

TWENTY SECOND REPORT
STANDING COMMITTEE ON
URBAN AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT
(2001)

(THIRTEENTH LOK SABHA)

MINISTRY OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT
(DEPARTMENT OF LAND RESOURCES)

DEMAND FOR GRANTS
(2001-2002)

Presented to Lok Sabha on 20.4.2001

Laid in Rajya Sabha on 20.4.2001



LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI

April, 2001/Chaitra, 1923 (Saka)

COMMITTEE ON URBAN AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT
(2001)

Corrigenda to the 22nd Report (13th Lok Sabha)

<u>Page</u>	<u>Para No.</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>For</u>	<u>Read</u>
21	3.16	6 from bottom	fooder	fodder
25	3.26	10 from bottom	Schemes	Scheme
25	3.27	7 from bottom	schemes	scheme
34	-	8	around	round
36	3.55	9 from bottom	through	thorough
41	Row 8	Col.14	335.00	135.00
41	Row 11	Col.3	1336.18	1336.16

CONTENTS

COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE

ABBREVIATIONS

INTRODUCTION

REPORT

CHAPTER I Introductory

CHAPTER II Analysis of the overall allocation of the
Department of Land Resources

CHAPTER III Scheme-wise Evaluation of Programmes

APPENDICES

I. Financial Requirements

II. Statement showing the 8th and 9th plan
outlays and Corresponding Expenditure
from 1998-99 to 2000-2001

III. Minutes of the Eleventh Sitting of the Committee
held on 4th April, 2001

IV. Minutes of the Fourteenth Sitting of the
Committee held on 12th April, 2001

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 Parja
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 Kamendu 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
45. Vacant

SECRETARIAT

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

ABBREVIATIONS

ASCI	—	Administrative Staff College of India
BE	—	Budget Estimates
CAPART	—	Council for Advancement of People's Action and Rural Technology
CLR	—	Computerisation of Land Records
DDP	—	Desert Development Programme
DoLR	—	Department of Land Resources
DoWD	—	Department of Wastelands Development
DPAP	—	Drought Prone Areas Programme
DRDA	—	District Rural Development Agency
EAS	—	Employment Assurance Scheme
IPS	—	Investment Promotional Scheme
IWDP	—	Integrated Wasteland Development Programme
NGO	—	Non-Governmental Organisation
NRSA	—	National Remote Sensing Agency
PIA	—	Project Implementation Agency
RE	—	Revised Estimates
SRA & ULR	—	Strengthening of Revenue Administration and Updating of Land Records
TDET	—	Technology Development, Extension and Training
UT	—	Union Territory
VA	—	Voluntary Agency

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 Twenty Second Report on Demand for Grants (2001-2002) of the Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development).

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

3. The Committee took evidence of the representatives of the Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development) on 4th April, 2001.

4. The Report was considered and adopted by the Committee at their sitting held on the 12th April, 2001.

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

6. They would also 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;
18 April, 2001
28 Chaitra, 1923 (Saka)

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

REPORT

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTORY

The Ministry of Rural Development consists of three Departments (i) Department of Rural Development (ii) Department of Land Resources; and (iii) Department of Drinking Water Supply.

1.2 The Department of Land Resources in the Ministry of Rural Development is mainly responsible for development of wastelands in non-forest areas aimed at checking land degradation, putting such wastelands to sustainable use by increasing biomass availability, specially fuel wood and fodder. Various programmes of the Department envisage people's participation and harnessing science and technology for their planning and implementation. Besides, the Department also monitors implementation of land revenue system and land records.

1.3 The Department of Land Resources implements the following important programmes:

- (i) Integrated Wastelands Development Programme
- (ii) Technology Development, Extension and Training Scheme
- (iii) Support to NGOs/Voluntary Agencies Scheme
- (iv) Investment Promotional Scheme
- (v) Drought Prone Areas Programme
- (vi) Desert Development Programme
- (vii) Computerization of Land Records
- (viii) Strengthening of Revenue Administration and Updating of Land Records

1.4 The overall Demand for Grants of the Department for the year 2001-2002 are Rs. 900.99 crore both for plan and non-plan.

1.5 The Demand for Grants of the Department was presented to Parliament under Demand No. 66.

1.6 The detailed Demand for Grants of the Department was laid in Lok Sabha on 20th March, 2001.

1.7 In the present Report, the Committee have restricted their examination only to the major issues concerning the programmes/schemes that are being implemented by the Department, in the context of the Demand for Grants, 2001-2002.

CHAPTER II

ANALYSIS OF THE OVERALL ALLOCATION OF THE DEPARTMENT OF LAND RESOURCES (MINISTRY OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT)

The plan and non-plan outlay of the Department *i.e.* BE 2000-2001, RE 2000-2001 and BE 2001-2002 is given at Appendix-I. The 8th and 9th Plan outlays and actual expenditure from 1998-99 to 2000-2001 is given at Appendix-II.

2.2 As regards the position of outlay earmarked during the 8th and 9th Plan, the following observations could be made while analysing plan outlay as given at Appendix II.

- (i) There is an underspending of Rs. 107.60 crore under the various schemes of the Department during the 8th Plan;
- (ii) Only one fifth of the outlay, as proposed during the 9th Plan, has been agreed to by the Planning Commission;
- (iii) There is a cut of Rs. 61 crore at RE stage during 1998-99;
- (iv) The position of utilisation of outlay during 1998-99 and 1999-2000 is almost full as compared to the RE during 1998-99 and BE and RE during 1999-2000;
- (v) There is a cut of Rs. 100 crore at RE stage during 2000-2001.

2.3 When asked whether proposed outlay of Rs. 900 crore would be sufficient to meet the targets fixed for different programmes/schemes of the Department during 2001-2002, it was stated by the Government that there is a definite need to accelerate the pace of implementation of different programmes/schemes of the Department in the years to come. For this reason, the Department had proposed a higher allocation of Rs. 1391 crore approx. for the year 2001-2002. However, keeping in view the resources available, the Planning Commission fixed plan allocation for various programmes/schemes of Department of Land Resources at Rs. 900.00 crore. Keeping in view the requirements of funds for ongoing projects, the physical targets for IWDP, DPAP and DDP have been reduced.

2.4 As regards the extent of wastelands in the country, it has been mentioned in the Annual Report 2000-2001 of the Ministry of Rural Development that there are various estimates of total wastelands/ degraded lands in the country. The Department of Land Resources follows the NRSA estimates. According to the latest wastelands Atlas of India, brought out by the NRSA in May 2000, out of 329 million hectares of total lands, 63.85 million hectares i.e. 20.17% of the total area are wastelands. Out of that 22% is forest land and 78% non forest land. The development of non forest wastelands comes under the jurisdiction of Department of Land Resources. As mentioned in the 12th Report of the Committee, out of the total non forest wastelands and such forest wastelands which form part of non forest wasteland, area approximately of 14 million hectares could be taken up gradually for development. The planning made in this regard is that 5 million hectares would be covered by the end of the 9th Plan. 15 million hectares will be covered during the 10th Plan and remaining 20 million hectares will be covered during the 11th Plan.

2.5 As per the written replies the physical achievements under the different centrally sponsored schemes of the Ministry of Rural Development during each year of the 8th and 9th plan are-

Plan	Year	Physical Achievement (in hectares)		
		IWDP	DPAP	DDP
8th	1992-93	27,000	2,09,000	28,000
	1993-94	50,000	2,57,000	38,000
	1994-95	65,000	2,47,000	69,000
	1995-96	58,000	5,95,000	2,02,000
	1996-97	84,000	5,50,000	1,31,000
	Total	2,84,000	18,58,000	4,68,000
9th	1997-98	90,000	4,54,000	1,40,000
	1998-99	1,03,000	3,65,000	1,60,000
	1999-2000	1,38,500	3,66,000	2,00,000
	2000-2001	3,19,450	7,50,000	3,41,000

When asked about the projections of the Department to cover the wastelands under different schemes during the 9th Plan it was stated in the written note that the scheme-wise areas taken up for treatment during 9th Plan from 1997-98 to 2001-2002 are:-

Scheme	Area under treatment (in lakh ha.)	Target for new sanctions during 2001-02 (in lakh ha.)
DPAP	34.66	6.00
DDP	17.97	4.00
IWDP	27.67	5.00

Further, the Secretary during the course of oral evidence stated as below:

"But the amount of work which has been done has increased very much and we have dealt with about 36.18 lakh hectares in 2000-2001. In 1996-97, soon after the programme was launched, it was only 2.9 lakh hectares only. We have expanded this programme considerably, especially last year."

2.6 Land and water are the most essential natural resources. However, with regard to both, ambitious claims have been made, but the Ministry of Rural Development is not being given the financial resources required to achieve these vital national goals. The Committee find that the 9th Plan outlay is not even one-fifth of what was proposed to the Planning Commission by the Ministry of Rural Development. Moreover, the targets fixed under different schemes of the Department for 2001-2002 had to be reduced in view of the reduced allocation made by the Ministry of Finance. Keeping in view the position of outlay sanctioned and physical achievements made under the different schemes of the Department, as set out in the preceding paras, the Committee are seriously concerned about the impossibility of achieving the target of reclaiming 40 million hectares of wastelands by the end of the 12th Plan period. In view of this, the Committee urge the Government to coordinate matters with the Planning Commission at the highest level so as to ensure that serious attention is paid to the development of wastelands in the country.

The Committee further note that land is the biggest resource in the country and when reclaimed, it can provide employment to millions of persons and can enhance the national income of the country considerably. Keeping in view the need for the development of wastelands in the country, the Committee has repeatedly recommended that there must be adequate outlay for the different schemes involved in the development of wastelands in the country. The Committee in their 12th Report (2000-2001) had recommended for high level coordination between the Government, the Planning Commission, the States and the Panchayats or other legally authorised bodies and NGOs and as well as the corporate sector as a whole, to prepare a detailed action Plan for the attainment of the stated goal. The Committee find that the Government in their action taken reply have not addressed these recommendations seriously. The Committee again strongly recommend that the Government should act upon their earlier recommendation with a meticulous note and take up the question of adequate allocation for different schemes at the highest possible level.

