

**GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
RURAL DEVELOPMENT
LOK SABHA**

STARRED QUESTION NO:248
ANSWERED ON:08.12.2006
EXTENSION OF WATERSHED PROGRAMMES UNDER DPAP
Reddy Shri Karunakara G.

Will the Minister of RURAL DEVELOPMENT be pleased to state:

:

- (e) Whether the Government has made any assessment of watershed programmes ;
- (f) If so, the details thereof ;
- (g) Whether some State Governments have sought extension for watershed programmes running under Droughts Prone Area Programme (DPAP) ;
- (h) If so, the details thereof; and
- (i) The decision taken by the Union Government in this regard?

Answer

MINISTER OF THE STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT (DR. RAGHUVANSH PRASAD SINGH)

(a) to (e) A statement is laid on the Table of the House.

STATEMENT REFERRED TO IN REPLY TO PARTS (a) to (e) OF LOK SABHA STARRED QUESTION NO. 248 DUE FOR ANSWER ON 8.12.2006

(a) & (b) : The Ministry of Rural Development commissioned Impact Assessment Studies by different expert agencies to know the impact of projects taken up under watershed programmes (IWDP, DPAP and DDP) in various States (Annexure-A). As per these studies, due to implementation of watershed projects the overall productivity of land and water table had increased and there had been a positive and significant impact on overall economic development in the project areas. The green vegetative cover had also improved in watershed areas that would have a positive impact in checking soil erosion by water and wind. The availability of fuel wood and fodder had also increased. The impact assessment studies reveal positive outcomes of these programmes.

Under a project of the Ministry, National Remote Sensing Agency (NRSA), Department of Space, Government of India, completed mapping of all the wastelands in the country in 1998 and estimated an extent of 63.85 million hectares of wasteland in the country. Subsequently, in 2005, NRSA prepared the Wasteland Atlas of India and estimated the total extent of wastelands to be 55.27 million hectares. Thus there was a reduction of 8.58 million hectares during this period

(Annexure - B).

(c) to (e) : DPAP projects are implemented on watershed basis with a project period of 5 (five) years. Accordingly, projects sanctioned from 2001-02 onwards are yet to complete their term.

However, for those projects which have been sanctioned in 2000-01, this Ministry has decided, in principle, to provide an extension of one additional year. In case of fifth batch projects sanctioned in 1999-2000, State Governments have been asked to review the performance of each project individually and give their specific recommendation for their continuance or otherwise. State-wise details of these projects are at Annexure-C.

Annexure -A

Annexure referred to in reply to part (a) and (b) of Lok Sabha Question No. 248 due for 8.12.2006

Impact Assessment Study of Watershed Development Programme Study objectives:

An impact assessment study was conducted by MoRD (Ministry of Rural Development) in 16 States covering the IWDP (Integrated Wastelands Development Programme), the DPAP (Drought Prone Areas Programme), and the DDP (Desert Development Programme) with the following objectives.

(1) To assess the economic development of the village community that is directly or indirectly dependent on the watersheds, through

(a) Optimum utilization of the watershed's natural resources like land, water, and vegetation that will mitigate the adverse effects of drought and prevent further ecological degradation, and

(b) Employment generation and development of the human and other economic resources of the village to promote savings and other income-generating activities.

(2) To assess the impact of the WDP on the restoration of ecological balance in the village, through

(a) sustained community action for the operation and maintenance of assets created and further development of the potential of the natural resources within the watershed, and

(b) simple, easy-to-use, and affordable technological solutions and institutional arrangements that make use of, and build upon, local technical knowledge and available materials.

(3) To assess the impact of the project in terms of improvement of economic and social conditions of the poor and the disadvantaged sections of the community such as the landless and women, through

(a) More equitable distribution of the benefits of community lands and water resource development and consequent biomass production, and

(b) Greater access to income generating opportunities and greater focus on their human resource development.

Summary of Impact Assessment Studies Impact on land, water, and biomass Land use :

Overall improvement in land use was reported from all States following the implementation of the WDP. Increase in the net sown area, gross cropped area, and area sown more than once was reported from Andhra Pradesh, Chhattisgarh, Haryana, Himachal Pradesh, Jharkhand, Karnataka, Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra, Orissa, Rajasthan, Tamil Nadu, and Uttar Pradesh.

Irrigation :

The number of irrigation options was enhanced in all the areas where watershed projects were undertaken. This was especially the case in Andhra Pradesh, Bihar, Chhattisgarh, Haryana, Himachal Pradesh, Jharkhand, Karnataka, Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra, Orissa, Rajasthan, Tamil Nadu, Uttaranchal, Uttar Pradesh, and West Bengal. Fuelwood and fodder availability :

Fuelwood and fodder availability increased, especially in the areas under the WDP, where considerable attention was paid to wasteland development and catchment area treatment. Several States including Bihar, Chhattisgarh, Haryana, Himachal Pradesh, Jharkhand, Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra, Orissa, Rajasthan, Tamil Nadu, and Uttar Pradesh reported positive changes in the availability of both fuelwood and fodder. Livestock :

While some States reported changes in the actual numbers of livestock owned, there was a marked preference for improved breeds after the project. Some States also reported the emergence of fishery potential following the development of tanks and other water bodies.

Socio-economic impact

Cropping pattern : Several States reported changes in their cropping pattern from one to two crops annually. This was directly attributed to the availability of irrigation water in the dry season. Some States reported the adoption of improved crop varieties.

Only a few States have recorded pre- and post-project yields for dominant crops in the annual cropping cycle. Where data has been available, an increase in yields has been reported.

Income and employment generation :

Several States reported an increase in agriculture related employment opportunities among beneficiaries and in other sectors for non-beneficiaries. These included trade, dairy, poultry, masonry, etc. Physical works carried out under the WDP provided varying numbers of man-days of work in nearly all States. Changes in household income levels varied from none at all in some States to over 50% compared to pre-project levels in other States.

Capacity building and people's participation Institutional arrangements :

All States reported having established institutional arrangements to undertake the WDP. Watershed Development Advisory Committees were set up at the district level in all the watershed districts. It was preferred that Government departments acted as PIAs and a range of line departments including forest, agriculture, animal husbandry, soil conservation, planning, revenue, rural development, and minor irrigation assisted in project implementation. In some States, NGOs were also used as PIAs.

People's participation :

User groups/self-help groups were set up only in some States. Similarly WCs and WAs also were established in most watershed areas but some areas were still left out. This was attributed in some States to the lack of familiarity of government agencies in dealing with social and institutional issues without adequate orientation and training. In other States, the non-availability of NGOs also hampered the efforts at engaging with the people in a meaningful way.

Capacity building :

All the States reported investing in capacity building at various levels including the levels of beneficiaries, WC and WA members, and PIAs. In some States, this led to positive outcomes. In others, it was felt that the quality of training received as well as the frequency of the training programmes needed improvement. Mostly State agriculture departments and universities and, in some cases, NGOs were also engaged in delivering capacity building programmes.