

SECOND REPORT
STANDING COMMITTEE ON
RURAL DEVELOPMENT
(2004-2005)

(FOURTEENTH LOK SABHA)

MINISTRY OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT
(DEPARTMENT OF LAND RESOURCES)

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS
(2004-2005)

*Presented to Lok Sabha on 18 August, 2004
Laid in Rajya Sabha on 18 August, 2004*



IR,esd t,rs

LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI

August, 2004/Sravana, 1926 (Saka)

CONTENTS

COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE	()
ABBREVIATIONS.	()
INTRODUCTION.	()

REPORT

CHAPTER I	Introductory	1
CHAPTER II	Analysis of the overall allocation of the Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development).	4
CHAPTER III	Scheme-wise evaluation	32

APPENDICES

I.	Statement showing outlay and corresponding expenditure during 9th and 10th Plans.....	60
II.	Overall position of the proposed, agreed to allocation during each year of 9th and 10th Plans and physical and financial progress scheme-wise.	64
III.	State-wise extent of wastelands identified.	66
IV.	The statement regarding the funds released under IWDP in the North Eastern States for the projects approved since 1995-96.	68
V.	Unspent outlay of the Department of Land Resources for the North Eastern States	70
VI.	Statement showing number of districts, number of DDP blocks and projects sanctioned during 1995-96 to 30.6.2004	74
VII.	Minutes of the First sitting of the Committee held on 11 August 2004	75
VIII.	Minutes of the Third sitting of the Committee held on 13 August 2004.	78
IX.	Statement of Observations/Recommendations	80

COMPOSITION OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE
ON RURAL DEVELOPMENT
(2004-2005)

Shri Kalyan Singh — *Chairman*

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

2. Shri V. Kishore Chandra S. Deo
3. Shri Sandeep Dikshit
4. Shri L. Ganesan
5. Shri Mohan Jena
6. Shri Shrichand Kriplani
7. Shri Subhash Maharia
8. Shri Hannan Mollah
9. Shri Dawa Narbula
10. Shri A.F. Golam Osmani
11. Shri K.C. Palanisamy
12. Shri Anna Saheb M.K. Patil
13. Shrimati Tejaswini Seeramesh
14. Shri P. Chalapathi Rao
15. Shri S. Sudhakar Reddy
16. Shri Nikhilananda Sar
17. Shri Mohan Singh
18. Shri Sita Ram Singh
19. Shri D.C. Srikantappa
20. Shri Bagun Sumbrai
21. Shri Mitrasen Yadav

Rajya Sabha

22. Kumari Nirmala Deshpande
23. Shri Ghanshyam Chandra Kharwar
24. Prof. Alka Balram Kshatriya
25. Shri Penumalli Madhu
26. Shri Stephen Marandi
27. Shri Kalraj Mishra
28. Dr. Chandan Mitra
29. Shri Keshubhai S. Patel
30. Dr. Faguni Ram
31. Prof. R.B.S. Varma

SECRETARIAT

- | | | |
|---------------------------|---|-----------------------------|
| 1. Shri P.D.T. Achary | — | <i>Additional Secretary</i> |
| 2. Shri V.K. Sharma | — | <i>Joint Secretary</i> |
| 3. Shri K. Chakraborty | — | <i>Director</i> |
| 4. Shrimati Sudesh Luthra | — | <i>Deputy Secretary</i> |
| 5. Shri A.K. Shah | — | <i>Assistant Director</i> |

ABBREVIATIONS

ASSOCHAM	—	Associated Chambers of Commerce and Industry
BE	—	Budget Estimates
CII	—	Confederation of Indian Industries
CLR	—	Computerisation of Land Records
DDP	—	Desert Development Programme
DFID	—	Department For International Development
DoLR	—	Department of Land Resources
DoWD	—	Department of Wastelands Development
DPAP	—	Drought Prone Areas Programme
DRDA	—	District Rural Development Agency
EAS	—	Employment Assurance Scheme
FICCI	—	Federation of Indian Chambers of Commerce and Industry
IPS	—	Investment Promotional Scheme
IWDP	—	Integrated Wastelands Development Programme
NABARD	—	National Bank of Agriculture and Rural Development
NIC	—	National Informatics Centre
NGO	—	Non-Governmental Organisation
NRSA	—	National Remote Sensing Agency
NWDB	—	National Wastelands Development Board

PIA	—	Project Implementation Agencies©
PMGJSY	—	Pradhan Mantri Gram Jal Samvardhan Yojana
PRIs	—	Panchayati Raj Institutions
RE	—	Revised Estimates
SHGs	—	Self-Help Groups
SRA & ULR	—	Strengthening of Revenue Administration and Updating of Land Records
TDET	—	Technology Development Extension and Training
UGs	—	User Groups
UT	—	Union Territory
ZP	—	Zilla Parishad

INTRODUCTION

I, the Chairman of the Standing Committee on Rural Development (2004-2005) having been authorised by the Committee to submit the Report on their behalf, present the Second Report on Demands for Grants (2004-2005) of the Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development).

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

3. The Committee took evidence of the representatives of the Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development) on 11 August, 2004.

4. The Report was considered and adopted by the Committee at their sitting held on 13 August, 2004.

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

6. They would also like to place on record their deep sense of appreciation for the invaluable assistance rendered to them by the officials of Lok Sabha Secretariat to the Committee.

NEW DELHI;
17 August, 2004
26 Shrawana, 1926 (Saka)

KALYAN SINGH,
Chairman,
Standing Committee on Rural Development.

REPORT

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTORY

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

Responsibility of the Government

1.2 The Department of Land Resources implements schemes for development of non-forest wastelands and degraded lands and other area development programmes such as Desert Development Programme and Drought Prone Areas Programme to increase bio-mass production as also to create opportunities for providing rural employment. It also implements schemes for Technology Development and Training and monitors implementation of land reforms measures.

