

22

**STANDING COMMITTEE
ON URBAN AND RURAL
DEVELOPMENT**

(1995-96)

TENTH LOK SABHA

**MINISTRY OF RURAL AREAS AND
EMPLOYMENT**

**DEMANDS FOR GRANTS FOR THE YEAR
1995-96 OF THE MINISTRY OF RURAL
AREAS AND EMPLOYMENT AND
DEPARTMENT OF WASTELANDS
DEVELOPMENT**

TWENTY-SECOND REPORT



सत्यमेव जयते

**LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI**

365712

TWENTY-SECOND REPORT
STANDING COMMITTEE ON URBAN
AND
RURAL DEVELOPMENT
(1995-96)

(TENTH LOK SABHA)

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS (1995-96)
MINISTRY OF RURAL AREAS &
EMPLOYMENT

[Action taken by the Government on the recommendations contained
in the Sixteenth Report of the Standing Committee on Urban & Rural
Development (Tenth Lok Sabha)]



Presented to Lok Sabha on.....
Laid in Rajya Sabha on.....

11 MAR 1996

LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI

January, 1996/Pausa, 1917 (Saka)

Price: Rs. 22.00

PARLIAMENT LIBRARY
Central Govt Publications
Acc. No. DC...93792, (2)
Date... 12/3/96

u
328.3657 R
NS. 22j1

©1996 BY LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT

Published under Rule 382 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha (Seventh Edition) and printed by the Manager, P.L. Unit, Government of India Press, Minto Road, New Delhi-110002.

CORRIGENDA TO THE 22ND REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE
ON URBAN & RURAL DEVELOPMENT (10TH L.S.) ON DEMANDS
FOR GRANTS (1995-96) OF MINISTRY OF RURAL AREAS &
EMPLOYMENT

PAGE	LINE	FOR	READ
(iii) 1st		<u>Delete</u> LIST OF MEMBERS OF	
2	2 from bottom	note	not
3	22 from top	objectives	objective
		DWCRS	DWCRA
	17 from bottom	as	an
5	12 from bottom	at	in
6	12 from top	achicevement	achievement
	15 from top	Physical	Physical
		Expenditure	Performance
	16 from bottom	not	no
8	6	would like	-
		to know	desired on
	3 from bottom	the action	
		taken	strict action
10	5 from top	further	further
	13 from top	<u>add to after</u> Ministry	
	16 from top	State	States
14	4 from bottom	<u>add a after</u> is	
15	2 from top	<u>add a after</u> is	
	12 from top	activities	activity
16	2 from top	to	that
		to	and
21	5 from top	<u>add is in after</u> Committee	
	2 from bottom	<u>add for after</u> noted	
22	8 from top	rather	and
29	6 from top	know	known
	16 from top	needs	need
30	20 from bottom	recommended	recommend
	16 from bottom	recommended	recommend
31	3 from bottom	recommended	recommend
38	2 from top	evaluator	evaluation
40	Last line	areas	area
41	8 from top	invisage	envisage
42	7 from top	could	can
47	Last line	<u>add have been before</u> kept	

CONTENTS

		PAGE
COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE		(iii)
INTRODUCTION		(v)
CHAPTER I	Report	1
CHAPTER II	Recommendations that have been accepted by the Government	10
CHAPTER III	Recommendations which the Committee do not desire to pursue in view of the Government's replies	31
CHAPTER IV	Recommendations in respect of which replies of the Government have not been accepted by the Committee	39
CHAPTER V	Recommendations in respect of which final replies of the Government are still awaited.	45
APPENDICES		
I.	Minutes of sitting of Committee on Urban & Rural Development held on 21.12.1995	47
II.	Analysis of Action Taken by Government on the recommendations contained in the 16th Report of Committee on Urban & Rural Development (Tenth Lok Sabha)	48

**LIST OF MEMBERS OF COMMITTEE ON URBAN & RURAL
DEVELOPMENT
(1995-96)**

Shri Prataprao B. Bhosale—Chairman

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

2. **Shri P.P. Kaliaperumal**
3. **Shri Sajjan Kumar**
4. **Shri Gangadhara Sanipalli**
5. **Shri Rajesh Khanna**
6. **Shri Prabhulal Rawat**
7. **Shri J. Chokka Rao**
8. **Dr. Y.S. Rajasekhar Reddy**
9. **Shri Vijayaramaraju Satrucharla**
10. **Shri Prithviraj D. Chavan**
11. **Shri K.M. Mathew**
12. **Shri P.R. Kumaramangalam**
13. **Shri Maruti Deoram Shelke**
14. **Shri Surendra Pal Pathak**
15. **Shri Rampal Singh**
16. **Shri Devi Bux Singh**
17. **Shri Karia Munda**
18. **Shri Girdhari Lal Bhargava**
19. **Shri Ram Singh Kashwan**
20. **Shri Sudhir Giri**
21. **Shri Subrata Mukherjee**
22. **Mohd. Ali Ashraf Fatmi**
23. **Shri Sukhdeo Paswan**
24. **Shri Dharmabhiksham**
25. **Shri N. Murugesan**
26. **Shri Gulam Mohammad Khan**
27. **Shri Sobhanadreeswara Rao Vadde**
28. **Shri Shailendra Mahto**
29. **Shri Kalpnath Rai**

Rajya Sabha

30. Shri Nilotpal Basu
31. Shri Ram Deo Bhandari
32. Shri Debabrata Biswas
33. Shri Shivprasad Chanpuria
34. Choudhary Harmohan Singh
35. Smt. Meera Das
36. Shri Satyanarayana Dronamraju
37. Dr. B.B. Dutta
38. Shri Sangh Priya Gautam
39. Shri B.K. Hariprasad
40. Shri Jagmohan
41. Prof. Vijay Kumar Malhotra
42. Dr. Jagannath Mishra*
43. Shri Thennala Balakrishna Pillai
44. Shri V. Hanumantha Rao

SECRETARIAT

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

*Ceased to be a Member of the Committee consequent upon his appointment as Minister in the Council of Ministers w.e.f. 11 June, 1995.

INTRODUCTION

I, the Chairman of the Standing Committee on Urban & Rural Development (1995-96) having been authorised by the Committee to submit the Report on their behalf, present this Twenty-second Report on the action taken by Government on the recommendations contained in the Sixteenth Report of the Standing Committee on Urban & Rural Development (Tenth Lok Sabha) on "Demands for Grants (1995-96)" of the Ministry of Rural Areas & Employment.

2. The Sixteenth Report was presented to Lok Sabha on 15th May, 1995. Replies of the Government to all the recommendations contained in the Report were received on 20th November, 1995. The Report was considered and adopted by the Committee at their sitting held on 21st December, 1995.

3. An analysis of the action taken by Government on the recommendations contained in the Sixteenth Report (1995-96) of the Committee is given in Appendix II.

NEW DELHI;
January 12, 1996

Pausa 22, 1917 (Saka)

PRATAPRAO B. BHOSALE,
Chairman,
Standing Committee on
Urban and Rural Development.

CHAPTER I

REPORT

1. This Report of the Standing Committee on Urban & Rural Development (1995-96) deals with the action taken by the Government on recommendations contained in their Sixteenth Report on Demands for Grants (1995-96) of Ministry of Rural Areas & Employment which was presented to Lok Sabha on 15th May, 1995.

2. Action Taken notes have been received from Government in respect of all the 54 recommendations which have been categorised as follows:—

(i) Recommendations/observations, that have been accepted by the Government:

Para Nos. 3.8, 3.9(1), 4.10 to 4.16, 5.5, 5.6, 6.6., 6.7, 6.9, 8.4, 8.6, 8.7, 9.4, 9.5, 9.7, 10.5 to 10.7, 11.6, 11.7, 12.5 to 12.7, 12.9, 13.5, 13.7, 2.13, 2.15, 2.16, 2.26 & 2.37

(ii) Recommendations/Observations which the Committee do not desire to pursue in view of Government's replies:

Para Nos. 3.7, 3.10, 7.6, 14.2, 2.12, 2.20 & 2.25

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

Para Nos. 2.3, 3.9(2), 6.8, 7.7, 8.3, 8.5, 13.6 & 2.14

(iv) Recommendations in respect of which final replies of Government are still awaited:

Para Nos. 9.6, 12.8, & 14.4

3. The Committee require that final replies in respect of the recommendations for which only interim replies have been given by the Government should be furnished to the Committee expeditiously.

4. The Committee will now deal with Action Taken by Government on some of the recommendations.

A. Insufficient Plan Outlay

Recommendation (Para No. 2.3)

5. The Committee had felt that the plan outlay for 1995-96 was not sufficient to meet the targets fixed for different Schemes by the Ministry. The Committee was deeply concerned over the cut made by Planning Commission over the proposed outlay of the Ministry and recommended that the outlay for 1995-96 should be increased from Rs. 7700/- crores to Rs. 10,500 crores as proposed by the Ministry.

6. The Government in their reply have stated that the observations of the Committee have been brought to the notice of Planning Commission for appropriate action.

7. The Ministry in Action Taken notes have stated that the observation of the Committee to increase the outlay for 1995-96 from Rs. 7700 crores to Rs. 10,500 crores has been brought to the notice of Planning Commission for appropriate action. The reply of the Ministry is interim in nature as the Government has initiated the action by intimating the Planning Commission about the appropriate action.

The Committee would like the Ministry to furnish the information relating to the action taken by the Planning Commission on the recommendation of the Committee within a fortnight.

B. Timely Provision of Infrastructure under JRY

Recommendation [Para No. 3.9(2)]

8. The Committee had noted that there were complaints in the States about the uniform application of the guidelines issued by the Centre. As such, the Committee urged that it should be ensured by the Ministry that necessary infrastructure required for different activities related to creation of assets in the rural areas such as construction of roads was provided timely. Necessary guidelines were to be issued in this regard.

9. The Government in their reply have stated that the Ministry of Rural Areas and Employment has laid down broad parameters with which the implementing agencies are to take up the works. The guidelines give only the illustrative list of works to be taken up which is not an exhaustive list. Within the guidelines enough flexibility has been given to the districts and village panchayats to take up the works as per the felt needs of the area and the local people. Development of infrastructure including construction of roads can however be undertaken subject to certain sectoral ceilings. This has been laid down to avoid skewed investment and lop sided development. Sectoral Departments are also expected to contribute towards development of infrastructure.

10. The Committee note that pursuant to their recommendation that necessary infrastructure required for different activities related to creation of assets in the rural areas such as construction of roads is provided timely, the Government have reproduced the guidelines by stating that enough flexibility has been given to the districts and village panchayats to take up the works as per the felt needs of the area and the local people. They are not satisfied with the reply furnished by the Government as they have not responded to the observation of the Committee regarding timely provision of infrastructure for different activities related to the creation of assets under JRY. The Committee have considered the guidelines and are perturbed to note that in spite of the guidelines of the Centre in this regard, there are complaints of note getting the infrastructure like rural roads etc. for the different activities related to the creation of assets.

The Committee therefore urge the Government to issue necessary instructions to the State Governments so that the guidelines are implemented. They would also like that the copy of the instructions should be furnished for the information of the Committee.

C. Targets & Achievements under DWCRA

Recommendation (Para No. 5.5)

11. The Committee were unhappy to note that the findings of audit para No. 6.1 of the C&AG Report for the year 1993, according to which in Arunachal Pradesh out of 35970 families assisted under DWCRA during 1985-90 only 14967 and 2947 families were brought above the poverty line of Rs. 3,500 and Rs. 6,400 respectively. The Committee were also concerned to note that the figures regarding the number of beneficiaries who have actually been brought above the poverty line was not available with the Ministry. The Committee were of the opinion that the right evaluation of the programme is not that the performance should be goal-oriented and the target fixed under the programme should be realistic. As such the Committee recommended that the achievement of the programme should be judged qualitatively rather than quantitatively. The Committee had also urged that Ministry should make available the data regarding the beneficiaries who have actually been brought above the poverty line.