Allocation for North-Eastern States

2.7 As per the written note, 10% of the total allocation was earmarked for North-Eastern States during 2000-2001. Similarly, during 2001-2002, also Rs. 90 crore i.e. 10% of the total outlay has been earmarked for North-Eastern States. When asked about the position of utilisation of outlay by North-Eastern States during 2000-2001, the position as furnished by the Government is as below:

1. IWDP	:	2678.00 lakh
2. CLR	:	253.08 lakh
3. SRA & ULR	:	310.00 lakh
4. TDE & T	:	7.20 lakh
Total	:	3248.28 lakh

When asked about the detailed action plan received from North-Eastern States to ensure full utilisation of funds, it is submitted by the Government that the funds were released during 2000-2001 on receipt of individual proposals from various States in North East.

2.8 As could be seen from Appendix-II, there is a cut of Rs. 100 crore at RE stage during 2000-2001. When asked for the reasons, the Government in their written reply have stated that out of the total budget allocation of Rs. 900.00 crore for the Department of Land Resources for the year 2000-2001, a sum of Rs. 90 crore was earmarked for the North-Eastern States. However, none of the North-Eastern States is covered under the two major area development programmes namely DDP and DPAP. Similarly, the total liability of ongoing watershed under EAS in North Eastern States is only Rs. 4.63 crore (to be released in 3 years). Thus, the budget allocation of DPAP, DDP and EAS amounting to Rs. 675 crore should not have been taken into account for calculating the allocation for North-Eastern States. Since only IWDP, CLR, SRA and ULR are under implementation in these States, a sum of Rs. 22.50 crore being 10% of the remaining budget allocation of 225 crore for IWDP and other schemes ought to have been provided for the North-Eastern States. The excess provision of Rs. 67.50 crore for North-Eastern States in the budget of the Department of Land Resources was, therefore, kept for utilisation in these States under other schemes of the Ministry of Rural Development. This point was kept in view while discussing the issue with the Ministry of Finance regarding reduction in the budget of the Department. After a review in the pre-budget discussions, the Ministry of Finance fixed the ceiling for Department of Land Resources for the year 2000-2001 at Rs. 800 crore for RE as against the provision of Rs. 900 crore in BE for 2000-2001. During 2001-2002, again the allocation for Rs. 90 crore has been made for North Eastern States.

When asked further as to how far the physical achievement of the different programmes/schemes was affected by the said reduction, it was submitted by the Government that the reduction of Rs. 100 crore was effected in such a way so that the targets fixed for major programmes were not effected. The allocation for major schemes like DPAP, DDP and IWDP was kept at the same level as was provided under BE. Consequently, releases for ongoing watershed projects under these programmes were not affected and the targets for sanction of new watershed projects were not only achieved but were exceeded.

100% Allocation for the Scheme of Development of Wastelands

2.9 The Committee in their 12th Report (13th Lok Sabha) had recommended that the Government should consider providing 100% central allocation for the schemes of the Department keeping in view

the financial and other problems being faced by these States. The Government in their action taken reply to the said recommendation had submitted that 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. When asked about the finalisation of the said memorandum, it has been stated that out of three major schemes namely IWDP, CLR and SRA and ULR being implemented in North-Eastern States, IWDP and CLR are 100% grant-in-aid schemes and thus, will not be affected by the Memorandum in question. Only SRA and ULR which are 50:50 schemes are likely to be affected by final decision on this Memo. However, the EFC Memo is yet to be finalised.

2.10 The Committee note with concern from the reply furnished, that during 2000-2001 the Government allocated Rs. 67.50 crore to North Eastern States which were not applicable to these States in view of not coverage by DDP, DPAP and EAS schemes. At RE stage, the money had to be withdrawn, and as such, Rs. 100 crore cut was imposed by the Ministry of Finance. Another disturbing feature as noted from the replies furnished by the Government is that the mistake which was committed during 2000-2001 and detected at RE stage, has been repeated again during 2001-2002 whereby again Rs. 90 crore has been allocated to North Eastern States.

Keeping in view the above scenario, the Committee would like to be informed about the following issues:

- (i) The rationale for providing Rs. 90 crore during budget estimates of 2001-2002;
- (ii) The proposed cut is of Rs. 100 crore, whereas it should have been Rs. 67.50 crore which was additionally earmarked for North Eastern States during 2000-2001.

2.11 In view of the earlier recommendation made by the Committee in their 12th Report, the Committee would like that the final decision in respect of 100% grant to all the schemes/programmes being implemented in North Eastern States should be made without any further delay.

The Committee note that a very laudable initiative has been taken by the Government to provide 10% of the total allocation to North Eastern States. However, they find that there is absolutely no planning on the part of the Government to make best possible use of the outlay. The Committee deplore the casual attitude of the Government while planning and asking for outlay from the Ministry of Finance for different schemes.

Unification of all the schemes/programmes of wastelands development

2.12 When asked about the different approaches and the resultant problems thereof in the implementation of watershed development programme and the need for a 'Single National Initiative', the Government in their written note have stated that different Ministries/Departments are implementing the watershed development schemes on the basis of different approaches and guidelines issued by them. There have been variations in cost norms, implementing agencies financial pattern, mode of releases etc. These differences in the approaches have resulted in confusion at the field level. The High Level Committee on Wastelands Development under the Chairmanship of Shri Mohan Dharia had recommended in its report during 1995 that all the land based activities may be brought under one umbrella and a separate Department may be created at the Central level. A separate Department of Land Resources was set up in April, 1999 and all the land based Programmes of Ministry of Rural Development were brought under this Department. Further, for consideration of the Committee of Secretaries, Department of Land Resources had submitted a Discussion Paper on Land Resources Management, for coordination of activities in respect of watershed development and soil conservation by the Department of Land Resources. No final decision has yet been taken in this regard and the matter is still under consideration of Government.

2.13 The Committee has been repeatedly recommending that all the schemes/programmes for the development of wastelands run by different Ministries/Departments must be brought under one umbrella. The similar recommendation had also been made by the high level Committee on Wastelands Development under the chairmanship of Shri Mohan Dharia. The need for a single national initiative has been expressed by the Government to Parliament at the level of Union Finance Minister. In spite of this, not only has no final decision been taken by the Government in this regard, there is little on record to suggest that this matter is being given the priority it deserves. The Integrated Wastelands Development Programme is not an integrated programme notwithstanding its name and the Department of Land Resources is not incharge of all land resources notwithstanding its designation. Running numerous schemes through numerous Departments with a single objective is not a right way of developing wastelands in an integrated manner. The Committee

expect the Government to act on this recommendation within the coming year given that this Committee has been recommending it for at least four years and Government have declared themselves to have accepted this approach in principle. The Committee note that the aforesaid schemes suffer due to various bottlenecks like continuous insecurity of availability of funds at grass-root level, the feeble horizontal linkages amongst various agencies and the limitation of planning at the district level, and improper maintenance after completion of projects at the cost of sustainability. The Committee feel that different agencies and different approaches in handling the schemes have sidetracked the above issues and led to confusion. The Committee, therefore, reiterate once again that the urgent need for bringing under one umbrella all schemes and programmes relating to watershed, wastelands development being implemented by the Government, that is the Department of Land Resources in the Ministry of Rural Development. The Committee expect that Government to act on this recommendation within the cost of fiscal year 2001-2002.

The finding of Mid Term appraisal of 9th Plan

2.14 The Mid Term Appraisal while commenting on the actual achievement during 8th Plan observed as below:

“According to estimates, up to the end of Eighth Plan about 16.5 million hectares rainfed/degraded land was treated/developed. However, these achievements do not get reflected in net sown area, which has almost remained stagnant at around 142 million hectares. This indicates that either the treated lands were already under cultivation or an equal area was getting degraded or diverted for non-agriculture purposes. The possibility of bogus reporting can also not be ruled out. This requires deeper analysis.”

2.15 When asked about the comments of the Government on the above noted observation of Mid Term appraisal, it was submitted by the Government that it is quite likely that cultivated lands in rainfed areas get treated under the two area development programmes, namely DPAP and DDP for drought proofing and for checking the adverse effects of desertification. It may however, be submitted that the primary objective of the three water-shed development programmes namely IWDP, DPAP and DDP is the restoration of ecological balance through conservation of natural resources and sustainable production of

bio-mass. The main activities under these programmes are *in-situ* soil and moisture conservation, pasture development, natural regeneration and afforestation etc. The treatment under the programmes, therefore, is likely to improve the productivity of the treated lands rather than converting wastelands into cultivable lands. However, land degradation is a dynamic process and the programmes envisage checking the same.

2.16 During the course of oral evidence, the Secretary stated as under:

“...Department of Land Resources has a part of the nodal responsibility for the programmes of wasteland development in this country. It does not have the entire responsibility because that convergence is yet to be effected. But we have substantial part of the responsibility of implementing and formulating wasteland development programmes.

This is a Department which is now completing about two years of its existence and during this period, we have taken some steps to not only ensure that the reports that come to us are factually correct but we are also collecting them through the means of monitoring at our disposal in the Department and through other agencies which work as our monitors and evaluators. We are trying to ensure that there is both quality and speed in the implementation of the programmes...”

The Secretary further stated: “...the net sown area includes irrigated area and the rainfed area. ...A total net sown area of 142 million hectares. Out of this roughly 42 million hectares is irrigated and 100 million is rainfed. Apart from this, IWDP largely concerns itself with the wastelands which are normally brought in the net sown area. In a monsoon dependent situation, we have to largely depend on monsoon. If the monsoon is good, then there is more rainfed area. So, it would be difficult to straightway give this kind of figure...the areas relating to total land cultivation in the country is really the concern of the Ministry of Agriculture. The wasteland development programmes come under two or three Ministries. The Ministry of Agriculture has a programme called, National Watershed Development Programme. Then we have three programmes, namely, Integrated Wastelands Development Programme, Drought Prone Areas Development Programme and Dessert Development Programme. Then Planning Commission itself has a couple of watershed based programmes. The Ministry of Environment and Forests also has programmes which are related to the treatment of land. There are several other programmes.

So the initial reporting for net sown area is done by the Ministry of Agriculture which deals with crops. We are only a part of the total system which deals with treatment of degradable land."

