ON URBAN AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT
(2001)

Corrigenda to the 19th Report (13th Lok Sabha)

<u>Page</u>	<u>Para No.</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>For</u>	<u>Read</u>
17	3.7	4	additionally	additionality
19	-	9	Recourse	Records
		from bottom		
26	3.30	13	delete the before position	
26	Row 11 from bottom	Col.4	correspon- during	corresponding
26	Row 5 from bottom	Col.6	53.67	53.63
28	3.38	9	crucial to preparing	crucial for preparing
28	3.43	4	add of after out	
		from bottom		
35	-	10	Resoures	Resources

CONTENTS

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

APPENDICES

- I. Extracts of the Minutes of the 5th Sitting of
the Committee held on 7.03.2001.....
- II. Extracts of the Minutes of the 6th Sitting
of the Committee held on 12.03.2001
- III. Analysis of the Action taken by the Government
on the recommendations contained in the
12th Report of the Committee (13th Lok Sabha)....

COMPOSITION OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON
URBAN AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT
(2001)

Shri Anant Gangaram Geete—*Chairman*

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

2. Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar
3. Shri Padmanava Behera
4. Shri Jaswant Singh Bishnoi
5. Shri Ambati Brahmaniah
6. Shri Swadesh Chakraborty
7. Shri Haribhai Chaudhary
8. Shri Bal Krishna Chauhan
9. Prof. Kailasho Devi
10. Shrimati Hema Gamang
11. Shri Holkhomang Haokip
12. Shri R.L. Jalappa
13. Shri Babubhai K. Katara
14. Shri Madan Lal Khurana
15. Shri Shrichand Kriplani
16. Shri P.R. Kyndiah
17. Shri Bir Singh Mahato
18. Shri Punnulal Mohale
19. Dr. Ranjit Kumar Panja
20. Shri Ramchandra Paswan
21. Shri Chandresh Patel
22. Shri Dharam Raj Singh Patel
23. Prof. (Shrimati) A.K. Premajam
24. Shri Rajesh Ranjan
25. Shri Nikhilaranda Sar
26. Shri Maheshwar Singh
27. Shri Chinmayanand Swami
28. Shri Sunder Lal Tiwari
29. Shri D. Venugopal
30. Shri Chintaman Wanaga

(iv)

Rajya Sabha

31. Shri S. Agniraj
32. Shrimati Shabana Azmi
33. Shri Karnendu Bhattacharjee
34. Shri N.R. Dasari
35. Shri R.S. Gavai
36. Prof. A. Lakshmisagar
37. Shri C. Apok Jamir
38. Shri Faqir Chand Mullana
39. Shri Onward L. Nongtdu
40. Shri A. Vijaya Raghavan
41. Shri N. Rajendran
42. Shri Solipeta Ramachandra Reddy
43. Shri Man Mohan Samal
44. Shri Suryabhan Patil Vahadane

SECRETARIAT

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

INTRODUCTION

1. The Chairman of the Standing Committee on Urban and Rural Development (2001) having been authorised by the Committee to submit the Report on their behalf present the Nineteenth Report on the Action taken by the Government on the recommendations contained in the Twelfth Report of the Standing Committee on Urban and Rural Development (1999-2000) on Demand for Grants (2000-2001) of the Ministry of Rural Development (Department of Land Resources).

2. The Twelfth Report was presented to Lok Sabha on 24th April, 2000. The replies of the Government to all the recommendations contained in the Report were received on 22nd August, 2000.

3. The replies of the Government were examined and the Report was considered and adopted by the Committee at their sitting held on 12th March, 2001.

4. An analysis of the action taken by the Government on the recommendations contained in the Twelfth Report of the Committee (1999-2000) is given in Appendix III.

NEW DELHI;
21 March, 2001

30 Phalgun, 1922 (Saka)

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

REPORT

CHAPTER-I

This Report of the Committee on Urban & Rural Development (2001) deals with the action taken by the Government on the recommendations contained in their Twelfth Report on Demand for Grants for the year (2000-2001) of the Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development), which was presented to Lok Sabha on 24th April, 2000.

2. Action taken notes have been received from the Government in respect of all the 21 recommendations which have been categorised as follows:

- (i) Recommendations which have been accepted by the Government:—
Sl. Nos. 2.16, 2.17, 2.22, 3.6, 3.7, 3.12, 3.15, 3.34 and 3.39
- (ii) Recommendation which the Committee do not desire to pursue in view of Government's replies:—
Sl. No. 2.13
- (iii) Recommendations in respect of which replies of the Government have not been accepted by the Committee:—
Sl. Nos. 2.10, 2.11, 2.26, 3.8, 3.18, 3.24, 3.30, 3.38 and 3.43
- (iv) Recommendations in respect of which final replies of the Government are still awaited:—
Sl. Nos. 2.19 and 3.46

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. Development of land under wastelands and high level coordination between the Government, Planning Commission, Corporations etc. for preparation of Development Plans.

Recommendation (Para Nos. 2.10 and 2.11)

5. The Committee had recommended as under:

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

Recommendation (Para No. 2.10)

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

Recommendation (Para No. 2.11)

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

"The Department of Land Resources (DoLR) had impressed upon the Planning Commission the need for allocation of larger resources for development of wasteland on watershed basis. Accordingly, it has been possible to increase the budget allocation for the year 2000-2001 to Rs. 805.00 crore for the Programmes, namely, IWDP, DPAP and DDP, of the DoLR."