Functions of the Department

1.3 The following functions have been assigned to the Department of Land Resources:

- (i) National Land Use and Wasteland Development Council;
- (ii) Promotion of Rural Employment through Wastelands Development;
- (iii) Promotion of production of fuel-wood, fodder and timber on non-forest lands, including private wastelands;
- (iv) Research and Development of appropriate low cost technologies for increasing productivity of wastelands in sustainable ways;

- (v) Inter-departmental and inter-disciplinary coordination in programme planning and implementation of the Wastelands Development Programme including training;
- (vi) Promotion of people's participation and public co-operation and co-ordination of efforts of Panchayats and other voluntary and non-Government agencies for Wastelands Development;
- (vii) Area specific development programmes to counter endemic problems due to adverse climatic conditions and degeneration of the eco-system (DPAP, DDP);
- (viii) Administration of Land Acquisition Act, 1894;
- (ix) Examination of Central and State Legislations on Acquisition and Requisition of Properties;
- (x) Examination of other land laws;
- (xi) National Policy on Resettlement & Rehabilitation;
- (xii) Distribution of Government wastelands and Bhoodan land;
- (xiii) Conferment of Ownership Rights to tenants;
- (xiv) Prevention of alienation and restoration of alienated tribal lands; and
- (xv) Consolidation of land holdings.

1.4 The Department of Land Resources comprises two divisions namely Wastelands Development Division and Land Reforms Division and implements the following important programmes under these divisions :

1. Integrated Wastelands Development Programme (IWDP);
2. Drought Prone Areas Programme (DPAP);
3. Desert Development Programme (DDP);
4. Modernisation of Revenue and Land Administration;

- (a) Computerisation of Land Records; and
- (b) Strengthening of Revenue Administration and Updating of Land Records.

5. Technology Development, Extension and Training Scheme.

1.5 The overall Demand for Grants of the Department for the year 2004-2005 are Rs. 1264.48 crore both for plan and non-plan.

1.6 The Demand for Grants of the Department was presented to Lok Sabha under Demand No. 81.

1.7 The detailed Demand for Grants of the Department was laid in Lok Sabha on 22nd July, 2004.

1.8 In the present Report, the Committee have restricted their examination only to the major issues concerning the over-all analysis of the Department with regard to programmes/schemes being implemented by the Department in the context of the Demand for Grants 2004-2005.

CHAPTER II

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

The information regarding 9th Plan outlay, expenditure during 9th Plan, proposed agreed to outlay and expenditure (as on 30.6.2004) during 10th Plan, BE, RE and actual expenditure during 2001-2002, 2002-2003 and 2003-2004, proposed, agreed to outlay and expenditure (up to 30.6.2004) during 2004-2005 overall as well as scheme-wise has been indicated in Appendix-I.

2.2 The following analysis of the comparative position of outlay during 9th and 10th Plans for plans and non-plan can be made.

(Rs. in crore)

Plan + Non-Plan	
1	2
The 9th Plan outlay	1801.89
Actual expenditure	1617.56
Underspending	184.33
Proposed 10th Plan outlay	5600.00
10th Plan agreed to outlay	6526.00
Difference between proposed and agreed to outlay during 10th Plan	+926.00
BE 2002-2003	1003.81
RE 2002-2003	953.62
Cut at RE stage	50.19

1	2
Expenditure	919.87
Underspending	33.75
BE 2003-2004	1053.66
Expenditure	957.28
Underspending	96.38
Proposed outlay during 2004-2005	1553.00
BE 2004-2005	1264.48
Difference between proposed outlay & BE	288.52
Expenditure as on 30.6.2004	136.21

2.3 The following conclusions can be drawn by analyzing the aforesaid data:—

- (1) 10th Plan outlay is more than three times of 9th Plan allocation. However, this is due to the fact that more schemes like DDP, DPAP, SRA & ULR, Computerisation of Land Records (CLR) have been shifted from the Department of Rural Development to the Department of Land Resources;
- (2) The Department has got Rs. 926 crore more than what was proposed during 10th Plan.
- (3) Underspending is the recurrent feature during 9th Plan and each year of 10th Plan;
- (4) Whatever is allocated at BE stage is further reduced at RE stage;
- (5) Although 10th Plan outlay is more than what was proposed, the outlay earmarked during 2004-2005 is Rs. 288.52 crore lesser than what was proposed;
- (6) Almost 2½ years of 10th Plan are over and the expenditure position indicates less than 1/3 of utilization of resources; and

- (7) The expenditure position during 2004-2005 during the first three months is also not very encouraging, only around 1/10 of BE could be utilised.

2.4 The reasons for under-utilisation during 9th Plan have been submitted by the Government as under:

"The under-utilisation of funds during the 9th Plan was because (i) the grounding of projects under the new guidelines of Watershed Development, which envisaged a high level of community participation for planning, implementation, monitoring, etc. of the projects took time. The development of community organisations and institutional mechanisms like Watershed Associations, Watershed Committee, Watershed Development Team, Self-Help Group, User Group, etc. is a time consuming process and caused delay in take off of the projects. (ii) The cuts imposed by the Ministry of Finance in the Budget outlay of the Department were quite substantial and led to lower release of funds. (iii) The funds earmarked for North Eastern States could not be fully released due to non-submission of proposals and poor fund absorption capacity."

2.5 While the detailed analysis of each of the scheme has been done in the succeeding chapters of the Report, the overall position of the proposed, agreed to allocation during each year of 9th and 10th Plan and the physical and financial progress scheme-wise, has been given in *Appendix-II*.

2.6 While analysing the data as indicated at Appendix-II, the following is observed:

- (i) Although the overall agreed to allocation during 10th Plan is more than what was proposed, the same is not the position when outlay for individual schemes is analysed. The agreed to outlay is more due to Rs. 1,000 crore earmarked for 'New Initiatives';
- (ii) The comparative position of outlay during 9th and 10th Plan scheme-wise indicate that in each of the schemes of the Department there is considerable hike. In DPAP, DDP, CLR, SRA & ULR and TDET, the outlay has almost been doubled;

- (iii) There is shortfall in physical achievement under IWDP and TDET. Under DPAP, DDP, CLR, SRA & ULR, no targets have been fixed; and
- (iv) There is shortfall in physical achievement under each of the scheme.