2.17 The Committee are concerned that the findings of Mid Term Appraisal of 9th Plan by the Planning Commission are not in consonance with the Government's assessment and that little attempt is being made to reconcile the conflicted assessments. According to the Mid Term Appraisal, there has been no increase in "Net Sown Area" notwithstanding the efforts and large investments made to reclaim wastelands. This view has been accepted by the Ministry of Rural Development who have pointed out that out of 142 million hectares of Net Sown Area, 100 million hectares are rainfed and, therefore, the stagnation in the Net Sown Area is to be accepted by the vagaries of monsoon. Further, the Committee note that the country has been experiencing an uninterrupted run of good monsoons for the past several years and, as such, the Ministry's argument is not convincing. There must be some deep rooted malaise which need to be addressed seriously. The Committee are disturbed to note that instead of addressing this seriously, the Ministry of Rural Development have tried to shift the responsibility to other Ministries involved in the development of wastelands. They are not convinced by the argument advanced by the Secretary during the course of the oral evidence before the Committee. In view of this, the Committee urge the Government to take the findings of Mid Term Appraisal seriously, and also to analyse the extent of the problem of treated land getting reconverted into degraded land. Further, the Government should have a fool proof mechanism for ensuring that the programmes are really implemented and not merely reflected on papers.

Involvement of People in Implementation of Different Projects

2.18 The Mid Term Appraisal of the Planning Commission have indicated that most projects have failed to generate sustainability because of the failure of the Government Agencies to involve the people. When asked about the Government's comments in this regard, they had replied that undoubtedly, success and sustainability of the watershed projects depend upon public participation and the guidelines for watershed development to provide for such participation. As stated earlier, IWDP, DPAP and DDP are being implemented under these guidelines w.e.f. 1.4.95. The projects sanctioned under these guidelines

are still under implementation. Hence, it is too early to say that these projects have failed to generate sustainability.

2.19 When asked further as to how they come to the conclusion that people's involvement will generate sustainability, the Department in the written replies has stated that the guidelines for watershed development envisage involvement of the Watershed Community right from the planning stage upto the completion stage. The watershed projects are implemented through an elected representative body called the Watershed Development Committee or the Watershed Committee under the guidance of a Project Implementing Agency who may be a reputed voluntary agency. Funds for entry point activities to the tune of 5% are being provided to ensure public participation at the initial stage. Contributions by land owners for treatment of private lands to a fund called Watershed Development Funds for post project maintenance also ensure sustainability. Thus, full involvement of the people at all stages is likely to ensure sustainability.

2.20 The Committee are seriously concerned to note the findings of Mid Term Appraisal that most of the projects of wastelands development have failed to generate sustainability because of the failure of the Government agencies to involve the people. They are further dissatisfied with the reply furnished by the Government that it is too early to say that these projects have failed to generate sustainability. They note that almost six years have elapsed since wasteland projects are being implemented on the basis of watershed guidelines, and this period is enough to analyse the shortcomings of the programme. In view of it, the Committee recommend that the Government must take into full consideration the issues raised in the Mid Term Appraisal. Besides, the Committee had recommended in their 12th Report that the re-oriented IWDP—one of the biggest scheme of the Department—must be essentially a Panchayat-based Programme. The Committee are distressed that little or no action has been taken on this recommendation, although the responsibility for implementing part IX of the Constitution vests essentially in the Ministry of Rural Development. The Committee reiterate their earlier recommendation to make all the programmes of the Department such as DDP, DPAP and IWDP, Panchayat based Programmes, so that the involvement of the people can be ensured. The Committee learn that parallel bodies to Panchayats are being set up in some States with regard to subjects that have to be devolved to the Panchayats. The Committee deplore such tendencies and recommend that the

practice of setting up parallel bodies to Panchayats should be discontinued immediately.

Private Participation in the Task of Development of Wastelands

2.21 When asked about the role of private sector in the field of development of wastelands, the Government in their written replies have stated that to mobilize resources from financial institutions and corporate bodies including user industries and other entrepreneurs for development of non-forest wastelands, Department of Land Resources implements scheme called Investment Promotional Scheme (IPS). The objectives of the scheme is to facilitate the development of non-forest wastelands for the production and flow of additional bio-mass including farm forestry product used as raw material input for different types of industries. The scheme also envisages the provision of Central subsidy, by DoLR, long term loan by banks and contribution by owners of the wastelands.

2.22 When asked further whether the Government ever thought of giving any incentives like tax holidays to the corporate sector as provided in the infrastructure sector to encourage them to come in the field of development of wastelands, the Government have stated that wastelands are owned either by private farmers, or by the community, including Government Institutions. However, under IPS subsidy upto 25% of the development cost subject to a maximum of Rs. 25 lakh is provided to the promoters including corporate sector. Long term loan is provided by the banks for the development of wastelands. No proposal to provide tax holiday to the corporate sector for development of wastelands, is under consideration of the Government.

2.23 The physical and financial achievements under Investment Promotional Scheme, are as below:-

Year	Physical		Financial	
	Targets (In ha.)	Achievement	Targets (Rs. in lakh)	Achievement
1999-2000	100	540	200.00	22.97
2000-2001	Not fixed	78.54*	50.00	7.57*
2001-2002	Not fixed	—	50.00	—

*Upto 31.1.2001.

When asked for the efforts being made to make Investment Promotional Scheme attractive for the private sector, the Government in their written reply have stated that efforts are being made to organise National level and State level workshops/seminars.

2.24 In view of the very poor physical and financial achievements under the Investment Promotional Scheme (IPS), the Committee find that adequate attention is not being paid to encourage private sector investment in the development of wastelands in the country. The initiatives taken by the Government in this regard are utterly inadequate. Since huge investments are required for developing wastelands in the country, Government funding alone will not suffice; as such, the involvement of private sector is essential. The private sector cannot be attracted merely by holding workshops and seminars. This require high level interaction between the Government and associations of private enterprises, in order to interact with interested private parties. The Committee in their earlier report had given detailed analysis as to how the private sector could be attracted towards this field and to achieve the said goals [12th report (para 3.24), 13th Lok Sabha]. The Committee reiterate their earlier recommendation and would like that the Government should seriously consider the matter and take necessary steps in this regard without any further delay.

The Cost of Development of Wastelands per Hectares

2.25 As per the Performance budget 2001-2002, it is proposed that under IWDP new projects, in 2001-2002 will be sanctioned at the rate of Rs. 6,000 per hectares while funds for the ongoing projects continued to be released at Rs. 4,000 per hectares.

2.26 When asked about the basis of increasing the amount per hectares and rationale of sanctioning Rs. 6,000 per hectares for new projects and Rs. 4,000 per hectares for on-going projects, the Department in its reply has stated that the cost norm of Rs. 4,000 was prescribed during the year 1994 and this came into operation from 1st April, 1995. The watershed projects are labour intensive. Over the years, the wages and cost of material have increased necessitating an increase in cost norm. Certain State Governments have also been requesting for revision of cost norm.

2.27 The on-going projects have been sanctioned at the cost norm of Rs. 4,000 per ha. The work programmes of these projects have been finalised and approved by the concerned DRDAs/ZPs. In the ongoing projects, the work programme has already been partly implemented. The implementation level also differs from project to project sanctioned in the same year. Revising the work programmes as per revised cost norm will delay the implementation in the field. Moreover, the revision of cost norm is generally prospective to avoid administrative problems.

2.28 When asked whether the Government have revised the projections regarding requirement of outlay for the total wastelands in the country, outlay required for achieving the targets during 9th Plan, the Department has replied that the revised projections regarding the requirement of outlay for the total wastelands in the country have not been worked out.

2.29 While noting that the cost of development of wasteland is being revised from Rs. 4,000 per hectare to Rs. 6,000 per hectare, the Committee urge that the norms should uniformly be applicable to all the schemes being implemented by the Department in this regard. Besides, the Government should also revise the projections for requirement of outlay made for the development of wastelands so as to have a realistic assessment of the outlay required in this regard and to make proper planning for this purpose. While revising the requirements of funds, the Government should also take into account future rise in cost.

CHAPTER III

A. SCHEME-WISE EVALUATION OF PROGRAMMES UNDER WASTELANDS DEVELOPMENT DIVISION

Integrated Wastelands Development Programme (IWDP)

Integrated Wastelands Development Programme (IWDP) has been under implementation since 1989-90 and was transferred to Department of Land Resources (DoLR) alongwith the NWDB in July, 1992. This is an ongoing scheme under which major projects are undertaken for development of non-forest wasteland on the basis of micro-watershed. The projects under the programme are being funded on 100% basis by the Central Government. The project under IWDP are generally sanctioned in non-DPAP and non-DDP block. The programme is being implemented in 216 districts of the country.

Financial Achievement under IWDP

3.2 The year wise allocation of funds during 9th Plan is as follows:-

(Rs. in Crore)			
Year	BE	RE	Expenditure
1997-1998	74.50	—	53.95
1998-1999	82.10	62.00	62.00
1999-2000	82.00	82.00	83.07
2000-2001	480.00*	387.00	312.25 (upto 22.2.2001)
2001-2002	430.00**	—	—
Total	1148.60		520.27

* This includes (Rs. 350 crore) funds for on-going EAS watersheds.

** Includes Rs. 200 crore for committed liability for on-going watershed works taken up under EAS and Rs. 20 crore for externally aided Projects in Andhra Pradesh and Orissa States.

3.3 Physical Achievement under IWDP

Year	Achievement (in hectares)
1997-1998	90,000
1998-1999	1,03,000
1999-2000	1,38,500
2000-2001	3,19,450

3.4 When asked as to how the Department would justify the reduction in outlay under IWDP from Rs. 480 crore during 2000-2001, to Rs. 430 crore during 2001-2002 specifically when the cost of developing wastelands per hectares is proposed to be increased from Rs. 4,000 to 6,000 per hectare, it was submitted that due to increase in the total area for treatment under DPAP and DDP on account of sanctions during 2000-2001 and previous years, higher outlay will be required for the on-going projects under these programmes. Keeping in view the above and the fact that the total allocation to the Department of Land Resources has been kept at Rs. 900 crore, the outlay for IWDP was reduced to Rs. 430.00 crore. Based on the allocation, the target for sanction of new projects under IWDP has also been reduced from 11 lakh ha. in 2000-2001 to 5 lakh ha. in 2001-2002. As stated earlier the increased cost norm will apply only to the new projects likely to be sanctioned during 2001-2002.

3.5 As per the written note during 2000-2001, Rs. 350 crore was allotted for ongoing EAS watershed projects which have been transferred from Department of Rural Development to Department of Land Resources. This outlay during 2001-2002 has been reduced to Rs. 200 crore.