(Action taken reply to the Recommendation at Para No. 2.10)

“The Government had constituted a National Standing Committee for Watershed Development in August 1999 under the Chairmanship of Deputy Chairman, Planning Commission with Ministers from Rural Development, Agriculture, Environment and Forests as well as their Secretaries as Members so as to have high level co-ordination at the Centre. Similarly, consultations with leading NGOs and Experts on Watershed Management is held from time to time through organising Seminars, Workshops, Symposia etc. in which Government Institutions/Departments/NGOs etc. participate and for which funds are also provided by the Government. A Workshop was also organised by the Department with the NGO leaders in February 2000. Further, the Panchayats are also involved for implementation of watershed projects as Panchayat members are also members of Watershed Committee and Watershed Association. The Guidelines provide for Non-Government Organisations also to work as Programme Implementing Agencies (PIAs) in watershed programmes under the three major programmes of DoLR.”

(Action taken reply to the Recommendation at Para No. 2.11)

7. The Committee are not satisfied with the common place reply furnished by the Government pursuant to their recommendation to have high level coordination between the Government, Planning Commission, the State Governments and the Panchayats or other legally authorised Local Bodies and NGOs as well as the corporate sector as a whole to prepare a detailed action plan for the attainment of the stated goals. The Committee are deeply distressed that the main issues namely—(a) mobilization of adequate resources to meet the physical targets set by the Government; (b) improvement of implementation by active involvement of PRIs and (c) involvement of the corporate sector both for private profit and larger national goals, have been sidetracked. Instead of addressing the specific issues raised in the recommendation, the Government have indicated the existing position in respect of development of wasteland by the Government sponsored schemes, already known to the Committee. The Committee, therefore, reiterate their earlier recommendation and would like the Government to take their recommendation seriously and furnish the specific action taken/to be taken by the Government in this regard.

B. Unification of all Schemes/Programmes of Watershed Development

Recommendation (Para No. 2.19)

8. The Committee had noted as below:

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

9. The Government have replied as below:

"The President of India in his address to Parliament on 23.3.2000 had referred to the intention of the Government to bring all the Programmes and Schemes alongwith the budgeted funds and infrastructure relating to the conservation, development and management of land resources in the country presently being implemented by other Ministries/Departments under the Department of Land Resources. The modalities for transfer of such schemes/programmes are being worked out by a Committee of Secretaries."

10. The Committee in their earlier recommendation had stressed for the unification of all old schemes/programmes of wasteland development within a stipulated time frame. The Committee find that nearly a year has passed since the assurance was given in the Parliament and the recommendation was made by the Committee, the Government are yet to take a final decision in this regard. In view of it, the Committee urged that the modalities for transfer of such schemes/programmes, as being worked out by a Committee of Secretaries, should be finalized by 30th April, 2001.

C. Post-project maintenance of IWDP projects

Recommendation (Para No. 2.26)

11. The Committee had noted as below:

"The Committee find that keeping in view the fact that most of the projects are still continuing, the problem of post-project maintenance may not be so acute, at present, but feel that as the

time passes and projects are completed, it will emerge as stupendous task. In view of this, the Committee hope that the Government, while planning, would give careful consideration in the practicality of placing the entire responsibility for maintenance on local bodies without ensuring the financial health of the elected local authorities and their precise relationship to wastelands development projects falling in their geographical domain."

12. The Government have replied as below:

"The Guidelines for Watershed Development provide for the constitution of a 'Watershed Development Fund' to take care of post project maintenance which is operated by the Watershed Committee, permanent body elected by the Watershed Association to ensure sustainability of the project."

13. The Committee are not satisfied with the reply furnished by the Government pursuant to their recommendation to give careful consideration to the practicality of placing the entire responsibility for maintenance on local bodies without ensuring the financial position and their relationship to wastelands development projects falling in their geographical domain. Instead of addressing the specific issues raised in the recommendation, the Government have furnished the existing position with regard to post wasteland project maintenance according to which there is a provision for constitution of a Watershed Development Fund to take care of the post project maintenance, as per the guidelines. The Committee are not able to appreciate the existing provision of Watershed Development Fund without having any idea of the funds required by each local body to take care of the watershed development project falling in their geographical domain. In view of it, the Committee urge that the Government should seriously take stock of the financial health of the existing Watershed Development Fund in the light of the cost of maintenance of each project and the number of projects falling in the geographical domain of a Panchayat and apprise the Committee accordingly. While doing so, as already recommended, the Government should take into account their precise relationship to wastelands development projects also, so that the local bodies are in a position to shoulder the responsibility of maintenance without any difficulties.

D. Reorientation of IWDP**Recommendation (Para No. 3.8)**

14. The Committee had noted as below:

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

15. The Government have replied as below:

"The DRDAs have been reminded to submit the completion certificate of all the projects which have attained the physical and financial targets. Attempts are also being made to sensitise DRDAs for better monitoring of the projects so that the projects are completed within the stipulated time frame. The Watershed Projects under IWDP comprise a number of micro watersheds of about 500 hectares. A micro-watershed may cover one village or a part of a village or parts of more than one village located contiguously; whereas the jurisdiction of a village Panchayat is normally limited to a village. The responsibility of planning, executing and maintaining the watershed projects is entrusted to the Watershed Committee which is a permanent body elected by the Watershed Association formed by the local people living in the watershed area. Since members of the gram panchayat are also members of the Watershed Committee and the Watershed Association, Panchayats are already involved with the implementation process of IWDP projects."