12. In their reply the Government have stated that the primary objectives of DWCRS is focusing attention on the women members of rural families below the poverty line with a view to provide them with opportunities of self-employment on sustained basis through income generating activities. However, the ultimate goal is to bring them above the poverty line. However, though the goal of IRDP is to bring, assisted families above poverty line, such goal have not been kept for DWCRA. Since the investment is very small for such as ambitious target emphasis is given to empowerment, providing social amenities in health, education etc. and also to enable them to start income generating activity as a small sector.

13. The Committee note that on the recommendation of the Committee to assess the achievement of DWCRA qualitatively rather than quantitatively, the Government have stated that the primary objective of DWCRA is focussing attention on the women members of rural families below the poverty line with a view to provide them with opportunities of self-employment on sustained basis through income generating activities. However, the ultimate goal is to bring the assisted families above the poverty line. Again, it has been stated in the replies that though the goal of IRDP is to bring assisted families above poverty line such goal has not been kept for DWCRA. The Committee felt that the Ministry are furnishing contradictory statements. On the one hand it has been stated that the primary objective of DWCRA is to provide sustained employment to beneficiaries below poverty line thereby ultimately bringing them above poverty line. On the other hand

It has been stated that bringing the beneficiary above poverty line is not the set target of the Government. The Committee note that giving a sustained employment to a beneficiary itself connotes bringing him/her above the poverty line. Moreover, the ultimate goal as stated by the Ministry is to bring a beneficiary above poverty line. The Committee take serious view of the contradictory statement put forth by the Government and would like to reiterate their earlier recommendation. They would also like to be apprised of the action taken by the Government in this regard specifically with regard to the observation of Comptroller & Auditor General.

D. Training Under TRYSEM

Recommendation (Para No. 6.8)

14. Further the Committee were perturbed to note the findings of C&AG Para according to which in Andhra Pradesh a training institute was closed without giving training to any person. The Committee took serious note of the fact that the Ministry had no knowledge of C&AG findings. The Committee would like the Ministry to explain the reasons for the closure of such institute.

15. In their reply the Government have stated that the matter has been taken up with the Government of Andhra Pradesh as to why a training institution for which assistance was provided by the Government of India has been closed without giving training to any person.

16. In response to the observation of the Committee regarding the closure of the training institution without updating training to any person as pointed out in Comptroller & Auditor General Audit Para of 1993 the Government in the Action Taken replies have stated that the matter has been taken up with the Government of Andhra Pradesh. The Committee are not satisfied with the response of the Government to the audit discrepancies as pointed out by Comptroller & Auditor General. It is noted that action on the Audit Para has been taken only now after a lapse of 2 years. Moreover, more than seven months have elapsed since the Committee pointed out the closure of the Institute in Hyderabad. Even though no concrete steps have been taken by the Government. The Committee would like to have an explanation from the Ministry in this regard and urge that they should also be apprised about the reasons for the closure of the Institute.

E. Fixing of Targets under EAS

Recommendation (Para No. 7.7)

17. The Committee note that in the absence of targets fixed under EAS, there is no yardstick to judge the performance of the scheme in the given time which hampers the successful implementation of the programme. The Committee feel some targets should be fixed at the national level under EAS. The Committee also recommend that work under EAS

should be given according to local requirements. The Committee would also like that work under this programme should be decided considering the lean period of that area.

18. The Government have stated in their reply that EAS has been envisaged as a demand driven scheme in which any group of 10 or more persons seeking work during the lean season is to be provided with employment. While the Ministry appreciate the concern of the Committee with regard to absence of targets, it is quite possible to envisage that fixing of targets may lead to target chasing and over reporting as has been seen in some other programme and may also be detrimental to the quality of works done and employment given. Further the rationale of the EAS as may be seen, forbids target setting. The scheme as mentioned aims at providing labour to the unemployed, on demand. The demand of labour can not be accurately estimated.

Those unemployed especially during the lean season through for labour and their number or period of labour to be provided can not be informally set for the country or even the State.

19. With regard to the recommendation of the Committee to fix some sort of targets under EAS, the Government in the action taken replies have not furnished any substantial suggestions in this regard. The Committee are not satisfied with the reply furnished by the Government and would like to reiterate their earlier recommendation in view of the fact that fixing some sort of target is essential to judge the performance of a Scheme. Further in respect of the recommendation of the Committee to decide the work under the EAS according to local requirement, the Government have not furnished replies. The Committee would like to know the response of the Government in this regard.

F. Spending of Plan Funds Under CRSP

Recommendation (Para Nos. 8.3 & 8.5)

20. The Committee had noted that not only there was inadequate provision of funds, even the meagre funds provided under 8th Plan have not been spend judiciously. The Committee at their Sixth Report on Demands for Grants had recommended the allocation of Rs. 300 crores during 1995-96. The Committee had reiterated their earlier recommendation strongly.

21. In their reply the Government have stated that the utilisation of funds upto 1994-95 has been indicated in the Table under Action Taken Note for S.No. 8.2. As regards allocation of Rs. 300 crores for 1995-96 the Deptt. has proposed an outlay of Rs. 120 crores with an indication that it need to be stepped upto Rs. 300 crores as recommended by the Standing Committee. However, the Planning Commission had finally approved an outlay of Rs. 60 crore for 1995-96 in view of the trend of expenditure in the past.

22. The Committee were distressed to note the uneven and inadequate allocation of funds during the first four years of 8th Plan. The Committee were at a loss as to how the remaining funds would be spend during the remaining one year of the plan. The Committee are constrained to note the shortfall in the percentage achievement of the programme. The Committee were at a loss as how the targets would be achieved during the remaining three months of 1994-95. The Committee were also unhappy to note the mismatch between utilisation of funds and achievements of targets.

23. In their reply the Government have stated that the percentage of utilisation of funds (actual expenditure *vis-a-vis* releases) and percentage physical ahicevement as under:—

CRSP—Financial and Physical Performance during the VIII Plan Period
(Rs. in Crores)

Year	Financial Expenditure			Physical Expenditure				
	Allocation	Release	% of Allocation	Allocation	releases	Target	Achievement	% of achievement
1992-93	20.00	21.64	14.534	108.2	67.16	90285	51272	56.79
1993-94	30.00	32.67	28.611	108.2	87.58	211943	134190	63.31
1994-95	60.00	59.65	46.814	99.4	78.48	627276**	578892**	92.29
1995-96	60.00	22.54*	9.098*	37.6	40.36	797559**	124130**	16.39
Upto 30.6.1995								

*Combined target and achievement under CRSP and MNP.

It may kindly be seen that the mismatch is reduced. The shortfall in physical achievement *vis-a-vis* expenditure is also due to variation in unit cost and subsidy in some of the States, permission to carry over 15% of allocation to the following year and the fact that expenditure on administrative cost, training of masons, IEC etc. is also incurred which has not direct linkage with the number of latrines constructed.

However, the observation/recommendations of the Committee has been noted for further compliances. The States have been suggested to take suitable measures to accelerate the progress of implementation of the programme. The position, in the current year 1995-96, is expected to be more satisfactory. The Ministry have further stated that the States have been suggested to complete the coverage of rural population through various Government programmes and private initiative within a period of 10 years.

24. With regard to the recommendation of the Committee to step up the allocation of funds from Rs. 60 crores to Rs. 300 crores during 1995-96, the Government have stated that at the stage of preparation of BE 1995-96, they had proposed the allocation for Rs. 120 crores which was finally reduced to Rs. 60 crores by the Planning Commission. Further pursuant to the Committee's recommendation with regard to time bound programme of

not more than 5 to 10 years to cover every habitation under Rural Sanitation Programme, the Government have stated in the reply that the States have been communicated to take necessary action. The Committee are not at all satisfied with the way the Government have dealt with their recommendation. The Committee note that no concrete efforts have been made to enhance the funds under the Rural Sanitation Programme. The Ministry have not bothered even to put up before the Planning Commission the revised proposals in view of the recommendation of the Committee at Para 8.3. Further, with regard to preparation of time bound programme of not more than 5 to 10 years for covering every habitation under Rural Sanitation Programme, the Central Government has shifted the responsibility to State Governments. The Committee are equally disturbed to note that the outlay of Rs. 60 crores was sanctioned by Planning Commission in view of the trend of expenditure in the past. They feel that the Government have not taken seriously the need to provide hygienic condition to the rural masses which is the fundamental requirement of living. The Committee would like to reiterate their earlier recommendation at Para No. 8.3 & 8.5 and would urge the Ministry to take action without any further delay and to be intimated accordingly.

G. Financial Target. & Achievements under RWSP

Recommendation (Para No. 9.6)

25. The Committee had noted that the allocation of Rs. 1110 crores during 1995-96 is not sufficient under Rural Water Supply Programme and are doubtful whether the provisional target for the year 1995-96 to cover 73000 habitations would be achieved. The Committee recommended that the allocation should be enhanced suitably so as to achieve the laid-down objectives.

26. In their reply the Government have stated that the revised target for the year 1995-96 have been fixed to cover 86746 habitations, is likely to be achieved with the financial allocation of Rs. 1110 crores and matching funds for State sector (MNP). The allocation of the funds are decided by the Ministry of Finance in consultation with Planning Commission subject to availability of resources.

27. In pursuant to the apprehension of the Committee to cover provisional target of 73000 habitation during 1995-96 with the allocation of Rs. 1110 crores, the Government in the Action Taken Replies have stated that even the revised target of 86746 habitations would be achieved with the revised allocation of Rs. 1110 crores and the matching funds from State sector. The Committee would like to be informed about the financial and physical achievement with regard to set targets during 1995-96.

H. Artificial Water Recharge Programme

Recommendation (Para No. 12.8)

28. Further the Committee had observed that under watershed approach, one good technique is Artificial Water Recharge Programme which can be used in areas where density of rain is very high. The Committee would like to know whether any initiative has been taken to undertake this technique in heavy rain areas also.

29. In their reply the Government have stated that the recommendation is being considered in the Ministry.

30. In so far as the Committee's recommendation is concerned it has been noticed that reply of the Government is of interim nature. The Committee would like to have detailed information as regards the steps taken by the Government in this context within three weeks.

I. Release of Funds as per Budgetary Provisions of 1994-95

Recommendation (Para No. 13.6)

31. The Committee are further unhappy to note that during 1994-95, only Rs. 1.95 crores were released upto December out of the Budget provision under the scheme of Rs. 27.47 crores.

32. In their reply the Government have stated that since the State proposals were received very late and since most of the Governments of the States/UTs could only show utilisation of earlier funds as per stipulation of this Ministry as mentioned above, the release of funds to concerned States/UTs had to be delayed. Under constant contact and monitoring, utilisation certificates were procured from the States at the later part of the financial year and arrangements were made to release of funds even with minor relaxations of financial stipulation. However, as per revised budget provisions of Rs. 16.97 crores, the LR Division could actually release Rs. 17.07 crores by 31st March, 1995.

33. On the observation of the Committee regarding the uneven allocation of funds during 1994-95, the Government have put forth the reasons as late receipt of the Utilisation Certificate from the States. The Committee take serious note of the fact that more than 90 per cent of the funds are being released at the lag end of the year. They need hardly to emphasis that expenditure should be planned in a phased manner during the financial year in order to ensure that the schemes are properly implemented and the objectives realised. The Committee would also like the action taken against the defaulter States who are not providing Utilisation Certificates in accordance with the guidelines issued by the Central Government.

J. Shifting NIAM to Ministry of Agriculture

Recommendation (Para No. 14.4)

34. The Committee had noted that there is no rationale behind keeping NIAM under Ministry of Rural Areas and Employment. The Secretary, Ministry also acknowledged before the Committee that NIAM should be with the Ministry of Agriculture and not with the Ministry of Rural Areas and Employment. In view of it the Committee strongly recommend that National Institute of Agriculture Marketing should be kept under the Ministry of Agriculture.

35. In their reply the Government have stated that the suggestion is under consideration.

36. The Committee are distressed to note that the Government so far, have not taken any concrete steps to shift NIAM under the administrative control of Ministry of Agriculture despite admitting during the evidence to this effect. The Committee would like to have up to date information as regards the steps taken by the Government for such shifting within three weeks of presentation of this report.