New Initiatives

2.7 Rs. 1,000 crore has been earmarked for 'New Initiatives' during 10th Plan. When asked for the justification of the said allocation, the Committee has been informed:

"An amount of Rs. 210 crore has been allocated under the Head 'New Initiatives' during 2004-2005 with the objective of implementing special projects that would be required to meet certain specific objectives or certain area specific requirements that otherwise would not have been met through the regular watershed development projects. Two Schemes – (i) Renovation of traditional water bodies (tanks) and (ii) development of Bio-fuel are proposed to be launched under this provision. So far, no expenditure has been incurred under this head. The financial requirement for operationalisation of the first phase of the National Mission on Bio-fuel has been estimated at Rs. 1,496 crore during the Tenth Plan period. Though no firm estimates are available of the new scheme of renovation of traditional water bodies in five selected districts on a pilot basis, as announced by the Finance Minister, based on the data on area under small irrigation tanks in the country, on a rough estimate, the scheme could cost about Rs. 300 crore. Considering these likely financial requirements, the allocation made under 'New Initiatives' is adequately justified."

2.8 Hon'ble Finance Minister in his Budget Speech proposed to launch a massive scheme to repair, renovate and restore all the water bodies that are directly linked to agriculture. The estimated cost of the project is stated to be Rs. 100 crore. It is also stated that funds for pilot projects will be drawn from existing programmes such as SGRY, PMGSY, DPAP, DDP & IWDP.

2.9 When asked whether the Department of Land Resources has any role in implementation of the said scheme, the Department has stated that water resource development and water harvesting are important

components of all the watershed development programmes of the Department of Land Resources (DoLR). While medium and major irrigation works (above 40 hectares) come under the Ministry of Water Resources, small water bodies like village tanks and ponds with command area of up to 40 hectares can be taken up for renovation by DoLR. A new scheme is proposed to be launched for renovation of traditional water bodies on a pilot basis.

2.10 In Appendix enclosed with the replies, the position of 9th Plan outlay and actual expenditure is indicated as below:

9th Plan outlay Rs. 1801.89 crore

Expenditure Rs. 1617.56 crore

Similar data was furnished while examining the Demands for Grants for the previous year.

2.11 However, at page 2 of the replies the position of BE, RE and actual during 9th Plan has been indicated as below:

BE	—	2769.90 crore
RE	—	2515.59 crore
Actual	—	2468.31 crore

It could be seen from above that two different types of data, with regard to 9th Plan allocation and actual has been indicated in the same document furnished by the Ministry.

2.12 The Committee note that the Government has furnished two different types of information with regard to BE and actual expenditure during 9th Plan. By examining the two different types of data, the underspending according to one type of data comes to 184.33 crore whereas according to other type of information given, the underspending is around Rs.300 crore. While examining Demands of the previous year, the Committee were informed that the underspending was Rs.184.33 crore. The Committee would like the Department to furnish the accurate data with regard to 9th Plan outlay, revised estimates and actual expenditure, so as to enable the Committee to come to the right conclusions. Besides, the Committee would also emphasise that while furnishing information before Parliament as well as before the Standing

C o m m i t t e e ,
utmost care should be taken to ensure that the data furnished is accurate.

2.13 As could be seen from the aforesaid analysis, the underspending of the outlay is the recurring feature during 9th Plan as well as during the first two years of Tenth Plan. However, the Committee note with satisfaction that the Planning Commission/Ministry of Finance have enhanced the allocation of the Department considerably due to the additional responsibilities given to the Department. The Department, during Tenth Plan, has got Rs.926 crore more than what was proposed. While appreciating the increased allocation of the Department, the Committee would like to emphasise the proper and effective utilization of the scarce resources earmarked for each of the schemes of the Department. In no case there should be underspending and efforts should be made to go deep at the root of underspending and create a positive ground for optimum utilization of the scarce resources. The Committee would also like to emphasise that while projecting outlay to the Ministry of Finance/Planning Commission, it should be ensured that projections are neither on the higher side nor on the lower side. The projections to the extent possible should be realistic.

2.14 Further analysis of the data indicate that whereas the overall position of the outlay indicates more than proposed allocation as has been mentioned above, the individual schemes of the Departments indicate another picture. In the major schemes of the Department like IWDP, DPAP, DDP, CLR, SRA & ULR, the allocation is Rs.100 crore less than what was proposed to Planning Commission. Similarly, under TDET and others the Department has got the reduced allocation. The Committee find that Tenth Plan allocation has been enhanced due to Rs.1000 crore earmarked for 'New Initiatives'.

While analyzing the position of expenditure under 'New Initiatives' the Committee find that Rs.210 crore were allocated during 2004-2005 to implement special projects that would be required to meet certain objectives that otherwise would not have been made through the regular Watershed Development Projects. The Committee are unable to comprehend the reasons for making separate allocations for Watershed Development Projects, when three comprehensive schemes IWDP, DDP, DPAP are the regular schemes of the Department. Not only that, DDP, DPAP cater to the special requirements of DDP, DPAP areas. The Committee fail to understand why a plethora of schemes have been launched by the Department to achieve a single objective. The Committee

are of the view that this approach of the Department should be discouraged. The emphasis should be more on the strengthening of the delivery mechanism in the existing schemes and to get better results by more allocation as well as effective monitoring of the implementation.

2.15 Further, the Committee note that under 'New Initiatives' two schemes like (i) Renovation of Traditional Water Bodies (ii) Development of Bio-fuel are proposed to be launched but no expenditure has been incurred under this head. The Committee appreciate the launching of the aforesaid schemes specifically when the ground water is fast depleting and the Government has to think over reviving the traditional water bodies. However, they note that no planning on the part of the Government is being made before launching a new scheme for which Rs.1000 crore has been allocated during Tenth Plan and almost half of the time has already elapsed and no expenditure could be made for the 'New Initiatives'. The Committee would like the Department to finalise the guidelines of the scheme expeditiously. They would also like that in future, proper planning should be made before launching and earmarking allocation for the new schemes so that the existing schemes do not suffer in the resources starved economy of the country.