16. The Committee in their earlier recommendation had stressed on reorienting IWDP to be essentially a Panchayat based programme. The Government in their action taken reply had only stated the existing position regarding implementation of IWDP. While the Committee have no objection to the Watershed Committees taking care of planning, execution and maintenance of watershed projects, they, however, stress that the involvement of local people can only be ensured with the set procedure of Watershed Committees reporting to Gram Panchayats and Gram Panchayats to the Gram Sabhas. Only then the general public in the Gram Sabhas can comment specifically to the work done by the Watershed Committees thereby ensuring the peoples participation in IWDP. The Committee, therefore, would like to reiterate their earlier recommendation to reorient IWDP on a priority basis.

E. Task Force for Ex-servicemen

Recommendation (Para No. 3.18)

17. The Committee had noted as below:

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

18. The Government have replied as below:

“The Department is exploring the possibility of constituting Task Force for development of wasteland in other States in view, of the recommendations of the Standing Committee.”

19. The Committee are dissatisfied to note that even when one year has elapsed since the Committee recommended to the Government to think of launching projects for development of wastelands with a view to availing of the experience, expertise and excellence of ex-servicemen especially during the Kargil period, the Government are still exploring the possibility of constitution of the Task Force for the purpose. The Committee find that the Government have not given due consideration to their recommendation on such a serious issue and would like that expeditious action in this regard is taken by the Government.

E. Involvement of private sector in the field of development of wastelands

Recommendation (Para No. 3.24)

20. The Committee had noted as below:

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

- (i) the Government should interact with the federations of industry and commerce, such as CII, FICCI, ASSOCHAM, who have not been involved in the National and Regional Workshops organised thus far;
- (ii) the Government should widen the approach to industry which has thus far been restricted regionally to the PHD Chamber and industry-wise to the pulp and paper industry, besides being concentrated on plantations to the virtual exclusion of other methods of land reclamation;
- (iii) the possibility of harnessing the Ministry of Finance and the Ministry of Commerce and Industry, at the highest level, to stimulate corporate sector involvement should be examined;
- (iv) the Government should request the Ministry of Finance to examine the possibility of providing fiscal incentives which would exponentially, raise the level of corporate sector participation in wastelands development; and
- (v) a high-level review, in consultation with the Finance Ministry and the RBI, of the role of financial institutions and scheduled banks in the implementation of schemes of the Department should be made by the Government."

21. The Government have replied as below:

"To popularize the IPS, a series of State level and district level workshops have been organized in Mizoram, Himachal Pradesh & Uttar Pradesh, involving the farmers, Nationalised Banks, Regional Rural Banks and Cooperative Banks. Similar workshops are proposed to be organized by some more potential States during the current financial year. In order to attract private sector participation in the task of development of wastelands, the Department has initiated consultations with associations of Industry and Commerce, etc. as suggested by the Committee."

22. The Committee are not satisfied with the way the Government have dealt with their earlier recommendation to stimulate corporate sector in the task of development of wastelands in the country. The objective of involving private sector in this task can only be achieved by resorting to the measures as indicated in their earlier recommendations at para 3.24 (i) to (v). The Committee, therefore, reiterate their earlier recommendation and would like that the Government should consider their recommendation seriously and after taking the necessary initiative, point wise reply may be furnished expeditiously.

G. Underspending and Unspent Balance in DPAP Projects

Recommendation (Para No. 3.30)

23. The Committee had recommended as below:

"The Committee are concerned to note the huge underspending under the Programme and would like to be apprised about the position of un-spent balances in each of the DPAP Project. It is urged that the Government should review the implementation of the programme and try to critically analyse the reasons for under spending in the respective blocks."

24. The Government have replied as below:

"The following Table indicates the State-wise Central Release, State share, expenditure incurred upto 31.3.2000 and the outstanding balance as on 1.4.2000:—

(Rs. in crores)

Sl.No.	Name of the State	Central releases during 1995-96 to 1999-2000	Corresponding State Share	Total funds made Available	Expenditure Up to 31.3.2000	O.B. as on 1.4.2000
1.	Andhra Pradesh	119.80	113.20	233.00	228.20	4.80
2.	Bihar	13.42	12.95	26.37	15.72	10.65
3.	Gujarat	39.29	36.99	76.28	53.63	22.65
4.	Himachal Pradesh	4.74	4.57	9.31	7.73	1.58
5.	Jammu & Kashmir	8.30	8.30	16.60	14.65	1.95
6.	Karnataka	41.49	39.01	80.50	70.65	9.85
7.	Madhya Pradesh	72.34	70.16	142.50	117.91	24.59
8.	Maharashtra	61.64	59.47	121.11	66.06	55.05
9.	Orissa	10.84	10.84	21.68	15.96	5.72
10.	Rajasthan	17.75	17.57	35.32	28.69	6.63
11.	Tamil Nadu	35.62	32.63	68.25	66.56	1.69
12.	Uttar Pradesh	55.16	51.80	106.96	97.85	9.11
13.	West Bengal	7.27	7.27	14.54	4.92	9.62
Total		487.66	464.76	952.42	788.53	163.89

It would be observed that there is no huge underspending as the total expenditure level is to the tune of 82.5%. As reported earlier, the Department has taken the following steps to ensure that unspent balances are restricted to the minimum. The criteria for release of subsequent instalment has been made stricter. Any subsequent instalment is released only when all the funds released upto the last but one instalment have been utilised and at least 50% of the last release have been utilised.

Sanction of new projects is linked with the performance of implementation of the existing projects.

Besides, the implementation of programmes is regularly monitored in various fora viz:—

- (a) Periodic Review meetings by Secretary (RD) with State Secretaries;
- (b) Review meeting by JS with State Secretary concerned;
- (c) Visit of programme officers of the Division to project areas for on the spot assessment; and
- (d) Visit of Area Officers to the States to review overall performance of Rural Development Programmes."