K. Full Utilisation of IWDS Funds

Recommendation (Para No. 2.14)

37. The Department had demanded only Rs. 4950 lakhs for 1995-96. This provision seemed to be low compared to the huge task before them. The Committee, therefore, recommended that the Department of Wastelands Development should take up the matter regarding reasonable enhancement of the allocation of amount under this head.

38. In their reply the Government have stated that the Department of Wastelands Development has requested the Planning Commission for enhanced allocations to the Department. The concerns expressed by the Committee were also brought to the notice of the Planning Commission both in the Draft Plan for 1995-96 and also during discussions with the Member Secretary of the Planning Commission. However, because of financial constraints the Planning Commission have not acceded to the request of this Department.

39. With regard to the recommendation of the Committee to enhance the allocation of funds under Integrated Wastelands Development Programme, the Government have responded that the proposal for enhancement of funds have not been acceded to by the Planning Commission due to financial constraints. The Committee are not satisfied with the response of the Government and would like to reiterate their recommendation in view of the big challenge before the country to develop the huge landmass of wastelands in the country. They would also like to be informed on the concrete steps initiated by the Government in this regard.

CHAPTER II RECOMMENDATIONS THAT HAVE BEEN ACCEPTED BY GOVERNMENT

Recommendation (Para No. 3.8)

The Committee further note that in few States progressive unspent balances were more than the funds released under JRY during 1994-95 as may be seen at Annexure-IIA & IIB which shows that the condition that the second instalment of JRY is released only when 50% of the funds have been utilised, is not being followed by the Centre. The Committee also note that although physical and financial achievement has been stated as more than 100% the accumulated unspent balances to the tune of Rs. 48190.20 lakhs as on 1.4.94 gives a different picture about the success of the programme. The Committee would like the Ministry explain the reasons for the contradiction of mismatch between cent per cent financial and physical achievement in the Centre and the underspending in different State. The Committee would also like to be apprised about the reasons for the release of funds to States where accumulated unspent balances are more than 100% of the funds released during a particular year.

Reply of the Government

As per the guidelines the first instalment of funds under JRY is released without any pre-conditions. The second instalment of JRY funds is released only when 50% of the available funds *i.e.* (opening balance of the year plus the first instalment released during the year) are utilised. The States/Districts which had not attained the required level of expenditure primarily in view of the heavy carry over funds, are not released the second instalment. In this case the releases are sometimes less than the opening balance in view of the financial discipline. We are however pursuing the State Governments to utilise the funds allocated to them within a year.

As per the JRY guidelines the States/Districts are permitted to have carry over to the extent of 15% of the funds received during a particular year. 15% carryover is allowed to maintain continuity of the works taken up and entire availability of employment opportunities in the beginning of the year.

[No. H. 11020/194-GC (P) Vol. (II)]

Recommendation [Para No. 3.9 (1)]

The Committee recommend that monitoring of the different programmes under JRY should further be strengthened.

Reply of the Government

JRY is reviewed regularly by the Central and State Governments. The review of the programme is done through monthly, quarterly and annual progress reports received from the State Governments. In addition, the Government of India periodically convenes meetings with the State Secretaries and the Project Directors of DRDAs/ZPs to review the programme.

The Ministry of Rural Areas and Employment have also introduced a system of Area Officers with a view to effectively monitor various programmes of rural development including Jawahar Rozgar Yojana (JRY). Under this scheme, senior officers at the level of Deputy Secretary and above have been allocated one or two States to them and give the feedback on the implementation of rural development programmes including JRY. To give greater attention to the States with higher proportion of rural poor and unemployed, the Area Officers Scheme has further been strengthened w.e.f. January, 1994 by including officers from the Department of Programme Implementation, Department of Wastelands Development and the Planning Commission also in the teams of Area Officers.

[No. H. 11020/1/94-GC(P) Vol. (II)]

Recommendation (Para No. 4.10)

The Committee note that the performance of IRDP during the last two years of the VIIIth Plan is satisfactory in Financial and physical terms. However, the Committee are distressed to note that the actual number of beneficiaries assisted in absolute term *i.e.* to cross the poverty line, is very low. On all India basis only 27.81% of the beneficiaries could cross the poverty line of Rs. 6,400/-. The Committee feel that incidence of the rural poverty is a big challenge before the Country even after more than 40 years of planned development. In view of the seriousness of rural poverty the Committee recommend that the criterion for the success of the programme should be the number of beneficiaries assisted in absolute terms rather than statistics of number of beneficiaries assisted so far. As such the Committee recommend that such programmes started for the alleviation of poverty should benefit the rural poor qualitatively rather than quantitatively.

Reply of the Government

The Ministry agrees with the Committee's recommendation that IRDP should benefit rural poor qualitatively rather than quantitatively. It is recognised that fixation of physical targets results in neglect of qualitative aspects of the programme and sometimes distracts from the basic objective

of IRDP which is to raise the income level of family in such a manner as to enable it to cross the poverty line. In view of this during the current financial year 1995-96, no physical targets have been prescribed under IRDP. The average level of investment per family is sought to be raised by further extension of the family credit plan to cover all the districts of the country by the end of the 8th Five Year Plan. The security free limits for loans have also been recently enhanced to facilitate higher levels of investments. The target level of investment per family which was Rs. 12,000 during 1994-95 has been now raised to Rs. 14,000 to Rs. 15,000 to bring about further qualitative improvements in IRDP.

[No. H. 11020/1/94-GC(P) Vol. (II)]

Recommendation (Para No. 4.11)

The Committee note with concern that banks play a very important role in the implementation of programme under IRDP. However, the attitude of banks is not very cooperative. The Committee recommend that Ministry should evaluate the performance of banks relating to the grant of loan under the Scheme.

Reply of the Government

The Committee rightly notes that banks play a very important role in implementation of IRDP and the latter need to be more cooperative for granting of loans. A greater synchronisation is to be brought about between the Annual Plan of DRDAs and the District Credit Plan to reflect more clearly the needs of IRDP. Credit targets have been formulated for the current year against which the performance of banks in terms of credit mobilisation will be assessed every month. This is expected to bring about further improvements in smooth flow of credit for IRDP projects.

[No. H. 11020/1/94-GC(P) Vol. (II)]

Recommendation (Para No. 4.12)

The Committee further note with concern the shortfall in the fulfilment of the target of 40% women beneficiaries under IRDP. The Committee urge that adequate attention should be given to benefit the rural women who constitute a bulk of our population.

Reply of the Government

The Committee has noted that there is a shortfall in coverage of women under IRDP. In an effort to raise the coverage the target was revised from 10% at the beginning of the programme to 30 per cent and then to 40% in 1990-91. However, on account of various socio-economic constraints it is sometime difficult to assist women for self-employment activities. The Ministry has been making concerted efforts to raise coverage of women over the years and as a result of this the coverage has risen from 9.9% in 1985-86 to about that 34% in 1994-95.

[No. H. 11020/1/94-GC(P) Vol. (II)]

Recommendation (Para Nos. 4.13 & 4.14)

4.13 The Committee appreciate that efforts are being made at the Central level to integrate allied programmes and activities. The Committee feel that earnest action is required in this regard to avoid overlapping and for the effective implementation of IRDP.

4.14 The Committee also hope that the basic condition that the DRDAs are required to prepare a comprehensive annual plan, to be fulfilled at the time of release of second instalment, is being adhered to by the Centre.

Reply of the Government

Integration of allied programmes and activities are essential pre-requisite of IRDP. The governing body of DRDAs having representatives of various State departments is to secure inter-sectoral and inter-departmental coordination and cooperation. Planning of IRDP projects is to be strengthened through recruitment of technical staff to ensure more effective implementation of IRDP. The Annual Plan prepared by the DRDAs is to be entrusted with District Credit Plans. The release of second instalment by the Centre has been made conditional upon preparation of the Annual Plan.

[No. H.11020/194-GC (P) Vol. (II)]

Recommendation (Para No. 4.15)

The Committee also recommend that a task force should be constituted to monitor IRDP. The primary objective of the Task Force should be to have a surprise visit at different places where programmes related to IRDP are being implemented.

Reply of the Government

Monitoring of IRDP has been further strengthened during the current financial year with revision in monitoring formats and collection of data at district level. Field visits by Area Officers of the Ministry is to further ensure that the IRDP Programme is being implemented properly.

[No. H.11020/194-GC (P) Vol. (II)]

Recommendation (Para No. 4.16)

The Committee further recommend that the funds under IRDP should be released by Centre to States and further by States to DRDAs considering market, social, geoclimatic conditions of different activities under IRDP so as to ensure full utilisation of funds.

Reply of the Government

Allocation and release of funds under IRDP is being done on the basis of extent of poverty in State. However, at the time of sanction of projects, care is taken to improve infrastructural requirements cater to market needs, and provide various forward backward linkages essential for better utilisation of funds and success of these projects.

[No. H.11020/194-GC (P) Vol. (II)]

Recommendation (Para No. 5.5)

The Committee are satisfied about the full utilisation of funds and more than 100% achievement in respect of targets. The Committee are also glad to note the popularity of the programme. However, the Committee are unhappy to note the findings of audit para No. 6.1 of the C&AG Report for the year 1993, according to which in Arunachal Pradesh out of 35970 families assisted under DWCRA during 1985—90 only 14967 and 2947 families were brought above the poverty line of Rs. 3,500 and Rs. 6,400 respectively. The Committee are also concerned to note that the figures regarding the number of beneficiaries who have actually been brought above the poverty line is not available with the Ministry. The Committee are of the opinion that the right evaluation of the programme is not to achieve the targets in numbers. The Committee recommend that the performance should be goal-oriented and the target fixed under the programme should be realistic. As such the Committee recommend that the achievement of the programme should be judged qualitatively rather than quantitatively. The Committee also urge that Ministry should make available the data regarding the beneficiaries who have actually been brought above the poverty line.

Reply of the Government

It may be stated that the primary objectives of DWCRA is focusing attention on the women members of rural families below the poverty line with a view to provide them with opportunities of self-employment on sustained basis through income generating activities. However the ultimate goal is to bring them above the poverty line. However, though the goal of IRDP is to bring assisted families above poverty line, such goal have not been kept for DWCRA. Since the investment is very small for such an ambitious target emphasis is given to empowerment, providing social amenities in health, education etc. and also to enable them to start income generating activity as a small sector.

[No. H.11020/1/94-GC (P) Vol. (II)]

Comments of the Committee

[Please see para 13, Chapter I of the Report]

Recommendation (Para No. 5.6)

The Committee are however dismayed to note the findings of the said audit para that out of 391 groups formed till 1992-93 for taking up economic activity, 144 groups were defunct. The Ministry in the written replies have admitted that it is fact that some of the groups are defunct. The Committee take serious note of it and would like the Ministry to examine the matter seriously and take remedial measures to avoid such happenings in future.

Reply of the Government

It may be stated that it is fact that some of the groups are defunct for various reasons including that of inadequate financial assistance. The matter has been taken up with the concerned State Government and the Ministry has already taken up the following remedial measures:—

- (i) The revolving funds for each group has been raised from Rs. 15,000/- to Rs. 25,000/-.
- (ii) If the certain members have left the group, the group is free to induct fresh members into the group.
- (iii) In case futher training is required, they are permitted to be retrained under TRYSEM.
- (iv) In case the economic activities was not viable the group was permitted to change the activity.

[No. H.11020/1/94-GC (P)Vol.(II)]

Recommendation (Para No. 6.6)

The Committee are unhappy to note the underspendings of outlays duing 1992-93, 1993-94 & 1994-95. The Committee further note that although percentage of achievement in repect of number of trainees has been shown during 1992-93 and 1993-94 as 92% and 86.57% respectively, but the percentage of total employment to trained youth was very low which is less than 50% in 17 States/UTs. The Committee would like to recommend that it should be ensured that the funds earmarked for specific programme should be utilised fully. Further the success of the employment generated schemes should be seen qualitatively, i.e. number of beneficiaries employed so far. The Committee take serious note of the shortfall in the achievement in different States.

Reply of the Government

The progress of TRYSEM activities in the States has not been satisfactory. One of the reasons for the poor utilisation by the States is the delay in transmitting the funds released by the Central Government to the implementing authorities. It has, therefore, been decided that from 1995-96 funds will be released directly to the DRDAs. The need for linking employment to TRYSEM training has been stressed time and again with the State Governments.