3.6 When asked about the justification for reducing the said outlay, the Government have replied that the outlay for ongoing watersheds under EAS has been reduced from Rs. 350 crore to Rs. 200 crore in view of the reduced allocation of Rs. 430 crore under IWDP. Out of Rs. 430 crore, a sum of Rs. 20.00 crore has been kept for externally aided projects for Andhra Pradesh and Orissa as also a sum of Rs. 80 crore for North Eastern States.

3.7 When asked about the information regarding funds released separately for EAS on-going watershed projects and IWDP projects, the Department has replied that upto 29.3.2001, Rs. 257.12 crore has been released for on-going watershed projects under EAS and Rs. 129.88 crore has been released for projects under IWDP.

3.8 When asked further about the suggestions for better financial and physical achievement in IWDP, the Government have stated that for better financial and physical achievements in IWDP, it is utmost necessary to keep proper liaison between the ZPs,/DRDAs and Project Implementing Agencies. Timely release of funds to the PIAs/Watershed Committees, monitoring and review of field activities by the ZP/DRDA, State Governments and the Central Government from time to time are some of the steps which would contribute towards better implementation of projects under IWDP.

3.9 As per the Performance Budget (2000-2001), since 1995-96 to 1997-2000, 192 projects were sanctioned for treatment of 18.22 lakh hectares of wastelands. These projects are at different stages of implementation. Though the projects period remains 5 years, community mobilization and institution building at village level takes considerable time and project period at times spills beyond 5 years.

3.10 When asked about the number of projects sanctioned under IWDP since inception, the projects completed/on-going, outlay earmarked and spent in each of the year, the following data is submitted by the Government:—

A total number of 298 projects have been sanctioned under IWDP since 1.4.95. Out of that, 8 projects have been completed and one foreclosed. The remaining 289 projects are still under implementation. Year wise outlay earmarked and funds released under IWDP are given below:—

Year	Outlay (Rs. in crore)	Funds Released (Rs. in crore)
1995-1996	49.50	51.00
1996-1997	50.50	50.80
1997-1998	74.50	53.95
1998-1999	82.10	62.00
1999-2000	82.00	83.07
2000-2001	480.00 (including EAS) (IWDP Rs. 130.00 EAS Rs. 350.00)	387.00 (IWDP : 130.00 EAS: 257.00)
Total	818.60	687.82

3.11 As per the written replies, District Rural Development Agencies (DRDAs) could not give full attention to the project formulation and sufficient new projects could not be received from the States.

3.12 When asked about the problems faced by the State Governments in devolving the implementation and execution of all the schemes of wastelands development to Panchayati Raj Institutions in view of the self-explained incompetence of DRDAs in handling the projects, the Department has stated that wherever Zilla Parishads/Zilla Panchayats are in place, the IWDP projects are sanctioned to Zilla Parishads/Zilla Panchayats. The Panchayati Raj Institutions are also being involved at the project implementing stage by inducting such institutions as PLAs. Gram Panchayats are represented in the Watershed Committees elected by the Watershed Associations.

3.13 As per the written note the physical and financial targets fixed and achievement made under IWDP during 8th and 9th Plan year-wise are given as under:—

Plan	Physical (in hectares)		Financial (in crore)	
	Target	Achievement	Outlay	Releases
<i>8th Plan</i>				
1992-1993	15,900	27,000	16.83	16.83
1993-1994	57,956	50,000	40.72	44.49
1994-1995	65,000	65,000	49.20	53.04
1995-1996	58,000	58,000	49.50	51.00
1996-1997	84,000	84,000	50.50	50.80
Total	2,80,856	2,84,000	206.75	216.16
<i>9th Plan</i>				
1997-1998	1,27,000	90,000	74.50	53.95
1998-1999	1,37,000	1,03,000	82.10	62.00
1999-2000	1,36,750	1,38,500	82.00	83.07
Total	4,00,750	3,31,500	238.60	199.02

3.14 When enquired about the steps undertaken by the Government to popularise the programme by media to make it a people's programme, the Department has replied that:—

"The programme is being popularised through exhibitions, broadcasting/T.V. etc. Besides at the district level the programme is being popularised through posters, pamphlets, wall posters. Suitable advertisements on post cards and inland letters have also been given for the information of the rural poor. The fact that a large number of project proposals are being received in the Department shows that the scheme is already popular.

3.15 After going through the replies furnished by the Government the following observations are made regarding the implementation of one of the flagship scheme of the Department of Land Resources:

- (i) A cut of Rs. 93 crore was imposed by the Planning Commission at RE stage during 2000-2001.
- (ii) While furnishing the data regarding outlay during 2000-2001 and 2001-2002, it has been clarified by the Government that the outlay includes funds for the on-going schemes of watershed development in view of watershed component of EAS being transferred to the Department of Land Resources. However, while indicating the physical achievement, the same clarification has not been made.
- (iii) The outlay under IWDP is reduced to make available more funds for DDP and DPAP.
- (iv) The targets under IWDP are reduced to commensurate with the reduced outlay.
- (v) The outlay during 2001-2002 under the watershed component of EAS has been reduced from Rs. 350 crore to Rs. 200 crore.
- (vi) Sufficient new projects are not being received from the States and also the DRDAs could not give full attention to the project formulation.
- (vii) Although the targets were achieved during 8th Plan there is slippage of targets during the first three years of 9th Plan.

The Committee note that the Government do not appear to be serious about the implementation of one of the oldest and most important programme of the Department of Land Resources. Adequate allocation is not being made for the programme. The Committee are constrained to note that the allocation under one of the important scheme of the Department is being reduced to increase the allocation for the other schemes of the Department. Thus the over-all outlay of the Department remaining stagnant with minor adjustments being made here and there. The Committee further note with concern that watershed component of EAS was given more importance and hence more outlay when it was under Ministry of Rural Development. However, while merging the same with IWDP, the outlay has been reduced. In view of this, the Committee feel that it is high time the Government should give serious attention towards IWDP. Not only the allocation should be enhanced, but it should be ensured that whatever is allocated at BE stage is not reduced at RE stage and there is meaningful utilisation of resources. The Committee further urge the Government to hand over the implementation of IWDP to PRIs in view of the self explained incompetence of DRDAs. Besides the Committee urge the Government that whatever data is furnished to them in connection with the examination of Demands for Grants, it should be able to give a clear picture of the implementation of the various programmes and should be easily comparable to help in arriving at some meaningful conclusion. This para may be read in conjunction with para 2.6 of the Report.

Technology Development, Extension and Training Scheme (TDET)

3.16 Technology Support is extremely vital for the success of a land-based programme especially in the development of wastelands. Realising this, a Central Sector Scheme—Technology Development, Extension and Training Scheme was launched during 1993-1994 to develop suitable technologies for the reclamation of wastelands for sustained production of food, fuelwood, fodder etc.

3.17 Under the Technology Development, Extension and Training Scheme 100% financial assistance is given for projects which are on Government and community land. The cost of the projects on private land is shared in the ratio of 60:40 between the Centre and the Farmers/Corporate Body.

The year-wise allocation of fund under TDET scheme is as follows:

(Rs. in crore)				
Year	Allocation	Released/ Expenditure	Target (Area in Hectares)	Achievement
1999-2000	8.00	8.70	3000	3000
2000-2001	12.00	8.33*	4000	2500
2001-2002	15.00	—	5000	—

* upto 22nd February, 2001.

3.18 When asked about the steps proposed to be initiated during 2001-2002 to fully utilise the enhanced outlay fully the Department has stated that during 2001-2002, emphasis will be on the development of special problem lands like waterlogged, salt affected including coastal sandy areas and arid areas. Efforts will also be made to cover more areas and obtain fresh proposals so that the enhanced outlay of Rs. 15.00 crore is fully utilised.

3.19 As per the Performance Budget, 88 projects have been sanctioned under this scheme, so far, out of which 33 projects have been completed.

When asked as to how the Department would ensure proper post maintenance of 33 projects mentioned above, it has been stated in the written note that under this scheme, the projects are mostly sanctioned as pilot projects for extension of the technology in private farmers wastelands. These projects are also used as demonstration models for the other farmers. Farmer's contribution is also envisaged in these projects in terms of their labour and maintenance aspects. Hence they themselves ensure sustainability of the project through post project maintenance.

3.20 Objectives

The objectives of this scheme are as under:—

- (i) development of data base for planning sustainable development of wastelands;
- (ii) operationalisation of cost effective and proven technologies for development of various categories of wastelands specially problem lands affected by soil erosion, land degradation, salinity, alkalinity, waterlogging, etc.

- (iii) implementation of location specific pilot projects/ demonstration models including pisciculture, duckery, bee keeping, domesticated animals and birds, etc.;
- (iv) dissemination of research findings and appropriate technologies for promoting wastelands development;
- (v) evaluation of the impact and replication of these models in larger areas;
- (vi) organising publicity, awareness campaign, seminar/ conferences, circulation of hand-outs/extension materials.

3.21 When asked to what extent each of the objectives mentioned above have really been achieved under the scheme it is submitted by the Government that to achieve the objectives of the scheme, pilot projects are sanctioned to different Institutes/ Organisations for tackling the problem of various categories of wastelands. In order to develop data-base on wastelands, Department has brought out a "Wasteland Atlas of India" in collaboration with National Remote Sensing Agency, (NRSA) Hyderabad in March, 2000. Training, awareness programme and circulation of hand-outs/extension materials are integral components of these projects which are ensured by the Project Implementing Agencies during implementation.

3.22 While noting the objectives of the scheme, the Committee would like to know the details regarding pilot projects/ demonstration models being implemented under the scheme. Besides, the Committee would also like to be apprised of the detailed information regarding the training and awareness programme arranged under the scheme since inception. The Committee note that farmers ensure the sustainability of projects under this scheme through post project maintenance as farmers' contribution is also envisaged in terms of their labour and maintenance. The Committee are of the view that post project maintenance should not be left to the farmers exclusively. The Government should share the responsibility and also evolve suitable guidelines for post maintenance.

Support to NGOs/VAs Scheme

3.23 Information relating to support to NGOs/VAs Scheme is as under:—

Year	Allocation (Rs. in crore)	Funds released by the Department
1997-1998	4.00	2.60
1998-1999	2.00	2.02
1999-2000	2.00	2.00
2000-2001	1.00	—
2001-2002	0.00	—
Total	9.00	6.62

3.24 As per the written replies during 1997-98, ongoing projects of the scheme were transferred to the Council for Advancement of People's Action and Rural Technology (CAPART) leaving with the Department a few projects which are being implemented by the universities/trusts/cooperative societies etc.