25. The Committee find that Government have tried to justify the underspending under DPAP projects by stating that the expenditure level was to the tune of 82.5% for the period 1995-1996 to 1999-2000 as per the data furnished in the action taken reply. The Government have perhaps not appreciated the recommendation of the Committee in the right perspective. The stress of the Committee's recommendation was on the increase in the unspent balances (refer Para 3.27 of the Report) which according to the Government's own data increased from Rs. 112.80 crore as on 1.4.1999 to Rs. 163.89 crore as on 1.4.2000. The Central release under DPAP during 1999-2000 was Rs. 54.48 crore. Taking into consideration the Central release in a particular year, the Committee feel that Rs. 163.89 crore as unspent balance is a huge amount and the Government should find out ways to contain this. The Committee would like that the Government should furnish the details of the specific measures taken to contain the huge unspent balances.

H. Updation and Computerization of Land Records

Recommendation (Para No. 3.38)

26. The Committee had noted as below:

"The Committee are concerned to note that the Government do not have the data of the districts where land records have been updated so far. The Committee express their grave apprehensions about the efficacy of the Government in completing the task of updating land records when they do not even possess the up-to-date

data in respect of those districts where the Government have claimed that they have completed the updating work, since the correction and updating of land records would be crucial to preparing the proposed Central Scheme on the Consolidation of Land Holdings, with a view to proposing it to the Planning Commission for the required financing in the X Plan, the Committee urge that the Department establish a mission mode to expeditiously prepare the crucial statistical data and other inputs needed to undertake this vitally needed national requirement which has the potential of transforming the prospects for agriculture, rural development and poverty alleviation."

27. The Government have replied as below:

"The observation of the Committee has been noted. Land Records are required to be updated every thirty years through the process of survey and settlement operations. The Government of India has been emphasizing upon the State Governments to ensure that the basic land records are updated and computerized in order to avoid manipulation by field staff. Once the survey/re-survey operations are completed by States, it will not be necessary to undertake re-survey and only computerised land records need to be updated from time to time. Some of the States such as Sikkim, Karnataka, Tamil Nadu, Andhra Pradesh, Kerala and West Bengal etc. have done good work in the computerisation of Land Records."

28. The Committee in their earlier recommendation had urged the Government to establish a mission mode to expeditiously prepare the crucial statistical data and other inputs needed to undertake to complete the work relating to updating the land records in rural areas. Instead of taking specific action on their recommendation, the Government have simply appreciated the performance of some of the States. The Committee are concerned that the Government have addressed their recommendation lackadaisically. They feel that such an important task of updating of land records which is vital for various sectors like agriculture, rural development and poverty alleviation, has not been given adequate importance. The Committee, therefore, urge that the Government should act upon their recommendation seriously and take immediate steps to update and computerise the land records within a specified time frame.

I. Funds for 2001-2002 for Computerisation of Land Records**Recommendation (Para No. 3.43)**

29. The Committee had noted as below:

"The Committee find that the allocation made during the 9th Plan is not adequate as out of the proposed allocation, Rs. 17.00 crore only is left for the next year. In view of this, they urge that the allocation of funds for the 9th Plan should be reviewed so as to provide adequate allocation during next year."

30. The Government have replied as below:

"The observations of the Committee have been noted. It is true that there is a balance of Rs. 17.00 crore under the Centrally Sponsored Scheme on Computerisation of Land Records for the next year *i.e.* 2001-2002. However, while formulating the Annual Plan for the year 2001-2002, the Planning Commission will be requested to provide adequate funds to undertake process of Computerisation of Land Records.

31. The Committee take serious note of the way the action taken reply is furnished by the Government wherein it has been stated that while formulating the Annual Plan for the year 2001-2002, Planning Commission will be requested to provide adequate funds to undertake the process of Computerisation of Land Records. They are of the view that the Government have to analyse the question of requirement of outlay for a specific task before going to the Planning Commission or Ministry of Finance for allocation of outlay. Mere request for adequate funds will not be a convincing move to get the enhanced outlay from the Ministry of Finance unless and until specific requirement is indicated. In view of it, they urge the Government to indicate the specific amount needed for a specific task. They would also like to be apprised of the allocation made by the Government for updation and computerisation of land records during 2001-2002.

J. Findings of the National Committee

Recommendation (Para No. 3.46)

32. The Committee had noted as below:

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

33. The Government have replied as below:

"The National Committee on Consolidation of Land Holdings is expected to submit its report shortly. As soon as the report is finalised, the position will be communicated to the Committee."

34. The Committee would like to be apprised of the status of the Report to be submitted by the Committee on Consolidation of Land Holdings and the details of the recommendations made by the Committee in the said Report.

CHAPTER II

RECOMMENDATIONS THAT HAVE BEEN ACCEPTED BY THE GOVERNMENT

Recommendation (Para No. 2.16)

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

Recommendation (Para No. 2.17)

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

Reply of the Government

A draft EFC Memo to effect revision in the pattern of matching contribution for the States has been circulated to the Ministries/ Departments concerned, as well as the State Governments. The recommendation of the Committee with regard to North East States will be kept in view while finalizing their Memorandum.

[Department of Land Resources O.M. No. H-11014/1/2000-M&C
dated August 22, 2000, Ministry of Rural Development]

Recommendation (Para No. 2.22)

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

Reply of the Government

The guidelines for watershed development provide for emphasis on training for the watershed development functionaries. For this purpose, earmarking of 5% of the project funds sanctioned under DPAP, DDP and IWDP is required to be made. Over and above this, Rs. 2 crore (during the year 1999-2000 the provision was Rs. 3 crore) has been provided under the head "Communication" for assistance to the SIRD/ETCs and other training institutions, towards lump sum grant for purchase of teaching aid equipments and also for organising training programmes. Since during the year 1999-2000, a majority of the SIRD/ETCs were given lumpsum grants for purchase of teaching aids and equipment, the reduced provision of Rs. 2 crore may be sufficient.