[No. H.11020/1/94-GC (P) Vol. (II)]

Recommendation (Para No. 6.7)

The Committee recommend that training under TRYSEM should be given to the beneficiaries to ensure self-employment and enhance income generation. The Committee as such feel that training should be imparted considering the local material, market and local skills. Further the training should be given for economically viable techniques. The Committee also

note that a lot of new technology is coming up in rural scenario and as such the Committee would like to training programme should reflect to address to these new opportunities.

Reply of the Government

It has been emphasised upon the States/UTs from time to time that training to the youth should be imparted considering the local material, market and local skills. Further it is also stressed in the workshops of the Project Directors of DRDAs being held annually that the training programme should reflect to address to the new technology coming up in rural scenario. The State Secretaries have been requested to identify skills relevant to the scenario in each district and liaise with the Technical Education Department for introducing such courses in the ITIs.

[No. H.11020/194-GC (P) Vol. (II)]

Recommendation (Para No. 6.9)

The Committee note that as per written replies furnished before the Committee, All India percentage of handicapped beneficiaries is 0.34% and 0.38% during 1992-93 and 1993-94 respectively which is very low of the targets i.e. 3% under the Scheme. The Committee would like to recommend that adequate attention should be paid to the handicapped strata of society which needs sympathetic consideration.

Reply of the Government

The States/UTs are being requested that while selecting the youth for training under the scheme, adequate attention should be paid to the handicapped strata of society which need sympathetic consideration.

[No. H.11020/194-GC (P) Vol. (II)]

Recommendation (Para No. 8.4)

The Committee are distressed to note the uneven and inadequate allocation of funds during the first four years of 8th Plan which is less than 50%. The Committee are at a loss as how the remaining more than 50% of funds would be spent during the remaining one year of the plan. The Committee are constrained to note the shortfall in the % achievement of the programme i.e. 10.81% in 1992-93 and 69.45% in 1993-94. Of equal concern is the achievement during 1994-95 i.e. less than 50% upto December, 1994. The Committee are at a loss as how the remaining targets would be achieved during the remaining three months. The Committee are also unhappy to note mismatch between the utilization of funds and achievement of targets. During 1992-93 utilization of funds is 109.55%, whereas the percentage achievement in respect of sanitary latrines is 10.81%. During 1994-95, out of 60 crores outlay, 56 crores have been released upto 15th March, 1995. However the achievement in respect of sanitary latrines is less than 50%.

Reply of the Government

The percentage of utilisation of funds (actual expenditure *vis-a-vis* releases) and percentage physical achievement as shown in table below para 8.2 is as under:—

Year	% of expenditure	% physical achievement
1992-93	67.16	56.79
1993-94	87.58	63.31
1994-95	78.48	92.29

It may kindly be seen that the mismatch is reduced. The shortfall in physical achievement *vis-a-vis* expenditure is also due to variation in unit cost and subsidy in some of the States, permission to carry over 15% of allocation to the following year and the fact that expenditure on administrative cost, training of masons, IEC etc. is also incurred which has no direct linkage with the number of latrines constructed.

However the observation/recommendation of the Committee has been noted for future compliance. The States have been suggested to take suitable measures to accelerate the progress of implementation of the programme. The position, in the current year 1995-96, is expected to be more satisfactory.

[No. H.11020/1/94-GC (P) Vol. (II)]

Recommendation (Para No. 8.6)

The Committee recommend that the sanitary unit should be a village instead of block.

Reply of the Government

The revised CRSP Guidelines provide for taking a village as a sanitary unit.

[No. H. 11020/1/94-GC (P) Vol. (II)]

Recommendation (Para No. 8.7)

The Committee note that lack of awareness regarding sanitation is the main cause of poor sanitation in rural areas. The Committee would like that an awareness campaign should be launched on warfooting and adequate funds should be given for such programmes.

Reply of the Government

The recommendation is accepted.

10% of annual funds released to the States and CAPART are intended to be utilised for creation of awareness, health education, publicity etc.

A new information Education and Communication (IEC) strategy is being launched In coordination with the States by involving local people

and Electronic media. School sanitation has been given top priority because it will inculcate among the children the felt need of sanitation which is sure to trickle down to the entire social fabric. An outlay of Rs. 14 crores has been provided in 1995-96 in the Central Budget for IEC activities and IEC cells in the States, over and above Rs. 6 crores available to the States/CAPART as 10% of CRSP outlay of Rs. 60 crores.

[No. H. 11020/1/94—GC (P) Vol. (II)]

Recommendation (Para No. 9.4)

The Committee are satisfied about the full utilization of funds during the year 1992-93 and 1993-94 and hope that the funds during 1994-95 would be utilised fully by the close of the financial year. However the Committee regret to note the achievement during 1992-93, 1993-94 and 1994-95 as regards spilled over problem villages which is not upto the mark. The Committee would like the Ministry to explain the reasons for it.

Reply of the Government

Out of total 161722 problem villages identified as on 1.4.85, only 146 villages remain to be covered with the safe drinking water as on 1.4.95. State-wise details are as under:

State	No.
Assam	03
Meghalaya	54
Jammu & Kashmir	45
Gujarat	09
Maharashtra	22
Rajasthan	13

Reason for non coverage.

Assam : Difficult terrain, inaccessibility, law and order problem.

Meghalaya : Non availability of power supply, boundary dispute, difficult terrain and inaccessibility.

J & K : Difficult terrain and inaccessibility, limited working season, transportation problem for carrying material, law and order problem.

Gujarat : Remote and difficult terrain, the source finding is very difficult, transportation problem for carrying equipment.

Rajasthan : Difficult and inaccessible area, villages are to be covered through supply from Indira Gandhi Nahar Project.

Maharashtra : Comprehensive pipe water supply scheme is prepared to cover under World Bank Project.

All these remaining problem villages will be covered in VIII Five Year Plan.

Recommendation (Para No. 9.5)

The Committee take serious note of the fact that States are getting funds during the fag end of the year. The Committee would like to recommend that funds should be released in time so as to ensure full utilization of funds and realization of targets.

Reply of the Government

The Central assistance for Accelerated Rural Water Supply Programme (ARWSP) is normally released in two instalments subject to special instructions from the Ministry of Finance. The 1st instalment is released in the month of April without any condition except that last instalment in the previous financial year was drawn by the States/UTs. The second instalment to cover the balance of the annual allocation is released on fulfilment of the following condition.

- (a) Utilization of 50% of the available resources under ARWSP and State Sector Minimum Needs Programme (MNP). Receipt of certificate of the actual expenditure under ARWSP & MNP from the Accountant General upto the year preceding the previous financial years, etc.
- (b) Government of India monitor the financial and physical progress regularly and pursue with the State Government to utilise the funds and send the proposal as earliest by the end of September of the current financial year for the release of the second instalment.

[No. H. 11020/1/94-GC (P) Vol. (II)]

Recommendation (Para No. 9.7)

The Committee also recommend that under this programme the benefit of new technologies should be taken. The Committee would also like that under this programme, new designs should be made use of to address to the specific requirement of an area.

Reply of the Government

Department of Rural Development has taken initiative to:

1. Provide R & D support to its various programmes by increasing the R & D budget from Rs. 100 lakhs in 1994-95 to Rs. 400 lakhs in 1995-96.
2. Development of new technologies in fluoride and arsenic affected areas as well as chronic water deficit areas have been given priority.
3. Priority areas of R & D also have been identified. R & D policy guidelines as well as R & D administration in the Mission has been streamlined.

[No. H. 11020/1/94-GC (P) Vol. (II)]

Recommendation (Para No. 10.5)

The Committee appreciate the allocation of funds to the tune of Rs. 350 crore during the Eighth Five Year Plan for rural housing. However the Committee are constrained to note that during the first four years of the plan only 39% of the funds have been sanctioned. Not only there is an inadequate sanction of funds for rural housing, but the meagre amount sanctioned has not even been spent fully. The Committee take serious note of it and would like the Ministry to explain the reasons for the inadequate attention paid to Rural Housing.

Reply of the Government

The subject of Rural Housing was transferred from Ministry of Urban Development to Ministry of Rural Development in 1990 and while formulating the Eighth Five Year Plan, an amount of Rs. 350 crore has been provided for Rural Housing. However, Rural Housing Scheme prepared by this Ministry was finally approved and launched in the end of the year 1993-94 only. The Rural Housing Scheme was framed to strengthen and enhance the efforts of State Governments/Union Territories in Rural Housing by providing Central grants-in-aid not exceeding 50% of the allocation made by the State Governments over and above the expenditure made by them during 1992-93 for Rural Housing. Being the first year of operation of the scheme *i.e.* 1993-94, the advantages of the scheme were not familiar to most of the States. Therefore, a meagre allocation of Rs. 10.00 crore was provided against which Rs. 11.00 crore were released to the States. During the year 1994-95, the allocation for Rural Housing was Rs. 30 crores, which was fully released to States by 31st March 1995. By third year of the operation, most of the State Governments/UTs have fully become aware of the benefits of centrally sponsored rural housing scheme and State Governments and have started allocating more and more funds for rural housing in their respective State budgets thereby their claiming central grants proportionate to their higher budgetary allocations. Many States have formulated and launched the rural housing programmes for upgradation and construction of new houses with a view to take maximum benefit of the central grants under rural housing scheme.

[No. H. 11020/1/94-GC(P) Vol. (II)]

Recommendation (Para No. 10.6)

The Committee are of the view that rural housing has not been given due consideration although 2/3 of the population still live in Rural Areas Rural Housing qualified as a Plan Programme only during the 5th Plan under the Minimum Needs Programme (MNP). The Committee recommend that the problem of rural housing should also be considered properly under the different Plans instead of having been considered as an urban problem only.

Reply of the Government

The Ministry fully agrees with the recommendation of the Committee that the problem of rural housing should be considered properly keeping in view the magnitude of the rural housing shortage in the country. It is submitted that the Ministry is giving utmost attention to mitigate the rural housing shortage as well as to improve the rural housing conditions in the country. In order to meet the demand for shelter by the rural poor, in addition to the allocation of Rs. 45 crores provided under rural housing scheme in 1995-96, an amount of Rs. 1000 crores have also been allocated in 1995-96. Budget under IAY to provide 10 lakh houses free of cost to SCs/STs, freed bonded labourers and non-SC/ST people below poverty line living in rural areas. The above allocations indicate that rural housing programme is being given due attention with an objective to provide more and more houses to the poor people in rural areas.

[No. H. 11020/1/94-GC(P) Vol. (II)]

Recommendation (Para No. 10.7)

The Committee recommend that it should be ensured by the Ministry that the funds allocated for rural housing are spent fully. Further the Committee are of the view that BE 1995-96 for Rs. 45 crores is not sufficient for the upgradation of rural housing and as such it should atleast be doubled. Further the Committee recommend that in line with the objective of National Housing Policy, the development of house sites and the upgradation of rural housing should be linked to activities under the IRDP, JRY and other programmes for the creation of assets and employment.

Reply of the Government

The recommendation of the Committee that it should be ensured by the Ministry that the funds allocated for rural housing are spent fully is noted and it will be ensured that the budget provision made for rural housing is spent fully. The Ministry fully appreciate the concern of the Committee that a provision of Rs. 45 crores during 1995-96 is not sufficient for upgradation of rural housing. As such it should at least be doubled. However, the funds allocated during 1995-96 will be utilised fully. The recommendation of the Standing Committee line with the objectives of National Housing Policy the development of house sites and upgradation of rural housing should be linked to activities under the IRDP, JRY and other programmes for creation of assets and employment is noted further necessary action.

[No. H. 11020/1/94-GC(P)-Vol. (II)]

Recommendation (Para No. 11.6)

The Committee observe that although the programme has created impact in the rural areas where it has been tried. However, as has been stated in the Annual Report 1994-95, the overall impact in the identified areas in the country was not encouraging. One of the reasons for it was that water shed approach was adopted at a few places. The Committee as such recommend that emphasis should be given to watershed approach and the activities under the programme should be integrated rather undertaken at isolated places.