When asked about how many project are left with the Department, it has been submitted in the written note that 12 projects are left with the Department under the scheme. The details are as follows:—

- (i) Amravati University, Maharashtra.
- (ii) Venkateshwara Tree Growers Co-operative Society Ltd., Nalgonda (A.P.).
- (iii) Paryavaran and Wasteland Development Co-operative Society Ltd., Jammu & Kashmir.
- (iv) Dr. Baba Saheb Ambedkar Marathwada University, Maharashtra.
- (v) Kendriya Vidyalaya Sangathan, New Delhi.
- (vi) The Duilon Joint Farming Multipurpose Co-operative Society Ltd., Takenlong, Manipur.

- (vii) Krishnaveni Tree Growers Co-operative Society Ltd., Nalgonda, A.P.
- (viii) Kanchenjunga Tree Plantation Co-operative Society Ltd.
- (ix) Bihar State Forest Development Corporation Ltd., Patna.
- (x) Shri Mata Vaishno Devi Shrine Board, Katra (J&K)-I.
- (xi) Kaorakhali Jana Sevashram, 25, S. Pargana, Sundarvan, West Bengal.
- (xii) Shri Mata Vaishno Devi Shrine Board, Katra (J&K)-II.

3.25 Further it is submitted that the Department is having one ongoing project which was sanctioned to Shri Mata Vaishno Devi Shrine Board, Katra of Udhampur district in J&K at a total cost of Rs. 195.85 lakh for the treatment of 3000 ha. of wastelands for a period of five years starting from 1998-1999. The project will be completed during 2002-2003. An amount of Rs. 47.00 lakh is likely to be required during the next financial year 2001-2002 to maintain the continuity of the project.

3.26 When asked about the justification of transferring the scheme to CAPART under Department of Rural Development, whereas the policy of the Government is to bring all the schemes under one umbrella, the Department has replied that CAPART an organisation under the Ministry of Rural Development, deals with the Non Governmental Organisations and Voluntary Agencies through its headquarters at Delhi and regional offices located at different parts of the country. It deals exclusively in funding Non Governmental Organisations for rural development works and has the necessary infrastructure to evaluate the capacity and ascertain the credibility of NGOs/VAs before advancing funds. Hence, the NGOs/VAs Schemes was transferred to CAPART for better coordination, implementation and monitoring of the projects under the scheme.

3.27 While noting that all the projects under the schemes support to NGOs/VAs have been transferred to CAPART, the Committee would like that a close coordination between the projects sanctioned by CAPART and other projects being implemented under different schemes of the Department should be maintained to avoid duplication and misreporting of achievements under these schemes.

Desert Development Programme (DDP) and Drought Prone Area Programme (DPAP)

(i) *Desert Development Programme (DDP)*

3.28 The Desert Development Programme (DDP) aims at controlling desertification and to conserve, develop and harness land, water and other natural resources for restoration of ecological balance in the long run and also to raise the level of production, income and employment through irrigation, afforestation, dry land farming etc. This is a Centrally Sponsored scheme which was earlier funded 100% by the Central Government. Allocation is shared on 75:25 basis between the Centre and the State in case of projects sanctioned after 1.4.1999. However, the projects sanctioned prior to 1.4.1999 will continue to be funded on 100% basis by the Centre. The Programme is in operation in 232 Blocks in 40 districts of 7 States.

(Rs. in crore)

Year	BE	Expenditure
2000-2001	135	101.20
2001-2002	160	

Number of watershed projects sanctioned

Year	Number
1995-1996	1693
1996-1997	65
1997-1998	36
1998-1999	400
1999-2000	1500
2000-2001	886
	(upto 22.2.2001)

3.29 As per the written information the number of watershed projects declined substantially during 1996-1997 as compared to 1995-1996. It increased during 1998-1999 and 1999-2000 and then during 2000-2001, there was decline in the number of watershed projects sanctioned.

When the Department was asked to explain the above-mentioned trend, it has been submitted in the written note that the year 1995-1996 was the first year when the new guidelines for Watershed Development were operationalised. In that year, therefore, all the programme allocation was utilised by sanctioning a total of 1693 watershed projects. Each of these watershed projects was to be completed in about 5 years. As such, all these projects sanctioned in 1995-1996 continued to be executed in subsequent years. Therefore, in subsequent years, besides the on-going 1693 projects, the projects sanctioned as mentioned above were additional. These were sanctioned only after accounting for the committed liabilities of the on-going projects. However, from 1999-2000, due to availability of sufficient budget allocation, more projects could be sanctioned.

3.30 When enquired about the reduction in the number of watershed projects during 2000-2001 as compared to previous year whereas the allocation has been increased from Rs. 135 to 160 crore, the Government have stated that upto 22.2.2001, the Department had sanctioned 886 watershed projects. A proposal to sanction 720 projects was under consideration at that time. These have since been sanctioned. In addition, 53 more watershed projects have been sanctioned for Kutch district, Gujarat, (in the light of the recent earthquake in the State). Thus during 2000-2001, a total of 1659 projects have been sanctioned against the target of 1600 projects. During 2001-2002, even though the budget has been increased, a target of 800 watershed projects has been fixed keeping in view the likely revision in the cost per hectare to Rs. 6000 and the increased liability of ongoing projects due to sanction of 1500 projects in 1999-2000 and 1659 projects in 2000-2001.

3.31 When asked about the total number of DDP projects in the country, the Government has furnished the following information:—

The State-wise break-up of watershed projects sanctioned under Desert Development Programme since 1995-1996:—

State	Total No. of watershed projects
Andhra Pradesh	362
Gujarat	1095
Haryana	433
Karnataka	507
Rajasthan	2405
Jammu & Kashmir	348
Himachal Pradesh	203
Total	5353

3.32 As per the written replies submitted by the Government, in 9th Five Year Plan it has been proposed that all the villages or blocks identified under DDP should be covered in 20 years by the Government at least taking up one watershed project of about 500 hectares in each village.

When asked as to how many villages or blocks have so far been identified under DDP, the Department have replied that under DDP, 232 blocks in 40 districts of 7 States covering an area of 4.6 lakh sq. kms. have been identified for coverage. It is estimated that, in these blocks there are about 22,000 villages.

3.33 When asked about what is the requirement of outlay to develop all of the DDP projects, the Department has replied that taking into consideration the number of watershed projects sanctioned so far under DDP, about 18,000 villages still need to be covered under the programme. The total outlay required to take up at least one watershed project in a village at a cost of Rs. 30 lakh (assuming revision of cost per hectare) would be Rs. 5,400 crore comprising a Central Share of Rs. 4050 crore. In fact, this requirement would be much higher keeping in view the relatively bigger size of villages in DDP areas which may require more than one watershed project to be sanctioned per village. Further, in some DDP areas, because of the inoperability of watershed projects, special projects of bigger size need to be taken up to tackle special problems like sand dune stabilization shelterbelt plantations. Therefore, it may be necessary to take up an average of 1500 ha. area for treatment in a DDP village equivalent to 3 watershed projects. The total outlay required for this would be about Rs. 16,200 crore comprising of a Central share of Rs. 12,150 crore.

As regards the slippage of targets during 9th Plan, the Government have informed that if all the DDP blocks are to be covered in 20 years as envisaged in the 9th Plan, about 5000 villages should have been covered under the programme requiring treatment of 75 lakh hectares through 15,000 watershed projects of 500 hectare each. However total coverage during 9th Plan would be 21,97,500 hectares. (the data regarding target of 2001-2002 has been included).

(ii) *Drought Prone Area Programme (DPAP)*

3.34 The Drought Prone Area Programme (DPAP) is an area development programme designed to tackle the problem of drought with a long term perspective based on strategy of optimum utilization of land, water and human resources. This is a centrally sponsored scheme, which was earlier funded on a matching basis by the Centre and States. However, with effect from 1st April, 1999, the allocation is shared on 75:25 basis between the Centre and State Governments in respect of new projects sanctioned during and after 2000-2001. The programme is in operation in 961 blocks in 180 districts of 16 States.

3.35 Outlay under DPAP is as follows:—

Year	(Rs. in crore)		
	BE	RE	Expenditure
1997-1998	115	100.75	100.75
1998-1999	95	73	73
1999-2000	95	95	94.99
2000-2001	190	190	127.37*
2001-2002	210	210	—

*As on 22.2.2001

Physical Achievement during 2000-2001

3.36 As per the written note in the year 2000-2001, 1685 new watershed projects have been sanctioned to the various States so far against the target of 3000 projects and the first instalment of 15% of Central Share has also been released to the concerned districts. The remaining projects are expected to be sanctioned during the last quarter of the financial year.

When asked as to how the Government would achieve the target of 3000 projects keeping in view the fact that 1685 projects out of 3000 projects have so far been sanctioned; it has been submitted that in March 2001, 1686 more projects (which include 150 projects for programme districts of Gujarat after the earth quake) have been sanctioned. Thus the target of a total of 3371 of new watershed projects, has been achieved.

Physical Performance

3.37 The number of watershed projects sanctioned as follows:

Year	Sanctioned
1995-1996	4523
1996-1997	280
1997-1998	396
1998-1999	858
1999-2000	2278
2000-2001	1685
Total	10020

whereas the number of completed projects is 2712.

As per the information given above the number of watershed projects declined substantially during 1996-1997 as compared to previous year. The number increased during 1997-1998, 1998-1999 and 1999-2000. Further, there was a decline during 2000-2001.

3.38 When asked as to how the Government would explain the trends of increase and decrease in number of DPAP projects in various years, it has been submitted in the written note that a watershed project takes 4 to 5 years to complete. The Central Share is released in 7 instalments 15%, 10%, 20%, 20%, 15%, 10% and 10%. The first instalment is released at the time of sanction of the project. The subsequent instalments are released on receipt of specific proposal from the DRDA subject to fulfillment of the specified financial criteria. Thus every year, there is outstanding liability for the projects taken up in earlier years. The new projects are sanctioned after meeting the outstanding liabilities of the ongoing projects. In any given year the new projects sanctioned are additional to the ongoing projects sanctioned earlier. Therefore, the cumulative number of watershed projects in a year would be more than that of the preceding year.