2.16 The Committee have analysed the performance of each of the schemes in detail in the subsequent chapters of the Report. The Committee would like to highlight here that in major schemes of the Department like IWDP, DDP and DPAP, there is shortfall in achievement of targets as may be seen from the position given in Appendix-II. Not only in 9th Plan, but also in the two years of Tenth Plan that have passed, the performance of the schemes is not very satisfactory. For example, under IWDP, against the target of 68 lakh hectares, the actual covered area is 13.42 lakh hectares during the half of the time that has passed since the Tenth Plan was launched. The Committee would like the Department to analyze the reasons for the shortfall in targets and take the corrective steps expeditiously. The Committee further note that under DPAP, DDP, CLR, SRA & ULR during 9th Plan and under SRA & ULR and CLR during 10th Plan, no targets could be fixed by the Department. The Committee fail to understand how the achievements under the schemes could be assessed in the absence of targets fixed for the schemes. The Committee would like the Department to indicate the reasons for not fixing the targets under the aforesaid schemes.

2.17 The Committee note that a new scheme is proposed to be launched for renovation of traditional water bodies on a pilot basis, the estimated cost of which is Rs.100 crore. They also find that funds for pilot projects would be drawn from the existing programmes such as SGRY, PMGSY, DPAP, DDP & IWDP. While the Committee appreciate the proposal of launching the scheme for renovation of traditional water bodies which is the need of the hour, they do not approve of the implementation of the scheme at the cost of the other major schemes of the Department. The Committee deplore the way the planning on the part of the Government is made. They would like that before launching any new schemes, the financial implications should be properly ascertained so that the allocation for other schemes is not disturbed.

Overall strategy of the Government for the development of wastelands in the country during 10th and 11th Plan Periods

2.18 As per figures made available to the Committee, 63.85 million hectares is wastelands in the country which is 20.57 per cent of the total geographical area. Out of this 14 million hectares is under forest wastelands which is not under the jurisdiction of the Department. During different Five Year Plans, the Department of Land Resources proposes to develop the above wastelands in the country as per the following schedule:—

Sl.No.	By the end of the Plan	Target (in million hectares)
1.	9th (1997-2002)	5
2.	10th (2002-2007)	15
3.	11th (2007-2012)	20
Total		40

2.19 When asked about the achievement of targets during 9th Plan, the Department has informed as under :

"Against the target of 5 million hectares, a total of 8.02 million hectares of wastelands have been covered during 9th Plan

period. The projects are spread over a period of five years and funds are released in instalments as the projects progress. The completion of these projects therefore spill over to Tenth Plan as well."

2.20 The position regarding the State-wise extent of wastelands identified has been given in *Appendix-III*. It could be seen therefrom that wastelands area in Andhra Pradesh, MP, Maharashtra, Rajasthan, Uttar Pradesh is much more *i.e.*, more than 20 million hectares. The physical achievement in said States is much less *i.e.*, Andhra Pradesh (18.81%), MP (15.72%), Maharashtra (17.38%), Rajasthan (30.87%), Uttar Pradesh (13.17%).

2.21 When enquired about the planning on the part of the Government to develop the total wasteland in the country, the Department has informed that a total target of 18 million hectares has been proposed for the Tenth Plan. So far, during first two years of the Tenth Plan Period, an area of 5.46 million hectares has been achieved. The year-wise area covered is as given below :

Year	Area Covered (in Million Hectares)
2002-03	2.385
2003-04	3.075
Total	5.460

2.22 As regards strategy of the Government during 11th Plan, the Department has informed :

"At the current pace of implementation of watershed programmes by DoLR, approx. 2.5 million hectares of wastelands are treated annually. There is a need to enhance this rate to 4 million hectares per annum in the coming years to achieve the desirable level. It would require doubling of the financial allocation for the Area Development Programmes."

2.23 The Committee also examined whether the Government have

ever reviewed the position of wastelands in other countries and the technology and strategy being used by them in this regard, the Department informed as under :

"DoLR has not reviewed the position of wastelands development and technologies used by other countries."

2.24 The Committee are happy to note that the Department could exceed the projected targets during 9th Plan period. Against the target of 5 million hectares, the Department could achieve 8.02 million hectares of wasteland during 9th Plan. The Committee further note that during Tenth Plan, the Department has projected to cover 15 million hectares. They find that during the first two years of Tenth Plan 5.460 million hectares could be covered. Similarly, the Committee note that although the targets during Tenth Plan are three times of the targets of 9th Plan, the commensurate allocation during Tenth Plan has not been provided.

2.25 During 9th Plan under the three area development schemes of the Department *i.e.*, DDP, DPAP and IWDP, Rs.1605 crore were earmarked. Against this during Tenth Plan Rs.4,400 crore have been allocated which is less than three times of what was given during 9th Plan. They also find that the cost of treating wastelands has increased and allocation of the Department has also been enhanced from Rs.4,000 to Rs.6,000 per hectare. In view of this scenario, the Committee find that it will not be possible to achieve the targets set during Tenth Plan. The Committee strongly recommend to convince the Ministry of Finance and Planning Commission to provide the adequate allocation to the Department so as to enable them to achieve the set targets during Tenth Plan. While recommending for higher outlay, the Committee would also like the Department to gear up their pace of implementation as the physical achievement during the first two years is not up to the mark. The Committee note that the Department has itself admitted that the physical annual targets of 2.5 million hectares of wastelands have to be doubled in the coming years to achieve the desirable level and as such, doubling of the financial allocation for the area development programmes would be required.

2.26 The Committee are surprised to note that the Government has never tried to analyse the position of wastelands development and technology being used by the other countries for the wastelands development for the reasons best known to them. In Committee's opinion,

such a review can help in evolving cost effective and efficient technologies for wastelands development in years to come. The Committee, therefore, recommend the Government to undertake a review of development of wastelands and technologies being used in other countries in the context of wastelands development within the country and apprise the Committee accordingly.