Reply of the Government

According to the guidelines for watershed development issued in October, 1994 and effective from 1.4.1995, area development in drought prone and desert areas will be taken up on watershed basis only. The development will be village based and a watershed of about 500 hectares will be developed in each village.

However, in hot sandy arid areas where development on watershed basis is not feasible due to topographical conditions, the same will be done on index catchment/cluster of villages basis. In such cases also the approach will be to develop and sustain natural resource base of the area covered under the project as is in case of watershed projects. All activities in a watershed project or the index catchment/cluster of villages projects will be undertaken in an integrated manner so as to produce total impact on the area. When the development is taken on project basis the activities at isolated places will not be undertaken.

[F.No. H.110201/1/94-GC (P)-Vol. (II)]

Recommendation (Para No. 11.7)

The Committee observe that there are certain plants such as Cactus, Zetroph Curus and Jojaba which not only preserve the land from degradation but also encourage natural regeneration. Besides these plants have economic advantage also. The oil produced from Jojaba can be used as lubricant for aeroplanes. The Committee as such recommend that emphasis should be given to tree plantation activities.

The Committee have been apprised by the Secretary of Ministry during evidence that Israel had a highly developed technology for desert and dry land farming. The Committee urge that Ministry should study these technologies and explore the possibilities of using in India.

Reply of the Government

- (i) The suggestion made by the Committee for growing Cactus, Zetroph Curus and Jojaba in desert areas is being examined in the Ministry.

- (ii) A proposal to send a team to Israel comprising of officers from DPAP Division and concerned State Governments is being examined in the Ministry.

[F.No. H.11020/1/94-GC (P) Vol. (II)]

Recommendation (Para No. 12.5)

The Committee appreciate the full utilisation of funds during 1992-93 and 1993-94. However, the Committee are constrained to observe the physical achievements of the programme during 1994-95 which has been shown as less than 50% upto 15th March, 1995. The Committee are doubtful about the achievement of the remaining targets during the said year.

Reply of the Government

The information regarding physical achievement submitted to the Committee was for the period upto September, 1994. The information is now available for the period upto March, 1995 except in case of Bihar and West Bengal for which information is available upto September and December. The achievements upto March, 1995 are as under:—

(in 100 hectares)

Core Sector Activity	Target	Achievement (Provisional)	Percentage
Land Resource Development	1685.95	1283.74	76.14%
Water Resource Development	471.80	258.92	54.88%
Afforestation and Pasture Development	1027.64	797.09	77.57%
Total:	3185.39	2339.75	73.45

[F.No. H. 11020/1/94-GC (P) Vol. (II)]

Recommendation (Para No. 12.6)

The Committee take serious note of the fact that a considerable amount under DPAP was released by the fag end of the year which accumulates in the unspent balances. Further the Committee are disturbed to note the late release of funds from States to DRDAs. The Committee strongly recommend that there should be strict monitoring of the Programmes/Schemes sponsored by Centre. States should be directed to submit quarterly progress reports. Timely evaluation of the programmes should also be made on regular basis.

Reply of the Government

According to the release procedure, funds for DPAP are released ZP/DRDA wise, in two instalments. First instalment is released without any information or document from the ZP/DRDA or State Government. The second instalment is, however, released only when the expenditure reaches the limit of 50% of available funds with a ZP/DRDA and a proposal for release of second instalment is submitted by the Zilla Parishad/DRDA through the State Government alongwith Audit Report and Utilisation Certificate. In case of some districts, expenditure is not incurred at the desired speed due to late approval of Annual Action Plan for DPAP or some other reasons. Therefore, the limit of 50% expenditure is achieved at a very late stage during the year.

Recommendation (Para No. 12.7)

Another reason is that some State Governments do not release the Central as well as State share to the DRDAs in time.

Reply of the Government

To overcome the difficulty of late release of funds by the State Governments to the ZP/DRDAs, it has been decided to release the Central share of allocation directly to the Zilla Parishads/DRDAs. The State Governments have been directed to release their matching share to Zilla Parishads/DRDAs within 15 days from the date of release of Central share.

The new procedure will cut short in time for releasing 1st instalment to DRDA/Zilla Parishads both by the Centre and State Governments. However, the second instalment even under new system will be released only when 50% of the available funds are spent and a proposal for release of instalment alongwith audit report for the previous year and utilisation certificate is sent by the districts to this Ministry.

[F.No. H. 11020/194-GC (P) Vol. (II)]

As regards monitoring, the same is being done regularly both on monthly and quarterly basis. Monthly reports contain information on expenditure. The quarterly report contain information both on financial performance and physical achievements. The monitoring also done by the Area Officers through their reports prepared after on the spot verification of facts about physical achievements quality of works and justification for the expenditure incurred.

The Programmes are also being evaluated regularly. The following are the details of evaluation conducted during 1993-94 & 1994-95.

1. Study of DDP by PEO, Planning Commission—Report received in August, 1993.
2. Evaluation of DPAP in Orissa, Gujarat & Rajasthan by JPS Associates, New Delhi—Report received in August, 1993.

3. Evaluation of DPAP by PEO, Planning Commission—Report received in January, 1995.

The following evaluation reports were also received by the Ministry during this period.

1. **Implementation of DDP in Cold Arid Areas—A Study Report by Department of Admn. Reforms and Public Grievances, Ministry of Personnel, Public Grievances and Pensions—Report Received in March, 1994.**
2. **Evaluation of DDP of Cold Desert of Spiti by Shri J.P. Negi, presently Secretary Health, Government of H.P.—Report received in October, 1993.**

The Programmes were also reviewed recently and Report submitted in April, 1994 by a Technical Committee under the Chairmanship of Prof. C.H. Hanumantha Rao. The Ministry has formulated new guidelines for Watershed Development for all area development programmes on the basis of findings and recommendation of this Committee. Since the new guidelines are effective from 1.4.95. The Programmes will be got evaluated after a period of one year.

[F. No. H. 11020/1/94-GC (P) Vol. (II)]

Recommendation (Para No. 12.9)

The Committee note that under Watershed Programme the benefited zone is a limited cluster of land and a large area remains uncovered. The Committee recommend that land development programme and other techniques such as bunding, levelling, terracing, trenching and gully plugging programmes should be introduced in such areas.

Reply of the Government.

50% of the allocation under EAS, IJRY will be spent on area development on Watershed basis. The areas not covered within a watersheds can also be developed with the remaining 50% amount of EAS and Integrated-JRY. Soil conservation works can also be taken up with funds allocated under JRY.

[F. No. H. 11020/1/94-GC(P) Vol. (II)]

Recommendation (Para No. 13.5)

The Committee observe that adequate attention has not been paid in respect of maintenance of land Records. Land Records is a basic document for possession and percolation. The land cannot be mortgaged, credit cannot be made available unless the mutation is upto date. The Committee note that although emphasis has been given to computerization of land-records but the upgradation of technology can never substitute the importance of actual information gathering process at the ground level. The Committee are constrained to observe the decreased outlay during the year 1995-96 which was reduced from 27.47 crores to 18.80 crores.

Reply of the Government

Inadequacy of attention in respect of maintenance of land records

It is not a fact that there is any lack of attention on the part of the Government in respect of maintenance of land records. In fact, with this objective in mind, this Ministry is financing 2 important schemes (a) Strengthening of Revenue Administration & Updating of Land Records, and (b) Computerisation of Land Records. The progress and success of the schemes entirely depend on the Governments of States/UTs as the Central Government can only assist financially.

Updation of records by mutation

The Ministry entirely agrees with the observation of the Standing Committee that a large number of mutation cases are pending in all States and UTs. The Central Government finances programmes taken up by State Governments in taking up cadastral survey and revisional settlement and special mutation drive. Very recently a proposal for a State-wise drive proposed by the Government of Bihar to complete updation of land records within two years has received serious consideration of this Ministry. The State of Madhya Pradesh has covered most of the districts under revisional settlement programme. The State of West Bengal has completed revisional settlement in all the district, though final publication is held up due to judicial intervention. Similarly, revisional settlement, cadastral survey and first time survey in unsurveyed areas of Arunachal Pradesh and Mizoram has been taken up with adequate seriousness and 90% grant-in-aid has been provided to the Arunachal Pradesh and Mizoram to take up pilot projects to complete cadastral survey in selected unsurveyed districts.

[F. No. H. 11020/1/94-GC(P) Vol. (II)]

Upgradation of technology

The major portion of the funds under Strengthening of Revenue Administration and Updating of Land Records goes for mechanisation of survey settlement offices and to the offices related to land administration including consolidation of land. This includes procurement of latest machines and equipments starting from binding machines, photocopiers, cyclostyled machines, risograph, lamination machines, theodolite, EDM, micro filming equipments, construction of record rooms and computer back-up. The Ministry is financing an adoption research on aerial photography alongwith introduction of photogrammetric system with the Survey of India, Research and Development Wing, Hyderabad. The said Organisation has taken up pilot project in Angul district of Orissa. The final outcome of the adoption research is expected to be available by the end of June, 1995. The success of the said project known as Angul-Nalco

project will bring spectacular change in effective, efficient low cost implementation of cadastral survey and revisional settlement works including printing of maps through the process of digitization of the RS maps. This technology of photogrammetric system and digitization of maps and use of EDM Theodolite is the latest available technology on the global basis.

Decreased Outlay

The outlay for 1995-96 under Strengthening of Revenue Administration and Updating of Land Records has been for the time being reduced to Rs. 18.80 crores from the last year budgetary allocation of Rs. 27.47 crores on the basis of an actual release of funds during 1994-95 which was only Rs. 17.07 crores. The release of funds under the above mentioned scheme entirely depends on the demands placed by the States through technically acceptable project reports and also on the basis of State's ability to qualify drawal of Central fund by fulfilling the financial stipulation prescribed by this Ministry *i.e.* utilising 50% of the funds released during the previous year and 100% of funds released in previous year by the concerned State/UT. Minor relaxations are allowed in special cases and at present about Rs. 49.48 crores are outstanding unutilised balance available with the States/UTs and hence only release of fund does not result in improvement of maintenance of land records. Efforts have been taken to ensure that the State's contribution to finance these scheme is made available to field level officials on time and the completion of the on-going projects is expedited. Letters have been issued to various States for sending schemes and projects directly relating to improvement of the maintenance of land records system. A substantial quantum of funds is also released every year for training of revenue/survey settlement officials including construction of training institutions etc. In case, there is additional demand from the States and requirement of mobilisation of additional financial allocation on the part of the State Governments during the current financial year, the same will be promptly arranged by re-appropriation of funds from other Heads.

[F. No. H. 11020/1/94-GC(P) Vol. (II)]

Recommendation (Para No. 13.7)

The Committee strongly recommend that in view of the importance of land-records, adequate attention should be paid to the updating of landrecords. The Committee also recommend that funds for this programme should be enhanced. The Committee also recommend that adequate steps should be undertaken by the Government for the preservation of Land record maps and village Maps which are the basic data of the country.

Reply of the Government

It has already been stated above that necessary amount will be made available through the revised budget and, if necessary, through reappropriation in case the State demands so require.

It is also mentioned above that lamination machines are being provided to States for better preservation of RS maps of villages. Construction of large number of record rooms has also been financed during the last few years for preservation of village level and other revenue records at the field level. The Ministry agrees with the spirit of the recommendation of the Standing Committee for providing greater attention and ensure improvement of land records management in the entire country for which, though there is no budgetary constraint at the Central level but there is certainly some budgetary constraint at the State level as expressed by Revenue Secretaries in their meetings and also as expressed in delay of State share. This Ministry also feels that there is a necessity to revamp and revitalise the land revenue administration of the country to achieve the aforesaid goal. With that objective in mind, this ministry constituted a National Committee under the Chairmanship of Shri P.S. Appu, which has submitted its "Report on Revitalization of Revenue Administration" on 2nd March, 1995. The Report of the Committee has been sent to all the State Governments and the Governments of UTs for their observations and suggestions. It is expected that State Governments will find the recommendations of the Committee useful for planning and developing the existing revenue administration of the State/UTs.