[Department of Land Resources O.M. No. H-11014/1/2000-M&C dated August 22, 2000, Ministry of Rural Development]

Recommendation (Para No. 3.6)

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

Reply of the Government

The liability for ongoing EAS Watershed Projects is expected to last till next financial year. Thereafter, the entire funds would be available for the three main programmes namely IWDP, DPAP and DDP of this Department. This will, therefore, enable the Department to provide more outlay for IWDP. However, the Department will continue to impress upon the Planning Commission to enhance allocations for IWD projects in the ensuing years.

[Department of Land Resources O.M. No. H-11014/1/2000-M&C dated August 22, 2000, Ministry of Rural Development]

Recommendation (Para No. 3.7)

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

Reply of the Government

The Employment Assurance Scheme was restructured as a part of an exercise aimed at rationalising the structure of various rural development programmes and has been retained as a wage employment scheme. The sanctioning of watershed projects which was permissible under the old scheme was discontinued *w.e.f.* 1.4.1999. However, to cater to the requirements of the on-going projects sanctioned under EAS till 31.3.1999, funds have now been provided under IWDP. The aims of IWDP also include generation of employment in the rural areas, among other things. The IWDP projects, are labour intensive and provide large scale employment in the project area. Moreover, the implementation of watershed projects lead to overall development of the project area and construction of permanent income generating assets leading to generation of employment on sustainable basis. Hence the transfer of EAS funds to IWDP would not, in any way, dilute the efforts of generation of employment.

[Department of Land Resources O.M. No. H-11014/1/2000-M&C
dated August 22, 2000, Ministry of Rural Development]

Recommendation (Para No. 3.12)

While hoping that the outlay for 1999-2000 would have been spent fully by now and the new projects are taken up during 2000-2001 to ensure 100% utilization of the outlay, the Committee like that the scope of the Scheme (TDE&T) should further be increased.

Reply of the Government

During 1999-2000, the budgeted provision for the TDET Scheme was fully utilized. The scope of the Scheme is being increased further during 2000-2001 to provide for the taking up of projects on special problem lands *viz.* saline and alkaline, waterlogged, mine spoil areas. Projects on development of data based using Remote Sensing & GIS Techniques are also being sanctioned for preparation of overall development plan of the selected districts of Desert Eco-system.

[Department of Land Resources O.M. No. H-11014/1/2000-M&C
dated August 22, 2000, Ministry of Rural Development]

Recommendation (Para No. 3.15)

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

Reply of the Government

During 1997, it was decided to transfer the pending project proposals as well as ongoing sanctioned projects under Grant-in-Aid Scheme for NGOs/VAs to CAPART. Accordingly, all the pending project proposals as well as all sanctioned ongoing projects were transferred to CAPART for further processing/funding. 40 ongoing projects were accepted by CAPART in 1997-98. 75 ongoing sanctioned projects were not accepted by CAPART. However, after further discussions, 63 cases have been accepted for transfer by CAPART in April 2000, leaving 12 with the Department. At present, a total number of 115 sanctioned projects are left with CAPART and the Department. The total requirement for these 115 projects is estimated at Rs. 6.55 crores.

[Department of Land Resources O.M. No. H-11014/1/2000-M&C
dated August 22, 2000, Ministry of Rural Development]

Recommendation (Para No. 3.34)

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

Reply of the Government

The Department had taken up 2194 watershed projects from 1995-1996 to 1998-1999. However, during 1999-2000, alone 1500 additional projects were sanctioned. Further, the Department proposes to sanction at least 1600 projects during current financial year. Viewed in this light the enhanced allocation from Rs. 85.00 crore in 1999-2000 to Rs. 135.00 crore in 2000-2001 does not appear to be excessive. This allocation has been made taking into account the committed expenditure on the ongoing 3694 watershed projects sanctioned from 1995-96 to 1999-2000 and new watershed projects already sanctioned/likely to be sanctioned to the programme States in the current financial year (2000-2001). Therefore, the DDP allocation of Rs. 135.00 crore during 2000-2001 is expected to be utilized fully.

[Department of Land Resources O.M. No. H-11014/1/2000-M&C
dated August 22, 2000, Ministry of Rural Development]

Recommendation (Para No. 3.39)

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

Reply of the Government

The observations of the Committee have been noted. Most of the North Eastern States have initiated revisional survey settlement operations as well as base map survey where the same not been done as yet with the help of survey of India. Pilot project for undertaking "Aerial Cadastral Survey-cum-Computerisation of Land Recourse" have been sanctioned to Nagaland, Mizoram, Arunachal Pradesh etc. The Budget provision under the scheme of Strengthening of Revenue Administration and Updating of Land Records (SRA&ULR) during the current financial year *i.e.* 2000-2001 is Rs. 25.00 crore and 10% of this amount *i.e.* Rs. 2.50 crore has been earmarked for the North-Eastern States which is expected to be utilised fully.

[Department of Land Resources O.M. No. H-11014/1/2000-M&C
dated August 22, 2000, Ministry of Rural Development]

CHAPTER III

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

Recommendation (Para No. 2.13)

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

Reply of the Government

As recommended by the Committee, efforts are being made in association with the State Governments to achieve 100% utilization of funds earmarked for North East Region. Unutilized outlay, if any, will go to the non-lapsable pool.