Role of Private Sector in development of wastelands in the country

2.27 A Central sector scheme *viz.*, Investment Promotional Scheme to stimulate involvement of corporate sector/financial institutions etc. to pool in resources for development of non-forest wastelands was started in 1994-95. The scheme has been discontinued from 1st April, 2003. When enquired about the reasons for discontinuation of the scheme, the Department has informed as under :

"To involve the private sector/corporate sector in the development of wasteland, the DoLR had launched the Investment Promotional Scheme (IPS). Continuous efforts were made by the Department to get proposals from the private sector. A letter was written from the Additional Secretary in the Department of Land Resources to the Chairman/Chief Executive of user industries/major corporate houses in the country, inviting them to develop the non-forest wastelands in the country and avail the subsidy under IPS. However, no response was received. Secretary (RD) has also interacted with the members of CII and ASSOCHAM during 2002-2003 on the involvement of the private sector in various rural development programmes including the development of wastelands and watershed development. The guidelines of the Schemes were distributed among all the stakeholder.

For the meetings, workshop/seminars organised by the Department to popularise the Scheme from time to time, representatives of the Ministry of Finance and Ministry of Commerce & Industry, NABARD, private sector/corporate sector, CII, ASSOCHAM, banks and financial institutions were invariably invited. In some cases their representatives assured that they would submit proposals within a short time, but ultimately nothing came of it."

2.28 The Committee in their earlier reports have repeatedly stressed

that the said scheme should not be discontinued and urged that the Government should make all possible efforts to involve beneficiaries and persons from all walks of life to complete the gigantic task of development of wastelands in the country. [Refer para No.53, Report 53rd (13th LS)]

2.29 The Committee in their 47th Report 2003-2004 had recommended to the Government to take the following steps to involve and attract private sector in the task of developing of wastelands in the country :

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

2.30 The Department has indicated the following reasons for non-participation of private sector in the areas of wastelands in the country:—

- (i) Wastelands are generally held by private farmers,

community, institutions and the Government. The industry/corporate sector do not own wastelands. Often their demand for allotments of large patches of wasteland on long-term lease basis, removal/relaxation of land ceiling laws for plantation, simplification of the transit and felling rules for plantation timber etc. cannot be met;

- (ii) Land being a State subject, the policy relating to allotment to land on lease basis, land ceiling laws, etc. are dealt by the States. Therefore, the role of State Government is paramount in this regard;
- (iii) The private sector prefers activities which bring in profit without much risk. However, investments in wastelands involve a lot of uncertainties; and
- (iv) Whereas, investment in wasteland development is large (around Rs.60,000 per hectare with drip irrigation) for a bankable and viable project, the subsidy is meagre (Rs.5,000 per hectare).

The Department has informed that in view of the fore-going reasons the said Scheme did not pick up and therefore, it was discontinued *w.e.f.*, 1st April, 2003.

2.31 In the Annual Report of the Department 2003-2004, the objective of initiating Investment Promotional Scheme has been stated to stimulate involvement of corporate sector/financial institutions etc., to pool in resources for development of non-forest wastelands. However, in the replies furnished to the Committee, it has been mentioned that the said scheme aimed at private land owners by providing them subsidy incentive when they raise bank loan for development of wastelands owned by them. The majority of those who own wastelands belong to the poorer sections of the society and are not in a position to go for bank loan and claim subsidy under IPS.

2.32 The Committee find that there is no clarity with regard to objectives of launching Investment Promotional Schemes. On the one side, the Department states that the scheme was started to stimulate involvement of corporate sector/financial institutions; on the other hand, it has been mentioned that the scheme was meant to help poor land owners who own small wastelands by way of subsidy. The Committee would like to be apprised about the clear position in this regard so as to enable them to comprehend the position with regard to discontinuation

of the scheme by the Planning Commission/Ministry of Finance.

2.33 The Committee in their earlier reports had repeatedly been emphasizing to take certain steps to attract private sector/corporate sector in the field of development of wastelands. As regards, the steps taken by the Department in this direction, the Committee feel that these are not sufficient. Only one correspondence was made with the Chairman/Chief Executive of user industries/major corporate houses in the country. In this direction, the Committee further find that as per the Government's own admission, the representatives of Ministry, NABARD, Private sector, Corporate sector, CII, ASSOCHAM, in the various workshops/seminars had assured that they would submit proposals within a short time. It has also been mentioned that nothing came of it later on. The Committee find from the aforesaid position that some sort of enthusiasm was expressed by corporate sector during the meetings but the need was to further pursue with them and convince them with the appropriate strategy as given by the Committee in their earlier report as stated above so as to really motivate them to this sector.

Impact of Wasteland development Programmes on employment generation

2.34 It came out during the course of examination that one of the objectives of the three important Schemes of the Department *i.e.* IWDP, DDP and DPAP is that these Schemes would provide employment generation. The Committee also found that about 60 per cent of the expenditure in execution of watershed projects is towards wage employment. On the issue of impact assessment studies of all the three programmes *viz.*, IWDP, DDP & DPAP, the Department furnished the following information :

"Impact assessment studies are carried out to assess if the objectives of the scheme have been met. The reports indicate that, where watershed projects have been implemented, the overall productivity of land has increased, the water table has gone up and there has been a positive significant impact on overall economic development in the project areas. The availability of fuel and fodder has also increased in the watershed area. Studies also reveal that the green vegetative cover has also improved which has a positive impact in checking soil erosion by wind and water.

The Watershed Development Programmes of the Department of Land Resources are primarily made for

improvement/restoration of the natural resource base of identified project areas. The development activities executed in the projects for land development, water resource development, plantations, pasture development, etc. are labour intensive and have the potential to generate substantial employment opportunities in the project areas. The experience gained in implementation of watershed project so far suggest that about 60 per cent of the expenditure in the execution of watershed projects generates wage employment.

Though no specific study has been conducted by Department of Land Resources so far to assess the impact of watershed schemes on employment alone, the impact assessment of watershed development projects have, *inter alia*, highlighted the extent of increase in mandays, increase in annual income of the beneficiaries, etc.”.

2.35 While examining Demands for Grants for the year 2003-2004, the Committee were informed by the Government that impact studies on the three schemes of the Government, *i.e.* IWDP, DPAP and DDP have been assigned and the Report of some of the States were available at that time. The replies from some of the States were awaited.