[F. No. H. 11020/1/94-GC(P) Vol. (II)]

Recommendation (Para No. 2.13)

Secondly, the Committee are not satisfied with the performance of the Department of Wastelands Development under the Integrated Wastelands Development Scheme and they urge the Department to fully utilize the funds allocated under the scheme. As a new Department, it has to face the growing challenges of regeneration of wastelands in the country and chalk out a strategy for speedy implementation of the scheme. In addition, the Committee desire to know as to how and by what time, the remaining unspent amount of Rs. 1448 lakhs would be utilised by the Department of Wastelands Development.

Reply of the Government

Upto 31.12.1994 out of a budget allocation of Rs. 5148 lakhs releases of Rs. 3700 lakhs were made which is about 72% of the total budgetary allocation. As per instructions of Ministry of Finance upto 31.12.1994 only 75% of the budget allocation can be spent. However, on 31.3.1995 under IWDP schème Rs. 5305 lakhs were released.

[F. No. H. 11020/1/94-GC(P) Vol. (II)]

Recommendation (Para No. 2.15)

The Committee observe that India has a large part of its total landmass as wasteland. It is assessed to be around 1295 lakh hectares in the country out of which 936.90 lakhs hectares is non-forest wastelands for which the Department of Wastelands Development would be responsible for the sustainable development. The Department of Wastelands Development

was established in 1992 in the Ministry of Rural Development. The Committee note that as per the Performance Budget of the Ministry for the year 1995-96 planwise, yearwise targets and allocations of funds have not been indicated. The Committee further note that with the meagre allocation of funds the existing pace of development will take a century to develop the existing know forest wastelands for sustainable use. The Committee as such strongly recommend that the Performance Budget should clearly indicate allocation of funds and targets planwise and yearwise so as to arrive at any meaningful conclusion. Besides, the Committee also recommend that an action plan should be chalked out to complete the challenging task of the development of wastelands within limited time period that may be 10—15 years. The Committee also feel that the existing stringency of funds for the task of Development of wastelands can be achieved with the help of such private agencies. For this, public awareness of the utility of agricultural land is necessary. The Committee, therefore, needs hardly emphasise that a public awareness programme should be launched in this regard. The Committee further urge that the viability of involving private agencies in this task should be examined and the Committee be apprised of the action taken in this matter.

Reply of the Government

The Department has noted the concerns expressed by the Committee. The Department has appointed a High Level Committee to look into various issues of non-forest wastelands under the Chairmanship of Shri Mohan Dharia. The Committee, among other items will look at the prospects of developing wastelands in India in a 10—15 year time span. Report of the High Level Committee is expected by the end of this year.

[F.No. H. 11020/1/94-GC(P) Vol. (II)]

Recommendation (Para No. 2.16)

The Committee note that the Ministry of Rural Development have formulated a set of Guidelines for development of Wastershed for all areas development schemes of the Ministry. From 1.4.95, these Guidelines will be applicable to the projects under the IWDP Scheme also. The Committee recommend that a set of the guidelines formulated for the Watershed areas be furnished for the information of the Committee.

Reply of the Government

10 copies of the Common Guidelines for watershed development have been sent separately.

[F. No. H. 11020/1/94-GC(P) Vol. (II)]

Recommendation (Para No. 2.26)

The Committee feel that not only there was inadequate allocation of funds under this scheme but the meagre amount sanctioned have not been utilised fully. The Committee would like to be informed about the scope of technology development and extension scheme.

Reply of the Government

The Budgetary Allocation provided for the Scheme during the Financial Year 1994-95 though was fully utilised, yet it is expected that the pilot scale approach under this scheme is setting base for covering large problem lands in the future. The scope of the Scheme is limited to dissemination of agroforestry models developed by ICAR and Demonstration Projects which has better replicability to such locations. The scheme aims at supporting smaller projects under different agroclimatic zones with eventual aim of having one such pilot project in each district of the country for diffusion of cost effective technology involved under the agroforestry system.

[F. No. H. 11020/1/94-GC(P) Vol. (II)]

Recommendation (Para No. 2.37)

The Committee strongly recommended that the funds should be utilised only for those schemes for which they have been actually allocated in the Budget Estimates/Revised Estimates. The Committee further recommended that the allocation of funds should be made realistically and there should not be any diversion of the funds from one head to the other. The Committee desire the Ministry/Department of Wastelands Development to review the allocation made against Item No. 5 to 8 of the performance Budget (Chapter IV, Page 92) of the Ministry/Department for the year 1995-96. In addition, these schemes should be restructured so that they are implemented in letter and spirit.

Reply of the Government

The expenditure report in respect of the following schemes as on 31.3.1995 is as under:—

Investment Promotional Scheme	—	7.2 lakhs
Wastelands Development Task Force	—	35.0 lakhs
Monitoring and Evaluation	—	2.0 lakhs

The observations of the Committee on the issue of diversion of funds from one scheme to another would be carefully considered to ensure that no larger scale diversion of funds takes place amongst different schemes.

[F.No. H. 11020/1/94-GC(P) Vol. (II)]

CHAPTER III

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

Recommendation (Para No. 3.7)

The Committee note with concern that the targets during 1995-96 have been reduced to 917.23 million mandays from 1036.55 million mandays during 1994-95.

Reply of the Government

The employment target under JRY is fixed at the beginning of the financial year on the basis of the budgetary allocation and after taking into account the minimum wages prescribed for each State. In case, there is an increase in the minimum wages in any State, the corresponding employment target gets reduced. As a matter of fact, during the year 1994-95, some States like Andhra Pradesh, Bihar, Haryana, Himachal Pradesh, etc., revised their minimum wages on account of which the targets for 1994-95 which were fixed at 1036.65 million mandays was itself reduced to 986.5 million mandays. Further, during 1994-95, the M.P.'s Local Area Development Scheme was introduced. The Department was required to divert Rs. 312.00 crores from JRY funds, towards funding this scheme, without any additionality being provided for the new scheme. If this is also taken into account, the targets should have been reduced even further. However, the Ministry retained the target at 986.5 million mandays, for 1994-95.

For the year 1995-96, on a Budget Estimates of Rs. 3862.00 crores (for JRY) the employment target has been fixed at 920.70 million mandays. Even though the budgetary allocation for the year 1995-96 is only marginally higher by Rs. 7.00 crores as compared to BE for 1994-95 which was Rs. 3855 crores, it may be noted that the entire wage increase in various States will need to be absorbed from the allocation provided for 1995-96. In essence, therefore, the targets fixed at the beginning of the financial year are indicative in nature and are based on the certain assumptions, regarding availability of funds as also wage rates and a revision in either of these would necessitate a revision of targets as also the corresponding achievements.

[F. No. H. 11020/1/94-GC(P) Vol. (II)]

Recommendation (Para No: 3.10)

The Committee further recommended that under JRY, provision of construction of Senior Secondary Schools be made keeping in view the requirement of the specific areas.

Reply of the Government

Permitting construction of Senior Secondary schools, will depend upon extension of Operation Black Board Schemes (OBB) to cover such schools. At present, OBB, a scheme of Ministry of Human Resource Development is restricted upto upper primary schools only and financial assistance under JRY for construction of primary schools/upper primary schools and addition of another room in primary school or an upper primary school is provided out of savings/additionality of funds becoming available during a particular year. Similarly, the construction of primary school buildings can be taken up under the normal programme of JRY by the implementing agencies out of JRY funds available with them.

Since, JRY is a wage employment programme, permitting construction of Senior Secondary School buildings at this stage may not be possible as their construction is a highly material intensive activity. Moreover, permitting the same may likely result in depletion of funds at the implementing agency level for taking up other more urgent needy works like rural roads, Anganwadis, village tanks and soil and water conservation works etc.

[F. No. H. 11020/1/94-GC(P) Vol. (II)]

Recommendation (Para No. 7.6)

The Committee find that utilisation of funds under EAS is very poor. The Committee regret to note that during 1994-95 upto December only 35% of funds have been utilized. The Committee would like to be informed about the reasons for steep shortfall in utilization of funds. The Committee are distressed to note the poor achievements in different States.

The Committee would also like to be informed about the reasons for the shortfall. The Committee recommend that there should be strict monitoring and it should be ensured that there is optimum utilization of funds and realisation of targets earmarked for certain programmes as under utilisation of funds leads to cost escalation and has an adverse effect on other projects/schemes.

Reply of the Government

As the scheme was started in late 1993-94 many States took time to familiarise themselves with the scheme. Progress has picked up during 1994-95 and the All India utilisation at the end of financial year has gone up to 65.2%. Some States like Tripura (100%), Mizoram (96.8%), A.P. (95.97%), Kerala (84.38%), M.P. (78.82%), West Bengal (76.39%) and Nagaland (76.26%) have spent over 75% of the funds. Only Assam, Maharashtra, Bihar, Gujarat, Himachal Pradesh, Meghalaya, Dadar and Nagar Haveli and Lakshadweep have spent less than 50% of funds. Some of the reasons for poor utilization in these States are given below:

(a) Although the Scheme was officially launched on 2.10.93, funds released could reach the districts only in early 1994. Consequently the

States could spend only around 30% of the allocations made in 1993-94. The backlog of funds were carried over to 1994-95. Funds released during 1994-95 alongwith carried over funds of 1993-94 resulted in poor utilisation till November-December, 1994.

(b) During 1994-95, 409 new EAS blocks were added in the month of December, 1994. Further another 256 blocks were added in the month of March, 1995. However, releases for these blocks were made simultaneously and because of this the level of utilisation by March end 1995 comes down considerably.

(c) In some States extraneous factors such as elections to Assemblies, Zila Parishads and Panchayats kept the Government Machinery pre-occupied for a few months in 1994-95. Similarly in States like Bihar three months long strike by Government staff also contributed to delay in the implementation of the scheme. The Ministry shares the concern of the Committee with regard to strict monitoring of EAS. A major initiative taken in this regard has been the organisation of field visits by Senior Officers of the Ministry, Planning Commission etc., to 100 districts of the country between the period April to June, 1995 for intensive monitoring of EAS.

[F. No. H. 11020/1/94-GC(P) Vol. (II)]

Recommendation (Para No. 14.2)

The Committee note the under spending under NIAM. Out of 3 crores BE 1994-95, RE was reduced to 1.75 crores. Further BE 1995-96 has been reduced to 1/2 of BE of 1994-95. The Committee would like the Ministry to explain the reasons for underspending and reduced outlay during 1995-96.

Reply of the Government

In the Expenditure Finance Committee meeting held on 19th June, 1992, construction of buildings for NIAM was approved at a cost of Rs. 6.35 crores. The CPWD was accordingly request to prepare the lay out plan and cost estimates for the proposed buildings. Also, an amount of Rs. 1.00 crores was released to NIAM for depositing with the CPWD as soon as the lay out plan and estimates are approved by the Ministry. The CPWD first submitted the lay out plan and cost estimates in May, 1993. After discussions with the Chief Engineer (NZ), CPWD, the Ministry approved the lay out plan and estimates in October, 1993. Another instalment of funds amounting to Rs. 2.18 crores for construction of buildings were released to NIAM in December, 1993. The amount was deposited by NIAM with CPWD in december, 1993. Another instalment of Rs. 1.62 crores was released for the purpose in March, 1994. The CPWD started the preliminary work in February, 1994 only. The Ministry felt that some changes in the lay out plan are required to suit the needs of a National Institute. Accordingly, a meeting was taken by Secretary (RD) in July, 1994 in which the revised lay out plan was approved and also addition of

guest house, construction of protection bund etc. was approved. With these additions the estimated cost of the buildings has gone upto Rs. 6.67 crores.

2. An amount of Rs. 4.80 crores was released for construction of buildings upto March, 1994. It was felt that the CPWD would not be able to complete the building during the year 1994-95 and may not require more funds. Therefore, the allocation for 1994-95 was reduced to Rs. 1.75 crores at RE stage. The CPWD had assured that they would complete all works and hand over the buildings to the Ministry before December, 1995. The CPWD requested in March, 1995 that they would require further amount of Rs. 1.25 crores within the next two months for construction purpose and the funds of Rs. 1.25 crores were released to NIAM in March, 1995 for depositing with CPWD as and when required.