When asked about the targets during 2001-2002, the Government have stated that the target for 2000-2001 is 1200 watershed projects. This is based on the assumption that cost norms will increase from Rs. 4000/- to Rs. 6000/- per hectare. In case the cost norms do not change, the target will increase proportionately.

During 9th Plan it is envisaged that all DPAP areas i.e. approximately 1,36,000 villages identified would be covered in 20 years. The requirement of outlay would be about Rs. 20,000 crore at the present cost which includes the commitment to the already sanctioned projects.

3.39 The Committee find that keeping in view the magnitude of problem, the allocations made for DDP and DPAP are utterly inadequate. They note that although the Government had set the target covering all DDP and DPAP blocks within 20 years, at the present rate of allocation it will take atleast 60 years to attain this objective. Moreover the Committee are deeply distressed that in a year in which large parts of the country are suffering serious drought conditions, sometimes for several years, allocations made to DDP and DPAP remain awfully meagre. At this rate, objectives set out in the 9th Plan cannot be achieved within a stipulated time frame. The Committee feel that the country cannot wait for such a long period to see DDP/DPAP blocks as the green areas. They, therefore, strongly recommend that adequate outlays must be made in the Plan and in annual budgets to ensure that the stipulated targets are achieved within a time frame that has been set out.

B. Scheme-wise evaluation of Programmes under Land Reforms Division

(i) Computerisation of Land Records

3.40 The Centrally sponsored scheme on Computerisation of Land Records was started in 1988-1989 in eight States as a pilot project and later on it was extended to cover 24 districts up to 1991-1992 in different States. It was started with the sole objective of ensuring issuing timely and accurate copy of records of rights to the land owners by the Tehsildar. The main objective of the scheme is computerisation of ownership and plot-wise details for issue of timely and accurate copy of the record of right to the land owners. This is a 100% grants-in-aid scheme. So far, 569 districts have been brought under the computerisation programme in the country and the scheme has been operationalised in 2341 Tehsils/ Taluka/Mandals in the country.

3.41 The year-wise allocation and expenditure of the Ninth Plan are given below:

(Rs. in crore)			
Year	BE	RE	Expenditure
1997-1998	20.00	20.00	20.19
1998-1999	30.00	25.00	24.75
1999-2000	33.00	33.00	32.24
2000-2001	50.00	48.00	43.59*
2001-2002	45.00	—	—

*As on 22.02.2001

3.42 When asked about the reasons for cut in outlay at R.E. stage during 2000-2001, the Department has replied that the cut in outlay of Rs. 2.00 crore at R.E. stage during 2000-2001 under the scheme of Computerisation of Land Records is due to overall cut imposed by the Ministry of Finance.

3.43 As per the written information forwarded to the Committee, under the scheme of Computerisation of Land Records (CLR), all the districts of the country including North Eastern States will be covered. The programme will be operationalised in all the remaining tehsils/talukas/mandals so that services could be provided to the land owners etc. Further, more pilot projects on digitisation of cadastral maps will be sanctioned during the remaining period of the 9th Plan.

3.44 When asked about the number of remaining districts which have not been covered, the Government have replied that the total number of districts in the country is 593, out of which 569 districts have already been covered under the programme and remaining 24 districts will be covered during the last year of the 9th Plan *i.e.* 2001-2002.

When asked further whether any time bound programme has been made to cover all the districts it is submitted by the Department that the remaining 24 districts will be covered during 2001-2002 subject to the condition that the proposals are received from the States/UTs. An outlay of about Rs. 45.00 crore would be required for the year 2001-2002 to cover the remaining 24 districts which includes the outlay for the ongoing sanctioned projects.

3.45 As per the Mid Term Appraisal of 9th Plan "Several factors have constrained the progress of computerisation of land records. These include delay in transfer of funds to implementing authority by the State Governments, power shortages and delay in construction of room with air conditioner for installation of computer and other equipment, delay in development of appropriate and comprehensive software as per requirement of the State Government, delay in supply and installation of the hardware by the National Informatics Centre (NIC), lack of adequate training facilities to staff to handle computers and non-availability of good vendors for taking up data entry work."

3.46 When asked about the comments of the Government on the findings of the Mid Term Appraisal, the Government have replied that the observation on Mid Term Appraisal of 9th Plan is factually correct. To speed up the progress of implementation of the scheme of computerisation of land records, the Ministry of Rural Development has impressed upon the State Governments to take effective steps for transfer of funds to Implementing Agencies in time and also take up data entry work through private vendors so that work could be completed within a stipulated time. The States have also been requested to procure and install hardware in the sanctioned tehsils/taluks/blocks/mandals at the earliest and also organise basic training programme to impart training to revenue officials at the taluk level to facilitate speedy implementation of the scheme.

3.47 The Committee note with concern the findings of Mid Term Appraisal of 9th Plan by Planning Commission in respect of the scheme of Computerisation of Land Records as mentioned in the preceding para. The Government have acknowledged the shortcomings as reflected in the said Mid Term Appraisal. They are disturbed to find that even the outlay under the scheme is not timely released to the implementing authorities. There are other infrastructure problems due to which the programme is suffering. Further adequate emphasis is not being given to training. The Committee, therefore, urge the Government to pay serious attention towards the programme as land records are the necessary documents for planning. The Government should look into the inadequacies as pointed out by the Planning Commission and ensure that the implementation of the programme do not suffer due to the shortcomings as mentioned in the Mid Term Review.

The Committee are happy to learn that under CLR all the districts of the country including North Eastern States will be covered. However, no time bound programme and the financial implications have been indicated. The Committee would like to urge that the Government before committing should think about feasibility so that it is realistic and does not remain an utopia. The Committee are of the view that Government should plan in advance and indicate the time schedule with expenses involved to make it an all around success.

(ii) *Strengthening of Revenue Administration and updating of Land Records (SRA&ULR)*

3.48 Strengthening of Revenue Administration and updating of Land Records (SRA&ULR) is a centrally sponsored scheme, under this scheme, financial assistance is provided to the State on a 50:50 sharing basis between the Centre and the State. However, Union territories are given 100% financial assistance under the scheme.

3.49 The year-wise allocation and expenditure as furnished by the Government is as below:—

(Rs. in crore)			
Year	BE	RE	Expenditure
1997-1998	18.80	18.80	18.83
1998-1999	8.80	8.80	9.05
1999-2000	10.00	10.00	10.25
2000-2001	25.00	25.00	22.27*
	1.00	—	—
	(token)		(for consolidation of Land Holdings)

*As on 22.2.2001.

3.50 As per the written note there are 593 districts in the country which includes districts in rural areas also.

When asked about the land records of how many districts are updated so far, the Government have stated that the task of updating of land records due to mutation in the rights of holders on inheritance, sale, mortgage etc. is a continuing process. As such district-wise information is not made available.

3.51 As per the Mid Term Appraisal of 9th Plan, it is observed that "The updating of land records can be expedited even without computerisation through the involvement of Panchayati Raj Institutions (PRIs) and local revenue functionaries. The village level revenue functionaries should be placed under the control of the Gram Panchayats, though the appellate jurisdiction should continue with the tehsildar. At the district level, the land revenue system must work under the Zilla Parishad. The 30 per cent representation for women in PRIs should help the cause of women in so far as recording of rights of women in land is concerned. Moreover, steps have to be taken to bring about greater transparency in the administration of land records, with access to information regarding land holdings on demand by any individual, copies of land records including record of rights, field books/maps. Land Pass Books as also mutation statements, status of land and jamabandi registers should be accessible and copies provided on payment of a fee."

3.52 The Committee are concerned to find that the Government have not maintained the district-wise information regarding the coverage of the schemes. In the absence of the said information, it is really difficult to assess the impact of the programme. The Committee therefore, strongly recommend the Government to procure the information regarding districts/States where the land records have been updated so far and furnish the same to the Committee.

3.53 While noting the findings of Mid Term Appraisal of 9th Plan, the Committee feel that the following steps need to be initiated to make the programme really successful:

- (i) The responsibility of execution and implementation of the programme should directly be handed over to the different tiers of the Panchayati Raj Institutions (PRIs).
- (ii) Steps should be taken to bring transparency in the administration of land records so that an individual could have easy access to the information relating to land records.
- (iii) There should be a set procedure for getting the copy of land record from the Revenue Office in the respective district. Steps should be taken to mitigate corruption in this regard.

Consolidation of Land Holdings

3.54 As per the Performance Budget, Administrative Staff College of India (ASCI), Hyderabad has been assigned a study of Land Consolidation and Computerisation of land records in 10 States and document the efforts made on consolidation and computerisation in various States. Administrative Staff College of India (ASCI) has since carried out the 'Spot Study' on progress of Land consolidation and Computerisation of Land Records in 10 States. Now, final report of ASCI has been received.

A token provision of Rs. 1 crore has been made during 2001-2002 for the proposed centrally sponsored scheme on Consolidation of Land Holdings.

3.55 When asked about the main findings of ASCI report, the Government have stated as under:—

The main findings of the ASCI report are the following:—

- (i) The consolidation of land holdings is to be considered as a State subject and there is need to organise the State resources to implement the scheme. The Central schemes with financial support need not be carried forward to implement the scheme on Consolidation of Land Holdings in various States.
- (ii) The States need to formulate region specific approaches for the consolidation process and should use bottom up strategies taking the concurrence of the farmers.
- (iii) There is a need to give through rethinking on the scheme of consolidation of land holdings, as there were many administrative and socio-economic hurdles experienced in the past. The scheme may be considered on case to case basis in consolidating the wastelands for improved agricultural practices.
- (iv) The scheme of consolidation of land holdings needs to be popularised in rural areas at grass root level revenue functionaries and non-Government organisation.

- (v) There is a strong feeling amongst the farmers that the consolidation officers do not take the concurrence of the farmers before confirming the scheme and such actions resulted in resistance among the farmers to accept the scheme. The concurrence of the farmers on the scheme before confirmation needs to be sought in the Gram Sabha.
- (vi) There is need for formulating a National Policy on the Consolidation of Land Holdings to provide a conceptual framework to the State Governments. The National Policy should address the institutional issues like credit, technology, marketing extension and managerial support to the farmers.

When asked further about the main objectives of the scheme, the Government have stated that National Level Scheme on Consolidation of Land Holding is yet to be formulated. However, the main objectives of the Consolidation of Land Holdings are prohibiting fragmentation of land holdings, consolidation by exchange of holdings and reservation of areas for common purposes.