2.36 The Common Minimum Programme of UPA Government assures 100 days employment to each bread earner of the family as stated by Finance Minister in his Budget Speech.

2.37 From the survey results, the Committee find that in some of the States the survey indicates positive trends by way of availability of fuel, fodder, increase in vegetative cover and above all in generation of wage employment. The studies reveal that 60 per cent of the expenditure in the execution of watershed projects generate wage employment. The Committee also find that as per the Minimum Needs Programme of UPA Government to the assurance of 100 days wage employment to each bread earner of the family has been given. The Committee conclude from the aforesaid position that development of wastelands is an option to provide wage employment to the poor strata of society. The need of the hour is to chalk out a strategy in coordination with all the Ministries involved in the task and after interaction with State Governments, Panchayats and through them public at large, private sector etc., involved in the task. The Committee would like the Government to ponder over it and chalk out the strategies expeditiously. The Committee should be kept informed about the steps

taken.

2.38 The Committee further find that a survey to know about the impact of assessment studies by State Governments is being undertaken. The Committee would like to be informed about the results of the said survey. Besides the Committee feel that after the survey results are available, the same should be revalidated by some independent evaluator and the follow up action with the suitable strategy and corrective action should be undertaken so that the big challenge of developing huge wastelands in the country can be successfully met.

Development of Wastelands on the basis of Common Property Resources (CPRs)

2.39 As per the 10th Five Year Plan Document, some of the most degraded lands in the country are Common Property Resources (CPRs). CPRs have been said to be the resources on which people have an equal right of use. In this context, the Committee have been informed as under:—

“The common theme of the Watershed Development Programmes is to address areas characterized by relatively low productivity and preponderance of community resources. Generally, the activities taken up under these programmes include land development, *in situ* soil and moisture conservation measures, afforestation, drainage line treatment, renovation and augmentation of water resources, pasture development, repair, restoration and upgradation of existing common property assets, etc. User Groups (UGs) are also constituted consisting of homogeneous groups, who may be most affected by each work/activity of the watershed and they are to take over the operation and maintenance of the completed community works or activities on Common Property Resources. Thus, development and management of CPR is very much a part of watershed programmes, and no separate data on CPR is maintained.”

2.40 With regard to the ownership of wastelands, the Committee have been informed that wastelands are generally held by private firms, community institution and the Government.

2.41 The Committee feel that to analyse the problem related to development of wastelands in the country, it is imperative to know about the ownership status of wastelands. They note that no steps have been

taken to maintain the data with regard to wastelands under Common Property Resources. The Committee recommend the Government to take steps to collect the necessary data on ownership basis so as to enable them to address the specific problems of Government CPRs, privately owned land etc.

Key concerns with regard to Watershed Development and role of Panchayati Raj Institutions (PRIs) in Watershed Development Projects

2.42 During the course of examination, it came out that some key concerns were expressed by the Planning Commission in the Tenth Plan Document with regard to Watershed Programmes. In this connection, the Committee pointed out that following were the key concerns raised by the Planning Commission:

- (i) Lack of people's participation;
- (ii) Field staff unfamiliar with participatory approaches;
- (iii) Insecurity about fund availability at the grass root level;
- (iv) Limited time for preparatory activities;
- (v) Limited emphasis on cohesive group formation;
- (vi) Lack of transparent criteria for selecting areas and villages;
- (vii) Limited human resource capabilities;
- (viii) Lack of involvement of senior Government functionaries and line agencies;
- (ix) Weak horizontal linkages among various agencies at the district level;
- (x) No exist protocol for withdrawal after project completion; and
- (xi) Plethora of watershed development programmes with different guidelines and cost norms.

2.43 The Committee wanted to know about the steps undertaken/ proposed to be undertaken to overcome the shortcomings as pointed out in the Tenth Plan Document, particularly with regard to lack of people's participation, unfamiliarness with the participatory approaches and lack of involvement of senior Government functionaries and line agencies. The Department in a written note stated as under:

"Under the guidelines for Hariyali, Panchayati Raj Institutions have been given a pivotal role to secure greater participation of the people. Training of field staff, Panchayat functionaries and Panchayat Secretaries to familiarize them with participatory approaches, and training for the District and Block level officers for their involvement in the programme are organised. These aspects have been covered under the Hariyali guidelines. The cost norm has been made uniform at Rs.6,000 per hectare for all the Area Development Programmes. Provision for exit protocol introduced in revised guidelines of 2001 has been continued under guidelines for Hariyali to account for the deficiencies pointed out in the 10th Plan Document. Several States such as Karnataka, Andhra Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh, Chhattisgarh, Orissa, Tamil Nadu, etc. have created Special State level watershed missions with staff drawn from concerned line Departments and have instituted committed organizations specifically for adopting participatory approach for the developmental activities by specialists to the staff. Guidelines too have a provision to form a Watershed Development Team (WDT) consisting of a sociologist, an expert of plant/agriculture sciences, as expert of animal sciences/veterinary science and an engineer for organizing and sorting out the problems in a watershed project."

2.44 The Committee note that important observations have been made by the Planning Commission with regard to functioning of watershed development projects for wastelands development in the country. From the reply furnished by the Government, the Committee feel that in some States like Karnataka, Andhra Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh, Chhattisgarh, Orissa and Tamil Nadu, real work on watershed development projects is already under way. The Committee feel that the work done by these States needs to be emulated by other States in order to address the concerns of the Planning Commission adequately. The Committee hope that the Department of Land Resources being nodal Department will take necessary action in this regard. The Committee are informed that under the guidelines for Hariyali, PRIs have been given a pivotal role to secure

greater participation of the people. The Committee would like to know the achievements made in this regard. Mere assignment of the role is not enough. The concerns expressed by Planning Commission with regard to watershed programmes need serious introspection. The reply of the Ministry is not adequate. They need to address the observation of Planning Commission categorically to have the remedies.