[Department of Land Resources O.M. No. H-11014/1/2000-M&C
dated August 22, 2000, Ministry of Rural Development]

CHAPTER IV

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

Recommendation (Para No. 2.10)

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

1. The IXth Plan allocation of a mere Rs. 1354 crore in relation to the requirement of over Rs. 6542 crore projected by the Ministry to the Planning Commission; and
2. Persisting shortfall notwithstanding the welcome decision to allot more budgetary grants to land resources, including wastelands development in the current year than the expenditure in the last three years combined.

Reply of the Government

The Department of Land Resources (DoLR) had impressed upon the Planning Commission the need for allocation of larger resources for development of wasteland on watershed basis. Accordingly, it has

been possible to increase the budget allocations for the year 2000-2001 to Rs. 805.00 crore for the programmes, namely, IWDP, DPAP and DDP, of the DoLR.

[Department of Land Resources O.M. No. H-11014/1/2000-M&C dated August 22, 2000, Ministry of Rural Development]

Comments of the Committee

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

Recommendation (Para No. 2.11)

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

Reply of the Government

The Government had constituted a National Standing Committee for Watershed Development in August 1999 under the Chairmanship of Deputy Chairman, Planning Commission with Ministers from Rural Development, Agriculture, Environment & Forests as well as their Secretaries as Members so as to have high level co-ordination at the Centre. Similarly, consultations with leading NGOs and Experts on Watershed Management is held from time to time through organising Seminars, Workshops, Symposia etc. in which Government Institutions/ Departments/NGOs etc. participate and for which funds are also provided by the Government. A Workshop was also organised by the Department with the NGO Leaders in February 2000. Further, the Panchayats are also involved for implementation of watershed projects as Panchayat members are also members of Watershed Committee and Watershed Association. The Guidelines provide for Non-Government Organisations also to work as Programme Implementing Agencies (PIAs) in watershed programmes under the three major programmes of DoLR.

[Department of Land Resources O.M. No. H-11014/1/2000-M&C dated August 22, 2000, Ministry of Rural Development]

Comments of the Committee

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

Recommendation (Para No. 2.26)

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

Reply of the Government

The Guidelines for Watershed Development provide for the constitution of a 'Watershed Development Fund' to take care of post project maintenance which is operated by the Watershed Committee, a permanent body elected by the Watershed Association to ensure sustainability of the project.

[Department of Land Resources O.M. No. H-11014/1/2000-M&C dated August 22, 2000, Ministry of Rural Development]

Comments of the Committee

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

Recommendation (Para No. 3.8)

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

Reply of the Government

The DRDAs have been reminded to submit the completion certificate of all the projects which have attained the physical and financial targets. Attempts are also being made to sensitise DRDAs for better monitoring of the projects so that the projects are completed within the stipulated time frame. The Watershed Projects under IWDP comprise a number of micro watersheds of about 500 hectares. A micro-watershed may cover one village or a part of a village or parts of more than one village located contiguously; whereas the jurisdiction of a village panchayat is normally limited to a village. The responsibility of planning, executing and maintaining the watershed projects is entrusted to the Watershed Committee which is a permanent body elected by the Watershed Association formed by the local people living in the watershed area. Since members of the gram panchayat are also members of the Watershed Committee and the Watershed Association, Panchayats are already involved with the implementation process of IWDP projects.

[Department of Land Resources O.M. No. H-11014/1/2000-M&C dated August 22, 2000, Ministry of Rural Development]

Comments of the Committee

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

Recommendation (Para No. 3.18)

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

Reply of the Government

The Department is exploring the possibility of constituting Task Force for development of wasteland in other States in view of the recommendations of the Standing Committee.

[Department of Land Resources O.M. No. H-11014/1/2000-M&C dated August 22, 2000, Ministry of Rural Development]

Comments of the Committee

(Please see Paragraph No. 19 of Chapter I of the Report)

Recommendation (Para No. 3.24)

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

- (i) the Government should interact with the federations of industry and commerce, such as CII, FICCI, ASSOCHAM, who have not been involved in the National and Regional Workshops organised thus far;
- (ii) the Government should widen the approach to industry which has thus far been restricted regionally to the PHD Chamber and industry-wise to the pulp and paper industry, besides being concentrated on plantations to the virtual exclusion of other methods of land reclamation;
- (iii) the possibility of harnessing the Ministry of Finance and the Ministry of Commerce and Industry, at the highest level, to stimulate corporate sector involvement should be examined;
- (iv) the Government should request the Ministry of Finance to examine the possibility of providing fiscal incentives which would exponentially, raise the level of corporate sector participation in wastelands development; and
- (v) a high-level review, in consultation with the Finance Ministry and the RBI, of the role of financial institutions and scheduled banks in the implementation of schemes of the Department should be made by the Government.

Reply of the Government

To popularize the IPS, a series of State level and district level workshops have been organized in Mizoram, Himachal Pradesh & Uttar Pradesh, involving the farmers, Nationalised Banks, Regional Rural Banks and Cooperative Banks. Similar workshops are proposed

to be organized by some more potential States during the current financial year. In order to attract private sector participation in the task of development of wastelands, the Department has initiated consultations with associations of Industry and Commerce, etc. as suggested by the Committee.

[Department of Land Resources O.M. No. H-11014/1/2000-M&C dated August 22, 2000, Ministry of Rural Development]

Comments of the Committee

(Please see Paragraph No. 22 of Chapter I of the Report)

Recommendation (Para No. 3.30)

The Committee are concerned to note the huge under-spending under the Programme and would like to be apprised about the above the position of un-spent balances, in each of the DPAP Project. It is urged that the Government should review the implementation of the programme and try to critically analyse the reasons for under spending in the respective blocks.