3.56 When asked about whether the guidelines of the scheme have been finalised, the Government have stated that the matter relating to the finalisation of the scheme is still under consideration of the Government.

3.57 When asked further as to how the work regarding consolidation of land holdings can be carried on without having updated land records in various districts, the Government have stated that the process of consolidation of land holdings can be undertaken once the land records are updated. The updation of land records is a continuous process. However, consolidation of land holdings could be carried forward as per the existing land records.

3.58 The Committee would like to know the following information in view of the findings of the Administrative Staff College of India (ASCI):

- (i) **Whether the Government is still thinking of starting a Centrally Sponsored Scheme of Consolidation of Land Holdings in view of the findings of said Report according to which the Consolidation of Land Holdings is a State Subject and the Central schemes with financial support need not be carried forward to implement the scheme on Consolidation of Land Holdings in various States.**

- (ii) Whether the Government have thought of formulating a national policy on the Consolidation of Land Holdings in view of the said Report.

The Committee urge that information as stated above should be expeditiously made available to the Committee.

As per findings of ASCI, there were many administrative and socio-economic hurdles experienced in the past in the consolidation of land holdings. There is a strong feeling that the concurrence of farmers is not taken by consolidation officers before confirming the scheme. Besides, the scheme is not popular at grass root level. The Committee urge that the Government should pay their attention seriously to the aforesaid deficiencies and as indicated by ASCI, the National Policy should address the institutional issues like credit, technology marketing, extension and managerial support to the farmers. The Committee would like to hear from the Government in this regard.

Amendment of Land Acquisition Act

3.59 As per the written information, the proposal regarding amendment of Land Acquisition Act has been approved by the Group of Ministers (GOM) in its meeting held on 11.8.2000. The proposed amendment Bill is pending with the Ministry of Law, Justice and Company Affairs for vetting before it is submitted to the Union Cabinet for its approval.

3.60 When asked about the present status of the Land Acquisition Bill, it has been stated that the proposal is under consideration (for vetting by the Ministry of Law, Justice and Company Affairs).

3.61 While noting that the Land Acquisition Bill was sent for vetting to the Ministry of Law, Justice and Company Affairs several months ago, the Committee would like to be apprised whether the Bill has since been vetted by that Ministry.

NEW DELHI;
18 April, 2001
28 Chaitra, 1923 (Saka)

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

APPENDIX I
FINANCIAL REQUIREMENTS

(Rs. in lakhs)

Sl. No.	Name of Scheme/Items	Budget Estimates 2000-2001	Revised Estimates 2000-2001	Release 2000-2001 upto 31.1.2001	Budget Estimates 2001-2002
Plan					
1.	Computerisation of Land Records	5000.00	4800.00	4207.26	4500.00
2.	Strengthening of revenue Administration and Updation of Land Records	2500.00	2500.00	2077.00	3000.0
3.	Consolidation of Land Holdings	100.00	0.00	0.00	100.00
4.	Drought Prone Area Programme	19000.00	19000.00	12689.00	21000.00
5.	Desert Development Programme	13500.00	13500.00	9958.00	16000.00
6.	Integrated Wastelands Development Programme	48000.00	38700.00	31310.00	43000.00
7.	Technology Development, Extension & Training	1200.00	1087.00	785.00	1500.00
8.	Investment Promotional Scheme	50.00	10.00	7.57	50.00
9.	Support to NGOs/VAs	100.00	40.00	0.00	0.00
10.	Communication	200.00	92.00	78.15	50.00
11.	Appraisal, Monitoring & Evaluation	100.00	26.00	9.28	500.00
12.	Board Secretariat	250.00	245.00	175.64	300.00
Total - Plan		90000.00	80000.00	61296.90	90000.00
Non-Plan					
1.	Seckt. Economic Services	90.00	89.00	76.02	99.00
Grand Total		90090.00	80089.00	61372.92	90099.00

APPENDIX II

DEPARTMENT OF LAND RESOURCES

STATEMENT SHOWING THE 8TH AND 9TH PLAN OUTLAYS AND CORRESPONDING EXPENDITURE FROM 1998-1999 TO 2000-2001

(Rs. in crores)

Sl. No.	Name of Scheme	8th Plan		9th Plan Outlay		1998-1999			1999-2000			2000-2001			2001-2002	
		Outlay	Exp.	Proposed	As agreed to by Planning Commission	BE	RE	Actual Exp.	BE	RE	Actual Exp.	BE	RE	Actual Exp. upto 29.3.2001	Outlay Proposed	BE
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
	Plan															
	Commitment of Schemes of Erstwhile NWDB	6.42	6.42	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	—	—
1.	I.W.D.P.	206.75	216.16	3360.00	361.95	82.10	62.10	62.00	82.00	82.00	83.07	480.00*	387.00	387.00	620.00	430.00
2.	Support to NGOs/VAs	13.35	13.75	165.00	10.63	2.00	2.00	2.02	2.00	2.00	2.00	1.00	0.40	0.40	1.00	0.00
3.	T.D.E.&T	7.50	8.28	105.00	37.65	8.00	8.00	8.05	8.00	8.00	8.70	12.00	10.87	10.98	20.00	15.00
4.	Investment Promotional Scheme	6.00	0.22	1.00	6.04	1.60	0.60	0.04	2.00	2.00	0.23	0.50	0.10	0.10	1.00	0.50

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
5.	Wastelands Development Tasks Force	5.00	1.76	3.00	5.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.98	0.00	0.00	—	—	—
6.	Communication	1.45	1.04	102.00	10.78	3.00	0.75	0.37	3.00	3.00	2.99	2.00	0.92	0.85	2.00	0.50
7.	Appraisal, Monitoring and Evaluation	1.45	0.14	19.00	3.19	1.00	0.25	0.16	1.00	1.00	0.99	1.00	0.26	0.16	8.00	6.00
8.	Board Secretariat	5.48	4.89	##	8.69	2.00	2.00	1.42	2.00	2.00	1.71	2.50	2.45	2.30	3.00	3.00
9.	Promotional & Critical Support Services	1.50	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	—	—	—
10.	Drought Prone Areas Programme	448.26	442.36	700.00	465.00	95.00	73.00	73.00	95.00	95.00	94.99	190.00	190.00	190.00	375.00	210.00
11.	Desert Development Programme	410.00	375.89	1430.00	255.00	90.00	80.00	79.80	85.00	85.00	85.00	135.00	338.00	134.99	240.00	160.00
12.	Computerisation of Land Records	48.00	59.42	332.45	150.00	30.00	25.00	24.75	33.00	33.00	32.69	50.00	48.00	47.85	75.00	45.00
13.	SRA&ULR	175.00	98.23	325.00	40.00	8.80	8.80	9.05	10.00	10.00	10.25	25.00	25.00	24.99	50.10	30.00
14.	Consolidation of Land Holdings	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	1.00
	Total Plan	1336.18	1228.56	6542.45	1353.93	324.50	263.50	261.66	324.00	324.00	323.60	900.00	800.00	799.62	1396.10	900.00
	Non-Plan															
1.	Secretariat Economic Services	1.12	0.88	1.61*	N.A.	0.25	0.24	0.20	0.26	0.25	0.17	0.90	0.89	0.79	0.99	0.99
				upto 2000-01												
	Total Plan & Non-Plan	1337.28	1229.44	6542.45	1353.93	324.75	263.74	261.86	324.26	324.25	323.77	900.90	800.89	800.41	1397.09	900.99

Expenditure under Board Secretariat was proposed to be transferred to Non-Plan side during Ninth Plan.

* This includes Rs. 350.00 crore for ongoing watershed projects under EAS.

APPENDIX III

COMMITTEE ON URBAN AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT (2001)

MINUTES OF THE ELEVENTH SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE HELD ON WEDNESDAY, THE 4TH APRIL, 2001

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

PRESENT

Shri Madan Lal Khurana — *In the Chair*

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

2. Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar
3. Shri Jaswant Singh Bishnoi
4. Shri Ambati Brahmaniah
5. Shri Swadesh Chakraborty
6. Shri Bal Krishna Chauhan
7. Shrimati Hema Gamang
8. Shri Babubhai K. Katara
9. Shri Shrichand Kriplani
10. Shri P.R. Kyndiah
11. Shri Bir Singh Mahato
12. Dr. Ranjit Kumar Panja
13. Shri Dharam Raj Singh Patel
14. Prof. (Shrimati) A.K. Premajam
15. Shri Nikhilananda Sar
16. Shri Maheshwar Singh
17. Shri Chinmayanand Swami
18. Shri Chintaman Wanaga

Rajya Sabha

19. Shrimati Shabana Azmi
20. Shri Karnendu Bhattacharjee
21. Prof. A. Lakshmisagar
22. Shri C. Apok Jamir
23. Shri Faqir Chand Mullana
24. Shri N. Rajendran
25. Shri Solipeta Ramachandra Reddy
26. Shri Man Mohan Samal
27. Shri Suryabhan Patil Vahadane

SECRETARIAT

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

**Representatives of the Ministry of Rural Development
(Department of Land Resources)**

1. Shri Arun Bhatnagar — Secretary
2. Shri Lalit Mathur — Additional Secretary & Financial Adviser
3. Shri Mohan Kanda — Additional Secretary
4. Shri P.S. Rana — Joint Secretary
5. Shri B.B. Baruri — Joint Secretary
6. Shri R.P. Aggarwala — DIG

2. In the absence of Chairman, the Committee chose Shri Madan Lal Khurana, M.P. to act as Chairman for the sitting under Rule 258(3) of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha.

3. At the outset, the Chairman welcomed the representatives of the Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development) to the sitting. He also drew the attention of the witnesses to the provision of Direction 55(1) of the Directions by the Speaker.

4. The Committee then took oral evidence of the representatives of the said Ministry/Department on Demand for Grants (2001-2002).

5. While taking evidence, the Committee were not satisfied with the replies furnished by the representatives of the said Department on the following issues:—

- (i) The Committee found that they had repeatedly been requesting to bring all the schemes related to development of wastelands being implemented by different Ministries/ Departments of the Union Government under one umbrella. In spite of that, final decision in this regard has not been taken so far and the Government is not able to convince the Committee. Further, the Committee felt that since various Ministries like Agriculture, Forest and Environment are involved with the development of wastelands, perhaps the Ministry of Rural Development are not in a position to take a decision in this regard.
- (ii) The involvement of private sector in the field of development of wasteland is essential to fulfil the huge task. In spite of repeated recommendations by the Committee to involve the private sector, the Government are yet to take necessary steps for providing incentives to the private sector to attract them to come to the field of development of wasteland.