3. The Grants-in-aid to national Institute of Agricultural marketing are meant not only for construction of buildings but primarily for administrative and other expenses of the Institute. Upto March, 1995, an amount of about Rs. 6.00 crores was released for construction of buildings for NIAM and only about Rs. 70 lakhs are to be released for the purpose during the year 1995-96. About another Rs. 50 lakhs would be required for administrative and other expenses of the Institute. In view of this the BE 1995-96 has been reduced to Rs. 1.50 crores.

[F. No. H. 11020/1/94-GC(P)-Vol. (II)]

Recommendation (Para No. 2.11)

The Background Note furnished by the Department of Wastelands Development reveals that in 1992-93, 27000 hectares of land was covered under the Integrated Wastelands Development Scheme against an allocation of Rs. 1673 lakhs. This Scheme is under implementation since 1989-90 with the erstwhile National Wastelands Development Board. In 1993-94 the financial allocation was Rs. 4448 lakhs and 50000 hectares of land was covered under the scheme. As regards 1994-95 as many as 55000 hectares of land was covered against the budget allocation of Rs. 4920 lakhs.

Recommendation (Para No. 2.12)

However, the Performance Budget of Department (1995-96) gives a different picture. It states that in 1993-94 actual achievement was 28925 hectares of land against the physical target of 57956 hectares against the Budgetary allocations of Rs. 4445 lakhs which comes to 50%. In 1994-95 as many as 46250 hectares of land was covered under the scheme against the physical targets of 65000 hectares with an allocation of Rs. 5148 lakhs and only 3700 lakhs rupees were spent which comes to 71% of the target. In 1993-94 there was cent per cent utilization of funds but in 1994-95 only Rs. 3700 lakhs were utilised upto 31.12.94 out of a provision of Rs. 5148 lakhs. The information furnished by the Department of Wastelands Development

in the Background Note in respect of the physical and Financial targets and the achievements made thereon is even less than the previous two years whereas the cost escalation is increasing rapidly. It is contradictory to the information furnished in the Performance Budget for the year 1995-96. The Committee would, therefore, like to be apprised of the reasons for this contradiction.

Reply of the Government

In 1993-94 the estimated financial target given in the background note was Rs. 4445 lakhs, while the estimated physical target was to develop 50,000 hectares of non-forest wastelands. In the performance budget for 1995-96 the financial achievement for 1993-94 was shown as Rs. 4445 lakhs and the physical target was shown as 57956 hectares. The figures given reflect the target as per projects approved for 1993-94 and not the actual work done. In the estimated target for 1993-94 the physical target was shown as 50,000 hectares. While processing and actually approving the projects the physical target worked out to 57,956 hectares.

The projects are sanctioned throughout the year. The projects which are sanctioned between October and March cannot achieve their full physical targets. These funds are deposited with the District Rural Development Agency and are available in the next financial year for implementation/achievement of the targets.

The physical achievement as on 31.3.1994 was 28925 hectares. The physical achievement as on 31.3.1995 was 46,250 hectares.

The figures discussed by the Committee for 1994-95 are discussed in a similar narrative fashion.

In 1994-95 the estimated financial target given in the background note circulated by the Department was Rs. 4920 lakhs. While the estimated physical target was to develop 55,000 hectares of non-forest wastelands. In the performance budget for 1995-96 the financial achievement was shown as Rs. 5148 lakhs the physical target was shown as 65,000 hectares. The figures given reflect the target as per projects approved for 1994-95 and not the actual work done. In the estimated target for 1994-95 the physical target was shown as 55,000 hectares. While processing and actually approving the projects the physical target came out to 65,000.

The projects are sanctioned throughout the year. The projects which are sanctioned between October and March cannot achieve their full physical targets. These funds are deposited with the DRDA and are available in the next financial year for implementation/achievement of the targets.

The physical achievement as on 31.3.95 was 46250 hectares which is 71% of the target.

The information furnished in the background note gave estimated figures of achievement. The physical achievement reflected in these figures for budgetary purposes are collected on a flat rate. Once the projects are

received from the State Governments these figures for physical achievement/target undergo a change. The projects are based on assumptions that given availability of land, planting material and adequate rainfall the physical targets would be achieved. Some times because of situation beyond the control of the Project implementing Authorities the actual physical achievement is less than projected. In such cases the Department takes the following measures:—

- (i) Letters are written to the DRDAs to step up the pace of utilisation.
- (ii) Officers from the Department are sent to the Projects for review.
- (iii) Further releases are not made until utilisation of earlier funds is complete.

[F. No. H. 11020/1/94-GC(P) Vol. (II)]

Recommendation (Para No. 2.20)

The Committee note that an amount of Rs. 3 crores was allocated for the year 1994-95 under the Grants-in-Aid Scheme. Out of this the Department of Wastelands Development could utilize only Rs. 1.28 crores upto 31.12.1994 which comes to 42.66% only and Rs. 1.72 crores still remains unutilised. A similar provision is proposed to be made for 1995-96. The Committee have been informed through a written note that the work of all the 53 projects which were implementing the Grants-in-Aid Scheme was evaluated and the evaluation report is available upto 31.3.995. It was found after evaluation that 21 NGOs have done excellent work and their % survival was between 70-90. 5 NGOs have done very good work with the % survival of 60-70. 17 NGOs are stated to have done good work and their survival percentage is 50-60. 3 NGOs have done average work only with a % of 40-50 whereas 7 NGOs have done poor work with a survival percentage below 40. The Committee would like to be apprised of the steps proposed to be taken against those NGOs whose performance has been either poor or average. The Committee should also be apprised whether the Department of Wastelands Development proposes to put some sort of restrictions on such NGOs like putting them in blacklist, stopping financial aid to them and taking any other punitive action against those whose performance is far from satisfaction.

Reply of the Government

The recommendations of the Committee, for convenience, are being taken up in two separate groups:—

- (a) "The Committee note that an amount of Rs. 3 crores was allocated for the year 1994-95 under the Grants-in-Aid Scheme. Out of this the Department of Wastelands Development could utilize only

Rs. 1.28 crores upto 31.12.1994 which comes to 42.66% only and Rs. 1.72 crores still remains unutilised. A similar provision is proposed to be made for 1995-96".

- (b) "The Committee would like to be apprised of the steps proposed to be taken against those NGOs whose performance has been either poor or average. The Committee should also be apprised whether the Department of Wastelands Development proposes to put some sort of restrictions on such NGOs like putting them in blacklist, stopping financial aid to them and taking any other punitive action against those whose performance is far from satisfaction".

With regard to (a) above it may be mentioned that the Grants-in-Aid Scheme has an in-depth appraisal system before projects are approved by the two Committees constituted for this purpose. On receipt of an application from the Voluntary Agency it is examined in the Board on the basis of the guidelines of the scheme. The shortcomings are communicated to the Voluntary Agency. On the removal of these shortcomings the project is sent to the District Rural Development agency for pre-appraisal. The DRDA comments upon the technical feasibility of the project, the capacity of the Voluntary Agency to take up this project and also on the availability of land. On receipt of this completed project it is examined in the Board and put up to one of the two Committees constituted for this purpose.

On 31st December, 1994 out of the budget of Rs. 3 crores Rs. 1.28 crores had been released. The rest was released before 31st March, 1995 and a 100% utilisation of funds was possible.

With regard to (b) above the Board conducts evaluation on a continuous basis. The results of these evaluations are analysed in the Board based on the following parameters:—

- (i) Survival percentage of 50% and above merits a second instalment. It is pointed out that the land on which these projects are taken up is generally degraded, soil quality is poor and biotic pressure is high. Often these lands also receive scanty and irregular precipitation. Survival percentage has been taken as the main criteria for judging the success of the project. The soil and moisture conservation, quality of seedlings, efficacy of watch and ward, awareness raising are generally geared towards the survival of the saplings.
- (ii) Generally, in cases where survival has been less than 50% the agency is not considered fit for next release of fund. In such cases following action is taken:—
 - (a) In case the evaluation report reflects the fact that the Voluntary Agency had done the full work but because of drought, flood, technical shortcomings, poor quality of

seedlings or other factors which do not reflect mis-utilisation of funds. A gist of the evaluator report is sent to the Voluntary Agency for comments. On receipt of a reply from the voluntary agency further action is taken.

- (b) In cases where evaluation reports that work was not done, accounts were badly maintained or there is a possibility of a fraud then the case is referred to the State Government/Collector for detailed enquiry. Interim orders for non-release of further instalments are passed. In some cases bank account of Voluntary Agency is also frozen. On receipt of final report the State Government/Collector is requested to take action against the Voluntary Agency.

All Voluntary Agencies which do not qualify for a second release because of the reasons mentioned above are not eligible for further funding from NWDB.

Recommendation (Para No. 2.25)

The Committee note that an allocation of Rs. 2 crores was given to the Department of Wastelands Development under the Technology Development, Extension and Training Scheme and the Department has posed same amount for the year 1995-96. During 1994-95 the Department could utilise only about Rs. 1 crores and 9 lakhs. The Committee fail to understand as to why the allocation of Rs. 2 crores during 1995-96 can be justified when only 50% of the Budgetary Allocations could be utilized over the past two years. The Committee hope that the amount allocated for 1995-96 will be fully utilised for this very scheme and there will not be any diversion of funds to any other scheme being implemented by the Department.

Reply of the Government

The observations seem to have been based on the expenditure status upto the period ending 31st December, 1994. The actual expenditure by the end of the Financial Year 1994-95 as on 31st March, 1995 was of the order of Rs. 200.00 lakhs. Therefore, the Budgetary Allocation under the Scheme was fully utilised.

CHAPTER IV

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

Recommendation (Para No. 2.3)

The Committee feel that the marginal increase in BE 1995-96 does not cover only the percentage hike due to inflationary trends. The Committee observe that Rural Areas account for nearly three-fourth of the population of the country and have a much larger concentration of people below the poverty line. Rural Development which encompasses the entire gamut of improvement in the overall quality of life in the rural areas can only be achieved with the eradication of poverty of the people living there. The programmes of the Ministry provide opportunities to the poor people and enable them to participate actively in the growth process by encouraging and providing rural employment, increasing their access to institutional credit and subsidy, land reforms and development in drought prone areas etc. Considering the large activities of the Ministry and also the fact that Rural poverty alleviation has been of primary concern in the economic planning and development process in the country, the Committee feel that the plan outlay for 1995-96 is not sufficient to meet the targets fixed for different Schemes by the Ministry. Even the Ministry in the written replies furnished before the Committee have admitted that the approved outlay of Rs. 7700 crores will not be sufficient to achieve the target fixed under various schemes. The Committee is deeply concerned over the cut made by Planning Commission over the proposed outlay of the Ministry and recommend that the outlay for 1995-96 should be increased from Rs. 7700 crores to 10,500 crores as proposed by the Ministry.

Reply of the Government

The observations of the Committee have been brought to the notice of Planning Commission for appropriate action.

Comments of the Committee

[Please see Para 7, Chapter I of the Report]

Recommendation [Para No. 3.9 (2)]

The Committee note that there are complaints in the States about the uniform application of the guidelines issued by the Centre. As such, the Committee urge that it should be ensured by the Ministry that necessary infrastructure required for different activities related to creation of assets

in the rural areas such as construction of roads is provided timely. Necessary guidelines should be issued in this regard.

Reply of the Government

Ministry of Rural Areas and Employment has laid down broad parameters within which the implementing agencies are to take up the works. The guidelines gives only the illustrative list of works to be taken up which is not an exhaustive list. Within the guidelines enough flexibility has been given to the districts and village panchayats to take up the works as per the felt needs of the area and the local people. Development of infrastructure including construction of roads can however be undertaken subject to certain sectoral ceilings. This has been laid down to avoid skewed investment and lop sided development. Sectoral Departments are also expected to contribute towards development of infrastructure.

[(No. H.11020/1/94/-GC(P) Vol. (II)]

Comments of the Committee

[Please see Para 10, Chapter I of the Report]

Recommendation (Para No. 6.8)

Further the Committee are perturbed to note the findings of C&AG Para according to which in Andhra Pradesh a training institute was closed without giving training to any person. The Committee take serious note of the fact that the Ministry had no knowledge of C&AG findings. The Committee would like the Ministry to explain the reasons for the closure of such Institute.