Reply of the Government

The following Table indicates the State-wise Central Release, State share, expenditure incurred upto 31.3.2000 and the outstanding balance as on 1.4.2000:—

(Rs. in crores)

Sl.No.	Name of the State	Central releases during 1995-96 to 1999-2000	Corresponding State Share	Total funds Made Available	Expenditure Up to 31.3.2000	O.B. as on 1.4.2000
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1.	Andhra Pradesh	119.80	113.20	233.00	228.20	4.80
2.	Bihar	13.42	12.95	26.37	15.72	10.65
3.	Gujarat	39.29	36.99	76.28	53.67	22.65
4.	Himachal Pradesh	4.74	4.57	9.31	7.73	1.58
5.	Jammu & Kashmir	8.30	8.30	16.60	14.65	1.95
6.	Karnataka	41.49	39.01	80.50	70.65	9.85
7.	Madhya Pradesh	72.34	70.16	142.50	117.91	24.59

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8.	Maharashtra	61.64	59.47	121.11	66.06	55.05
9.	Orissa	10.84	10.84	21.68	15.96	5.72
10.	Rajasthan	17.75	17.57	35.32	28.69	6.63
11.	Tamil Nadu	35.62	32.63	68.25	66.56	1.69
12.	Uttar Pradesh	55.16	51.80	106.96	97.85	9.11
13.	West Bengal	7.27	7.27	14.54	4.92	9.62
Total		487.66	464.76	952.42	788.53	163.89

It would be observed that there is no huge under spending as the total expenditure level is of the tune of 82.5%. As reported earlier, the Department has taken the following steps to ensure that urgent balances are restricted to the minimum. The criteria for release of subsequent instalment has been made stricter. Any subsequent instalment is released only when all the funds released upto the last but one instalment have been utilized and at least 50% of the last release have been utilized.

Sanction of new projects is linked with the performance of implementation of the existing projects.

Besides, the implementation of programmes is regularly monitored in various fora viz:—

- (a) Periodic Review meetings by Secretary (RD) with State Secretaries;
- (b) Review meeting by JS with State Secretary concerned;
- (c) Visit of programme officers of the Division to project areas for on the spot assessment and;
- (d) Visit of Area Officers to the States to review overall performance of Rural Development Programmes.

[Department of Land Resources O.M. No. H-11014/1/2000-M&C dated August 22, 2000, Ministry of Rural Development]

Comments of the Committee

(Please see Paragraph No. 25 of Chapter I of the Report)

Recommendation (Para No. 3.38)

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

Reply of the Government

The observation of the Committee has been noted. Land Records are required to be updated every thirty years through the process of survey and settlement operations. The Government of India has been emphasizing upon the State Governments to ensure that the basic land records are updated and computerized in order to avoid manipulation by field staff. Once the survey/re-survey operations are completed by States, it will not be necessary to undertake re-survey and only computerised land records need to be updated from time to time. Some of the States such as Sikkim, Karnataka, Tamil Nadu, Andhra Pradesh, Kerala and West Bengal etc. have done good work in the Computerisation of Land Records.

[Department of Land Resources O.M. No. H-11014/1/2000-M&C dated August 22, 2000, Ministry of Rural Development]

Comments of the Committee

(Please see Paragraph No. 28 of Chapter I of the Report)

Recommendation (Para No. 3.43)

The Committee find that the allocation made during the 9th Plan is not adequate as out of the proposed allocation, Rs. 17.00 crore only is left for the next year. In view of this, they urge that the allocation of funds for the 9th Plan should be reviewed so as to provide adequate allocation during next year.

Reply of the Government

The observations of the Committee have been noted. It is true that there is a balance of Rs. 17.00 crore under the Centrally Sponsored Scheme on Computerisation of Land Records for the next year *i.e.* 2001-2002. However, while formulating the Annual Plan for the year 2001-2002, the Planning Commission will be requested to provide adequate funds to undertake process of Computerisation of Land Records.

[Department of Land Resources O.M. No. H-11014/1/2000-M&C
dated August 22, 2000, Ministry of Rural Development]

Comments of the Committee

(Please see Paragraph No. 31 of Chapter I of the Report)

CHAPTER V

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

Recommendation (Para No. 2.19)

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

Reply of the Government

The President of India in his address to Parliament on 23.2.2000 had referred to the intention of the Government to bring all the Programmes and Schemes alongwith the budgeted funds and infrastructure relating to the conservation, development and management of land resources in the country presently being implemented by other Ministries/Departments under the Department of Land Resources. The modalities for transfer of such schemes/programmes are being worked out by a Committee of Secretaries.

[Department of Land Resources O.M. No. H-11014/1/2000-M&C
dated August 22, 2000, Ministry of Rural Development]

Comments of the Committee

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

Recommendation (Para No. 3.46)

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

Reply of the Government

The National Committee on Consolidation of Land Holdings is expected to submit its report shortly. As soon as the report is finalised, the position will be communicated to the Committee.

[Department of Land Resources O.M. No. H-11014/1/2000-M&C
dated August 22, 2000, Ministry of Rural Development]

Comments of the Committee

(Please see Paragraph No. 34 of Chapter I of the Report)

NEW DELHI;
21 *March*, 2001

30 *Phalguna*, 1922 (*Saka*)

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

APPENDIX I

COMMITTEE ON URBAN AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT (2001)

EXTRACTS OF THE MINUTES OF THE FIFTH SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE HELD ON WEDNESDAY, THE 7TH MARCH, 2001

The Committee sat from 1500 hrs. to 1600 hrs. in Committee Room 'B', Ground Floor, Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi.