2.45 It also came out during the course of examination that under 2003 guidelines for Watershed Projects, PRIs would plan and execute these projects at Gram Sabha level. In this connection the Committee wanted to know the views of the Government on the experience of Government about planning and execution of Watershed Projects by PRIs in the country during the last one year and whether all the Gram Sabhas and Gram Panchayats are following the above guidelines. The Department stated as under:

"The Guidelines for Hariyali to involve PRIs in the task of wastelands development have become operational since 2003-04. Many of the watershed projects sanctioned under Hariyali are still at the planning stage. It is, therefore, too early to comment on the status of involvement of Panchayats in the implementation of the watershed development programmes. 190 projects have been sanctioned under Guidelines for Hariyali during 2003-04. These guidelines have come into force w.e.f. 1.4.2003. In States like Chhattisgarh, Madhya Pradesh and Karnataka, PRIs are already involved in coordinating execution of watershed projects. In other States, like Rajasthan and Gujarat, orders have been issued for planning and execution of watershed projects through PRIs."

2.46 Further emphasising the need for fresh guidelines under Hariyali, the Department stated as under:

"Following 73rd and 74th Amendments to the Constitution of India, the Panchayati Raj Institutions (PRIs) have been mandated with an enlarged role in the implementation of developmental programmes at the grass-roots levels. The Ministry of Rural Development is committed to empowering these Institutions through devolution of necessary financial and administrative powers to them. In this context, it was felt that the Guidelines for Watershed Development did not provide for a pivotal role to the PRIs and it is time to do so by bringing

in suitable revision to devolve the responsibility of managing watershed projects to these local bodies and empowering them accordingly. The new initiative Hariyali launched by the Prime Minister of India on 27th January, 2003 is a major step in this direction."

2.47 About the agency involved in identification of watershed under Hariyali, the Department has stated as under:

"The selection of watershed is done by the governing body of ZP/DRDA Gram Sabha comes into the picture once the project is identified and sanctioned to a particular village."

2.48 The Committee also wanted to know whether the Government have thought of releasing money directly to the Gram Panchayats under the different Schemes of the Department, the Department in a written note informed as under:

"There is no proposal to release funds under watershed development programmes of the Department of Land Resources directly to the Gram Panchayats. The funds of watershed development programmes are released to ZPs/DRDAs."

2.49 On the issue of capacity building of Panchayats it came out during the course of examination that 5% of the total project cost under 'Haryali' has been earmarked for capacity building of Panchayats. In this context, the Committee enquired as to whether the Department would furnish the data separately earmarked as well as spent so far in the capacity building of Panchayats, the Department in a written note informed as under:—

"In most projects only first instalment has been released to projects under Haryali for the purpose of plan preparation, community mobilization, capacity building etc. The districts are expected to submit these details when they come up for the release of next instalment of Central funds. It is, therefore, too early to give expenditure details on capacity building. However, 5 per cent of the project cost is earmarked for capacity building and training for Panchayati Raj functionaries and staff."

2.50 The Committee invited attention of the Department that the Committee in their 47th Report had desired to take similar initiative of earmarking separate money for capacity building of Panchayats in other schemes. In this regard the Department stated as under:—

“Under all the Area Development Programmes of Department of Land Resources *i.e.* IWDP, DPAP and DDP, 5 percent of the project cost has been earmarked for training of staff and stakeholders including Panchayats.”

2.51 The Committee are happy to note that in major wastelands development schemes of the Department, there is an in-built mechanism for the capacity building of Panchayats. Five per cent of outlay under IWDP, DDP and DPAP is earmarked for the purpose. The Committee feel that besides making provision in this regard, there is an urgent need to monitor that the earmarked outlay is spent for the desired purpose for which strict monitoring by the Department is required. The Committee hope that State Government would come forward in this regard and after taking the benefit of this allocation and pooling in other Union and State resources meant for Panchayati Raj empowerment, the schemes will be implemented by PRIs in the true spirit of the Constitution.

2.52 The Committee also like that the similar in-built provision in other schemes of the Department meant for updation of Land Records be made and the Committee informed accordingly.

Bringing all the Programmes relating to wastelands under one umbrella

2.53 The Committee have persistently been recommending in their earlier reports to bring the various schemes meant for the development of wastelands being run by the different Ministries under one umbrella (refer para 2.28 of 47th Report of 13th Lok Sabha). When asked about the latest position in this regard, the Department has informed as under:—

“A Cabinet Note on ‘Setting up of Lok Nayak Jayaprakash Narayan Mission for Land and Watershed Development’ in the Department of Land Resources (DoLR) and transfer of all watershed and soil conservation related activities to the DoLR was submitted for consideration of the Cabinet on 14.11.2002. Subsequently, the Ministers of Agriculture and Environment &

Forests had expressed reservations on the desirability and feasibility of setting up of the Mission and transfer of all watershed and soil conservation related activities from their Ministries to the DoLR. The specific views expressed by these Ministries in the matter are :

Ministry of Agriculture : The rainfed areas account for over 62% of the country's cultivable land and holds the promise for future increase in agriculture production and productivity through effective implementation of the various watershed development programmes of the Ministry of Agriculture. In view of this, the Minister for Agriculture reiterated their reservations on desirability and feasibility of transfer of all watershed and soil conservation programmes of the Department of Agriculture & Cooperation to the Department of Land Resources.

Ministry of Environment & Forests : The National Afforestation and Eco-development Board (NAEB) is mandated for the implementation of joint forest management and to fructify the objectives for bringing 33% of the total geographical area under tree/forest cover. The transfer or abolition of NAEB, therefore, cannot be even countenanced since it has a direct impact on the mandate of the MoEF for enhancing the forest and tree cover. It is also impractical to visualize that the Ministry of Rural Development in the restructured dispensation would deal with all matters related to policy formulation in respect of forest lands particularly as land use planning for forest lands is regulated by the provisions of the Indian Forests Act, 1927, Forest Conservation Act, 1980 and Wildlife Protection Act, 1972, which are being administered by the MoEF. Also, the absence of requisite technical and managerial expertise on forestry matters with the DoLR is an unavoidable handicap. In view of these reservations, the Cabinet Note was withdrawn on 22.07.2003.