6. The Committee, therefore, decided that the evidence of Cabinet Secretary in this regard should be taken by the Committee to impress upon the Government to take a final decision on the above mentioned issues.

7. A verbatim record of the proceedings was kept.

The Committee then adjourned.

APPENDIX IV

COMMITTEE ON URBAN AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT (2001)

MINUTES OF THE FOURTEENTH SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE HELD ON THURSDAY, THE 12TH APRIL, 2001

The Committee sat from 1100 hrs. to 1200 hrs. in Committee Room 'B' Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi.

PRESENT

Shri Anant Gangaram Geete — *Chairman*

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

2. Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar
3. Shri Ambati Brahmaniah
4. Shri Swadesh Chakraborty
5. Shrimati Hema Gamang
6. Shri Holkhomang Haokip
7. Shri Madan Lal Khurana
8. Shri Ramchandra Paswan
9. Prof. (Shrimati) A.K. Premajam
10. Shri Chinmayanand Swami

Rajya Sabha

11. Shri N.R. Dasari
12. Prof. A. Lakshmisagar
13. Shri C. Apok Jamir
14. Shri Faqir Chand Mullana
15. Shri Solipeta Ramachandra Reddy
16. Shri Man Mohan Samal

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 the draft Report on Demand for Grants (2001-2002) of the Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development).

3. The Committee adopted the Report on Demand for Grants (2001-2002) of the said Department with certain modifications as indicated in *Annexure*.

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

The Committee then adjourned.

ANNEXURE

(See Para 3 of Minutes dated 12.04.2001)

Sl. No.	Page No.	Para No.	Line No.	Modifications
1	2	3	4	5
1.	6	2.6	1 to 11	<p><i>For the existing lines read the following:</i></p> <p>“Land and water are the most essential natural resources. However, with regard to both, ambitious claims have been made, but the Ministry of Rural Development is not being given the financial resources required to achieve these vital national goals. The Committee find that the 9th Plan outlay is not even one-fifth of what was proposed to the Planning Commission by the Ministry of Rural Development. Moreover, the targets fixed under different schemes of the Department for 2001-2002 had to be reduced in view of the reduced allocation made by the Ministry of Finance. Keeping in view the position of outlay sanctioned and physical achievements made under the different schemes of the Department, as set out in the preceding paras, the Committee are seriously concerned about the</p>

1	2	3	4	5
				<p>impossibility of achieving the target of reclaiming 40 million hectares of wastelands by the end of the 12th Plan period. In view of this, the Committee urge the Government to coordinate matters with the Planning Commission at the highest level so as to ensure that serious attention is paid to the development of wastelands in the country."</p>
2.	13	2.13	—	<p>For the existing para read the following:</p> <p>"The Committee has been repeatedly recommending that all the schemes/programmes for the development of wastelands run by different Ministries/Departments must be brought under one umbrella. The similar recommendation had also been made by the high level Committee on Wastelands Development under the Chairmanship of Shri Mohan Dharia. The need for a single national initiative has been expressed by the Government to Parliament at the level of Union Finance Minister. In spite of this, not only has no final decision been taken by the Government in this regard, there is little on record to suggest that this matter is being given the priority it deserves.</p>

2

3

4

5

The Integrated Wastelands Development Programme is not an integrated programme notwithstanding its name and the Department of Land Resources is not incharge of all land resources notwithstanding its designation. Running numerous schemes through numerous Departments with a single objective is not a right way of developing wastelands in an integrated manner. The Committee expect the Government to act on this recommendation within the coming year given that this Committee has been recommending it for at least four years and Government have declared themselves to have accepted this approach in principle. The Committee note that the aforesaid schemes suffer due to various bottlenecks like continuous insecurity of availability of funds at grass-root level, the feeble horizontal linkages amongst various agencies and the limitation of planning at the district level, and improper maintenance after completion of projects at the cost of sustainability. The Committee feel that different agencies and different approaches in handling the schemes have sidetracked the above issues

1	2	3	4	5
				<p>and led to confusion. The Committee, therefore, reiterate once again that the urgent need for bringing under one umbrella all schemes and programmes relating to watershed, wastelands development being implemented by the Government, that is the Department of Land Resources in the Ministry of Rural Development. The Committee expect the Government to act on this recommendation within the cost of fiscal year 2001-2002."</p>
3.	17	2.17	—	<p>For the existing para read the following:</p> <p>"The Committee are concerned that the findings of Mid Term Appraisal of the 9th Plan by the Planning Commission are not in consonance with the Government's assessment and that little attempt is being made to reconcile the conflicted assessments. According to the Mid Term Appraisal, there has been no increase in "Net Sown Area" notwithstanding of the efforts and large investments made to reclaim wastelands. This view has been accepted by the Ministry of Rural Development who have pointed out that out of 142 million</p>

1**2****3****4****5**

hectares of Net Sown Area, 100 million hectares are rainfed and, therefore, the stagnation in the Net Sown Area is to be accepted by the vagaries of monsoon. Further, the Committee note that the country has been experiencing an uninterrupted run of good monsoons for the past several years and, as such, the Ministry's argument is not convincing. There must be some deep rooted malaise which need to be addressed seriously. The Committee are disturbed to note that instead of addressing this seriously, the Ministry of Rural Development have tried to shift the responsibility to other Ministries involved in the development of wastelands. They are not convinced by the arguments advanced by the Secretary during the course of the oral evidence before the Committee. In view of this, the Committee urge the Government to take the findings of Mid Term Appraisal seriously, and also to analyse the extent of the problem of treated land getting reconverted into degraded land. Further, the Government should have a fool proof mechanism for ensuring that the programmes are really implemented and not merely reflected on papers."

1	2	3	4	5
4.	19	2.20	—	<p data-bbox="776 425 1187 510"><i>For the existing para read the following:</i></p> <p data-bbox="776 532 1187 1776">"The Committee are seriously concerned to note the findings of Mid Term Appraisal that most of the projects of wastelands development have failed to generate sustainability because of the failure of the Government agencies to involve the people. They are further dissatisfied with the reply furnished by the Government that it is too early to say that these projects have failed to generate sustainability. They note that almost six years have elapsed since wasteland projects are being implemented on the basis of watershed guidelines, and this period is enough to analyse the shortcomings of the programme. In view of it, the Committee recommend that the Government must take into full consideration the issues raised in the Mid Term Appraisal. Besides, the Committee had recommended in their 12th Report that the re-oriented IWDP—one of the biggest scheme of the Department—must be essentially a Panchayat—based Programme. The Committee are distressed that little or no action has been taken on this recommendation, although the responsibility for</p>

1	2	3	4	5
				<p>implementing Part IX of the Constitution vests essentially in the Ministry of Rural Development. The Committee reiterate their earlier recommendation to make all the programmes of the Department such as DDP, DPAP and IWDP, Panchayat-based Programmes, so that the involvement of the people can be ensured. The Committee learn that parallel bodies to Panchayats are being set up in some States with regard to subjects that have to be devolved to the Panchayats. The Committee deplore such tendencies and recommend that the practice of setting up parallel bodies to Panchayats should be discontinued immediately."</p>
5.	21	2.24		<p><i>For the existing para read the following:</i></p> <p>"In view of the very poor physical and financial achievements under the Investment Promotional Scheme (IPS), the Committee find that adequate attention is not being paid to encourage private sector investment in the development of wastelands in the country. The initiatives taken by the Government in this regard are utterly inadequate. Since huge investments are required for</p>

1	2	3	4	5
				<p>developing wastelands in the country, Government funding alone will not suffice; as such, the involvement of private sector is essential. The private sector cannot be attracted merely by holding workshops and seminars. This require high level interaction between the Government and associations of private enterprises, in order to interact with interested private parties. The Committee in their earlier report had given detailed analysis as to how the private sector could be attracted towards this field and to achieve the said goals [12th report (para 3.24), 13th Lok Sabha]. The Committee reiterate their earlier recommendation and would like that the Government should seriously consider the matter and take necessary steps in this regard without any further delay."</p>
6.	23	2.29	1	<p>from bottom For "keep some margin for" read "take into account"</p>
7.	31	3.15	—	<p>Add at the end: "This para may be read in conjunction with para 2.6 of the Report."</p>
8.	48	3.39	—	<p>For the existing para read the following: "The Committee find that keeping in view the magnitude</p>

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

of problem, the allocations made for DDP and DPAP are utterly inadequate. They note that although the Government had set the target covering all DDP and DPAP blocks within 20 years, at the present rate of allocation it will take atleast 60 years to attain this objective. Moreover the Committee are deeply distressed that in a year in which large parts of the country are suffering serious drought conditions, sometimes for several years, allocations made to DDP and DPAP remain awfully meagre. At this rate, objectives set out in the 9th Plan cannot be achieved within a stipulated time frame. The Committee feel that the country cannot wait for such a long period to see DDP/DPAP blocks as the green areas. They, therefore, strongly recommend that adequate outlays must be made in the Plan and in annual budgets to ensure that the stipulated targets are achieved within a time frame that has been set out."

9. 61 3.61 — For the existing para read the following:

"While noting that the Land Acquisition Bill was sent for vetting to the Ministry of Law, Justice and Company Affairs several months ago, the Committee would like to be apprised whether the Bill has since been *vetted* by that Ministry."

1	2	3
		<p>As per findings of ASCI, there were many administrative and socio-economic hurdles experienced in the past in the consolidation of land holdings. There is a strong feeling that the concurrence of farmers is not taken by consolidation officers before confirming the scheme. Besides, the scheme is not popular at grass root level. The Committee urge that the Government should pay their attention seriously to the aforesaid deficiencies and as indicated by ASCI, the National Policy should address the institutional issues like credit, technology marketing, extension and managerial support to the farmers. The Committee would like to hear from the Government in this regard.</p>
17.	3.61	<p>While noting that the Land Acquisition Bill was sent for vetting to the Ministry of Law, Justice and Company Affairs several months ago, the Committee would like to be apprised whether the Bill has since been vetted by that Ministry.</p>