Reply of the Government

The matter has been taken up with the Government of Andhra Pradesh as to why a training institution for which assistance was provided by the Government of India has been closed without giving training to any person.

[(No. H.11020/1/94-GC(P) Vol.(II)]

Comments of the Committee

[Please see Para 16, Chapter I of the Report]

Recommendation (Para No. 7.7)

The Committee note that in the absence of targets fixed under EAS, there is no yardstick to judge the performance of the scheme in the given time which hampers the successful implementation of the programmes. The Committee feel that some targets should be fixed at the national level under EAS. The Committee also recommend that work under EAS should be given according to local requirements. The Committee would also like that work under this programme should be decided considering the loan period of that areas.

Reply of the Government

EAS has been envisaged as a demand driven scheme in which any group of 10 or more persons seeking work during the lean season is to be provided with employment. While the Ministry appreciates the concern of the Committee with regard to absence of targets, it is quite possible to envisage that fixing of targets may lead to target chasing and over reporting as has been seen in some other programme and may also be detrimental to the quality of works done and employment given. Further the rationale of the EAS as may be seen, forbids target setting. The scheme as mentioned aims at providing labour to the unemployed, on demand. The demand of labour cannot be accurately estimated.

Those unemployed especially during the lean season throng for labour and their number or period of labour to be provided can not be uniformly set for the country or even the State.

Comments of the Committee

[Please see Para 19, Chapter I of the Report]

Recommendation (Para No. 8.3)

The Committee note that not only there was inadequate provision of funds, even the meagre funds provided under 8th Plan have not been spent judiciously. The Committee at their 6th Report on Demands for Grants had recommended the allocation of Rs. 300 crores during 1995-96. The Committee reiterate their earlier recommendation strongly.

Reply of the Government

The utilisation of funds upto 1994-95 has been indicated in the Table under Action Taken Note for S. No. 8.2. As regards allocation of Rs. 300 crore for 1995-96 the Department has proposed an outlay of Rs. 120 crore with an indication that it needs to be stepped upto Rs. 300 crore as recommended by the Standing Committee. However, the Planning Commission had finally approved an outlay of Rs. 60 crore for 1995-96 in view of the trend of expenditure in the past.

Comments of the Committee

[Please see Para 24, Chapter I of the Report]

Recommendation (Para No. 8.5)

The Committee note with concern the inadequate attention paid towards Rural Sanitation. With the outlay provided, only about 2.5% of the population has been covered as per the 1991 census. The concept of sanitation has been restricted to provide sanitary latrines to rural population, SC/ST and people below the poverty line. The Committee observe that it was unfortunate to see the rural masses living in total unhygienic conditions even after more than 40 years of planned

development in the country. The poor sanitation has caused number of communicable diseases such as malaria, plague etc. which have taken enormous lives during the last few years. The Committee do not appreciate the compartmentalisation/categorisation of this programme. The Committee strongly recommend that Rural Sanitation Programme should be launched in a holistic manner so as to benefit all categories of people/inhabitants in the rural areas. The country could not wait more to live in a hygienic condition. The Committee had recommended in their 6th Report for preparation of a time bound programme not exceeding more than 5 to 10 years to cover every habitation under Rural Sanitation Programme. The Committee reiterate their earlier recommendation strongly. The Committee also recommend that the Rural Sanitation Programme should not be taken to provide sanitary latrines only. Rather an integrated approach should be taken to provide total hygienic condition to rural masses *i.e.* the primary concern for human living.

Reply of the Government

The observations/recommendations of the Committee have been communicated to the States for necessary action and compliance. The CRSP general guidelines provide for an integrated approach by providing not only Sanitary Latrines but also treating the programme as a package of services including construction of sanitary complexes exclusively for women, construction of drains, lanes, provision of soakage pits, garbage pits, school sanitation, etc.

A beginning has been made by adopting this approach in undertaking the development of the modal sanitation villages in the States for demonstration effect and replication.

In view of the limited financial resources it is proposed to continue the present policy of giving subsidy to people below poverty line and to cover the other general public by alternative delivery system of sanitary marts, IEC and making it a people's programme. It is not possible to provide subsidy to all categories of people in view of a sum of Rs. 330583.00 crores required for all sanitation facilities as per details given below. The actual progress will depend on yearly financial outlay and the active interest of the people and the implementing agencies. The States have been requested to complete the coverage of Rural population through various Government Programmes and private initiative within a period of 10 years.

(Rs. in Crores)

Sl. No.	Activity	Nos.	Unit Cost	Amount Required
1.	Sanitary Latrines	10.96 crore households	Rs. 2500	27400.00
2.	School Sanitation	5,00,000	Rs. 10000	500.00
<i>Other Facilities:</i>				
3.	Drains	13,18,699 habitation; in Km. in each habitation.	Rs. 300 per running metre	49561.00
4.	Bathing	4 per habitation	Rs. 600	31656.00
5.	Pavement of lanes		LS Rs. 10 lakh per habitation	131870.00
6.	Smokless Chullah	10.96 crore households	Rs. 100	1096.00
7.	Soakage pit	4 per habitation	Rs. 500	26380.00
8.	Garbage pits	4 per habitation	Rs. 1000	52760.00
9.	Women Complex	1 per habitation	50,000	6595.00
10.	Sanitary Mart	5500 (per block)	Rs. 3,00,000	165.00
11.	Support Services (HRD. RD)		Lumpsum	200.00
12.	IEC/Sanitation Cell	400 districts	Rs. 50 lakh per distt. per annum	2400.00
Total:				330583.00

Comments of the Committee

[Please see Para 24, Chapter I of the Report]

Recommendation (Para No. 13.6)

The Committee are further unhappy to note that during 1994-95, only Rs. 1.95 crores were released upto December out of the Budget provision under the scheme of Rs. 27.47 crores.

Reply of the Government

Since the State proposals were received very late and since most of the Governments of the States/UTs could only show utilisation of earlier funds as per stipulation of this Ministry as mentioned above, the release

of fund to concerned States/UTs had to be delayed. Under constant contact and monitoring, utilisation certificates were procured from the States at the later part of the financial year and arrangements were made to release of funds even with minor relaxations of financial stipulation. However, as per revised budget provisions of Rs. 16.97 crores, the LR Division could actually release Rs. 17.07 crores by 31st March, 1995.

[F. No. H. 11020/1/94-GC(P) Vol. (II)]

Comments of the Committee

[Please see Para 33, Chapter I of the Report]

Recommendation (Para No. 2.14)

The Department has demanded only Rs. 4950 lakhs for 1995-96. This provision seems to be low compared to the huge task before them. The Committee, therefore, recommend that the Department of Wastelands Development should take up the matter regarding reasonable enhancement of the allocation of amount under this head.

Reply of the Government

The Department of Wastelands Development has requested the Planning Commission for enhanced allocations to the Department. The concerns expressed by the Committee were also brought to the notice of the Planning Commission both in the Draft Plan for 1995-96 and also during discussions with the Member Secretary of the Planning Commission. However, because of financial constraints the Planning Commission have not acceded to the request of this Department.

[F.No. H. 11020/1/94-GC(P)-Vol. (II)]

Comments of the Committee

[Please see Para 39, Chapter I of the Report]

CHAPTER V

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

Recommendation (Para No. 9.6)

The Committee further note that the allocation of Rs. 1110 crores during 1995-96 is not sufficient under Rural Water Supply Programme and are doubtful whether the provisional target for the year 1995-96 to cover 73000 habitations would be achieved. The Committee recommend that the allocation should be enhanced suitably so as to achieve the laid-down objectives.

Reply of the Government

The revised target for the year 1995-96 have been fixed to cover 86746 habitations is likely to be achieved with the financial allocation of Rs. 1110 crores and matching funds from State Sector (MNP). The allocation of the funds are decided by the Ministry of Finance in consultation with Planning Commission subject to availability of resources.

[No. H. 11020/1/94-GC(P) Vol. (II)]

Comments of the Committee

[Please see Para 27, Chapter I of the Report]

Recommendation (Para No. 12.8)

Further the Committee observe that under Watershed approach, one good technique is Artificial Water Recharge Programme which can be used in areas where density of rain is very high. The Committee would like to know whether any initiative has been taken to undertake this technique in heavy rain areas also.

Reply of the Government

The recommendation is being considered in the Ministry.

[F. No. H. 11020/1/94-GC(P) Vol. (II)]

Comments of the Committee

[Please see Para 30, Chapter I of the Report]

Recommendation (Para No. 14.4)

The Committee note that there is no rationale behind keeping NIAM under Ministry of Rural Areas and Employment. The Secretary, Ministry also acknowledged before the Committee that NIAM should be with the Ministry of Agriculture and not with the Ministry of Rural Areas and Employment. In view of it the Committee strongly recommend that

National Institute of Agricultural Marketing should be kept under the Ministry of Agriculture.

Reply of the Government

The suggestion is under consideration.

[F. No. H. 11020/1/94-GC(P) Vol. (II)]

Comments of the Committee

[Please see Para 36, Chapter I of the Report]

NEW DELHI;
January 12, 1996

Pausa 22, 1917 (Saka)

PRATAPRAO B. BHOSALE,
Chairman,
Standing Committee on
Urban and Rural Development.

APPENDIX I

MINUTES OF THE 21ST SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE ON URBAN AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT (1995-96) HELD ON 21ST DECEMBER, 1995

The Committee sat from 1500 hrs. to 1645 hrs.

PRESENT

Shri Prataprao B. Bhosale—*Chairman*

MEMBERS

2. Shri Giridhari Lal Bhargava
3. Shri Ram Singh Kashwan
4. Shri Gangadhara Sanipalli
5. Shri J. Chokka Rao
6. Shri Prithviraj D. Chavan
7. Shri Devi Bux Singh
8. Shri Subrata Mukherjee
9. Shri Nilotpal Basu
10. Smt. Meera Das
11. Dr. B. B. Dutta
12. Shri Sangh Priya Gautam
13. Shri Ram Deo Bhandari

SECRETARIAT

1. Smt. Roli Srivastava — *Joint Secretary*
2. Shri G. R. Juneja — *Deputy Secretary*
3. Smt. Sudesh Luthra — *Assistant Director*

REPRESENTATIVES OF MINISTRY OF RURAL AREAS AND EMPLOYMENT

1. Shri Vinay Shankar — *Secretary*
2. Shri Sukumar Das — *Director (LR)*
3. Shri R. K. Upadhaya — *Assistant Commissioner (LR)*
4. Shri O. P. Sisodia — *Research Officer (LR)*

2. ** ** ** **

3. The Committee then considered and adopted the Draft Report on Action Taken by Government on the recommendations contained in the 16th Report on 'Demands for Grants—1995-96 of Ministry of Rural Areas and Employment' without any modifications. The Committee also authorised the Chairman to finalise the action taken Report and present the same to the Parliament.

The Committee then adjourned.

**Minutes of Evidence on the subject 'Land Records' kept separately.

APPENDIX II

(Vide Para 3 of Introduction)

Analysis of the Action Taken by Government on the recommendations contained in the Sixteenth Report of the Standing Committee on Urban and Rural Development (10th Lok Sabha)

I. Total Number of Recommendations	54
II. Recommendations that have been accepted by Government (Para Nos. 3.8, 3.9(1), 4.10 to 4.16, 5.5, 5.6, 6.6, 6.7, 6.9, 8.4, 8.6, 8.7, 9.4, 9.5, 9.7, 10.5 to 10.7, 11.6, 11.7, 12.5 to 12.7, 12.9, 13.5, 13.7, 2.13, 2.15, 2.16, 2.26 and 2.37)	36
Percentage to Total	66.67
III. Recommendations which the Committee do not desire to pursue in view of the Government's Replies (Para Nos. 3.7, 3.10, 7.6, 14.2, 2.12, 2.20 and 2.25)	7
Percentage to Total	12.96
IV. Recommendation in respect of which replies of Government have not been accepted by the Committee (Para Nos. 2.3, 3.9(2), 6.8, 7.7, 8.3, 8.5, 13.6 and 2.14)	8
Percentage to Total	14.81
V. Recommendation in respect of which final replies of Government are still awaited (Para Nos. 9.6, 12.8 and 14.4)	3
Percentage to Total	5.56