PRESENT

Shri Anant Gangaram Geete — *Chairman*

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

2. Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar
3. Shri Jaswant Singh Bishnoi
4. Shri Ambati Brahmaniah
5. Shri Swadesh Chakraborty
6. Shri Haribhai Chaudhary
7. Shri Bal Krishnā Chauhan
8. Shrimati Hema Gamang
9. Shri Babubhai K. Katara
10. Shri P.R. Kyndiah
11. Shri Punnulal Mohale
12. Dr. Ranjit Kumar Panja
13. Shri Chintaman Wanaga

Rajya Sabha

14. Shri N.R. Dasari
25. Prof. A. Lakshmisagar
16. Shri Faqir Chand Mullana
17. Shri Onward L. Nongtdu
18. Shri Solipeta Ramachandra Reddy
19. Shri Man Mohan Samal

SECRETARIAT

- | | | |
|---------------------------|---|---------------------------|
| 1. Shri S.C. Rastogi | — | <i>Joint Secretary</i> |
| 2. Shri K. Chakraborty | — | <i>Deputy Secretary</i> |
| 3. Shrinati Sudesh Luthra | — | <i>Under Secretary</i> |
| 4. Shri P.V.L.N. Murthy | — | <i>Assistant Director</i> |

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

*** *** *** ***

3. The Committee thereafter took up for consideration Memorandum No. 4 regarding draft report on the action taken by the Government on the recommendations contained in the Twelfth Report of the Committee (13th Lok Sabha) on Demand for Grants (2000-2001) of Ministry of Rural Development (Department of Land Resources) and deferred adoption of the draft Report to a subsequent sitting.

4. *** *** *** ***

The Committee then adjourned.

APPENDIX II

COMMITTEE ON URBAN AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT (2001)

EXTRACTS OF THE MINUTES OF THE SIXTH SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE HELD ON MONDAY, THE 12TH MARCH, 2001

The Committee sat from 1500 hrs. to 1620 hrs. in Committee Room 'B', Ground Floor, Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi.

PRESENT

Shri Anant Gangaram Geete → *Chairman*

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

2. Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar
3. Shri Jaswant Singh Bishnoi
4. Shri Swadesh Chakraborty
5. Shrimati Hema Gamang
6. Shri Holkhomang Haokip
7. Shri Madan Lal Khurana
8. Shri Shrichand Kriplani
9. Shri Bir Singh Mahato
10. Shri Punnulal Mohale
11. Dr. Ranjit Kumar Parja
12. Shri Chandresh Patel
13. Shri Dharam Raj Singh Patel
14. Shri Chinmayanand Swami
15. Shri Sunder Lal Tiwari
16. Shri Chintaman Wanaga

Rajya Sabha

17. Shri Karnendu Bhattacharjee
18. Shri N.R. Dasari
19. Prof. A. Lakshmisagar
20. Shri Vijaya Raghavan

SECRETARIAT

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

2. At the outset, the Chairman welcomed the members to the sitting of the Committee. The Committee then considered Memorandum No. 4 regarding draft report on the action taken by the Government on the recommendations contained in the twelfth Report of the Committee (13th Lok Sabha) on Demand for Grants (2000-2001) of Ministry of Rural Development (Department of Land Resources) and adopted the draft Report with some modifications as indicated in *Annexure*.

- | | | | | |
|----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 3. | *** | *** | *** | *** |
| 4. | *** | *** | *** | *** |

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.

ANNEXURE

[See Para 2 of the Minutes dated 12.03.2001]

Sl. No.	Page No.	Para No.	Line No.	Modifications
1	2	3	4	5
1.	5	7	6	<p><i>For "The Committee are deeply distressed that the main issues have been sidetracked."</i></p> <p><i>Read "The Committee are deeply distressed that the main issues namely — (a) mobilization of adequate resources to meet the physical targets set by the Government; (b) improvement of implementation by active involvement of PRIs and (c) involvement of the corporate sector both for private profit and larger national goals, have been sidetracked."</i></p>
2.	7	10	3	<p><i>For "The Committee find that nearly a year has passed since the recommendation was made, but the Government are yet to take a final decision in this regard."</i></p> <p><i>Read "The Committee find that nearly a year has passed since the assurance was given in the Parliament and the recommendation was made by the Committee, the Government are yet to take a final decision in this regard."</i></p>

APPENDIX III

[Vide Para 4 of the Introduction]

ANALYSIS OF THE ACTION TAKEN BY THE GOVERNMENT ON THE RECOMMENDATIONS CONTAINED IN THE 12TH REPORT OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON URBAN AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT (13TH LOK SABHA)

I. Total number of recommendations	21
II. Recommendations that have been accepted by the Government (Para Nos. 2.16, 2.17, 2.22, 3.6, 3.7, 3.12, 3.15, 3.34 and 3.39)	9
Percentage to the total recommendations	(42.86%)
III. Recommendation which the Committee do not desire to pursue in view of the Government's replies (Para No. 2.13)	1
Percentage to the total recommendations	(4.76%)
IV. Recommendations in respect of which replies of the Government have not been accepted by the Committee (Para Nos. 2.10, 2.11, 2.26, 3.8, 3.18, 3.24, 3.30, 3.38 and 3.43)	9
Percentage to the total recommendations	(42.86%)
V. Recommendations in respect of which final replies of the Government are still awaited (Para Nos. 2.19 and 3.46)	2
Percentage to the total recommendations	(9.52%)