2.54 Subsequently, the matter was discussed in the meeting of Sub-Committee for Celebration of Birth Centenary of Lok Nayak Jayaprakash Narayan held on 22.09.2003 wherein, the Ministry of Rural Development was advised to again move a Cabinet Note. Keeping in view the

recommendation of the Sub-Committee, the DoLR, again submitted a Cabinet Note on "Setting up of Lok Nayak Jayaprakash Narayan Watershed Mission" to the Cabinet Secretariat on 1st October, 2003. It is learnt that the matter has been deferred.

2.55 Further the Committee have been informed that no integrated planning has been made to cover all wastelands in the country through a common approach and no estimate could be made with regard to the total financial requirement for the development of wastelands in the country.

2.56 The Committee for the last six years have been recommending strongly to bring the various schemes meant for the development of wastelands at present being handled by different Ministries of Government of India under one umbrella. By noting the latest position in this regard, the Committee feel that 'in principle' issue of convergence has been agreed to by the concerned Ministries. However, the main reservation expressed by the Ministries is their unwillingness to transfer area of activity being undertaken by them in this regard. The Committee also find that Department of Land Resources, has again submitted a Cabinet Note on setting up of like 'Lok Nayak Jayaprakash Narayan Watershed Mission' under which all the activities related to watershed and soil conversion would be brought. They also note that the matter for the time being has been deferred. The Committee further note that in the absence of convergence, the Government has not been able to make some integrated planning on the huge task of developing wastelands in the country. In view of this scenario, the Committee again emphatically recommend to take this issue seriously and the matter regarding various reservations of respective Ministries should be sorted out by discussing the matter across the table and the issue should be finalised expeditiously. The Committee would also like that their concerns in this regard should be brought to the notice of the Cabinet Secretariat.

Norms for development of Wastelands under schemes being implemented on the basis of Watershed Guidelines

2.57 Three schemes of the Department *viz.*, IWDP, DDP and DPAP are being implemented on the basis of watershed guidelines. The projects have to be implemented over a period of five years at an overall cost of Rs. 4,000 per hectare for projects sanctioned up to 31 March, 2000

and at an overall cost of Rs. 6,000 per hectare for projects sanctioned after 1 April, 2000. On being asked whether the said norms are justified in case of difficult areas, the Department has stated that the rationale of revising cost norms was to make it uniform for all projects and to ensure and streamline better monitoring of the financial performance of these projects. The Department has also mentioned that the flexibility of fixing up cost estimates for each work item and project activity an account of variation in the topography, treatment technologies, etc. has been left to the State Governments.

2.58 The Committee find that even the enhanced allocation of Rs. 6,000 per hectare being provided for the development of wastelands under IWDP, DDP and DPAP is not justified keeping in view the actual higher per hectare cost involved in this task. To appreciate the position further, the Committee would like to be apprised of the actual rate of expenditure involved in developing per hectare of land. Further, the Committee find that due to regional imbalances, the cost of developing wasteland in hilly areas may be much more. As such the Committee may also like to be apprised of the actual cost of developing land per hectare in such difficult areas so as to enable the Committee to come to the right conclusion and to recommend for higher outlay.

Funds for North-Eastern States

2.59 As per the material furnished by the Department, 10% of the total allocation of the Department of Land Resources *i.e.*, Rs.126 crore has been earmarked for North Eastern Region. In the said region, Integrated Wastelands Development Project (IWDP) is the only major scheme in operation. Other two major schemes *i.e.*, Drought Prone Areas Programme (DPAP) and Desert Development Programme (DDP) are area specific and no block of North-Eastern States has been identified for coverage under the schemes.

2.60 North-East allocation during 2002-2003 and 2003-2004 was Rs.100 crore for each year respectively. As regards the achievement in North-East, the Department has informed that sufficient proposals for sanctioning of new projects/release of funds for the ongoing projects were not received and the funds earmarked for North-Eastern region remained unutilized. Further 6.87 lakh hectares could be covered so far by the Government's initiative during 9th Plan under IWDP schemes in North-Eastern States, whereas the total wastelands in such areas is 78.52 lakh

hectares. During first two years of 10th Plan, 5.59 lakh hectares could be covered.

2.61 When asked about the criteria for coverage of IWDP in these States, Department has informed that the extent and quantum of wastelands in a particular State/district is an important consideration for approval of new projects in the States/districts but various other factors like progress under the old projects, absorption capacity of the State/district and other local issues, the extent of area approved under the projects in a particular districts/States may or may not necessarily correspond (proportionately) to the extent of wastelands and geographical area in that States/districts.

2.62 When asked about money allocated and spent in each of the States since 1995-96, the Department has informed that as this is a demand driven programme, money is not allocated State-wise. On receipt of proposals, funds are released to the projects. The funds released under IWDP for North-Eastern States for the projects approved since 1995-96 is at *Appendix-IV*.

2.63 It could be seen from the Appendix that the allocation during 2000-2001 since the concept of exclusive allocation to North Eastern States has been started, it has drastically increased, *i.e.* more than 2½ times of what was allocated during the previous year. Subsequently, the allocation from the data is given below:

Funds released under IWDP in the North-Eastern States since 2000-2001 to 2004-2005

	(Rs. in lakh)
2000-2001	2638.17
2001-2002	4263.85
2002-2003	5793.93
2003-2004	6620.04
2004-2005 (upto 30.6.2004)	537.46

2.64 The position in this regard since 2000-2001 when the concept

of allocating 10 per cent exclusively outlay for North-Eastern States has been given in *Appendix-V*.

2.65 Asked further about the position of unspent outlay transferred to the non-lapsable pool in each of the State/district, the Department has stated that the extent of unspent outlay of the Department of Land Resources for the North-Eastern States is as per savings indicated in *Appendix-V*. The unspent outlay is transferred to the non-lapsable pool of resources for the development of North Eastern Region, as is utilised for the projects, works etc., approved by the Ministry of Development of North Eastern Region as per their norms and criteria.

2.66 During the course of examination, the Committee drew the attention of the Department over Committee's recommendations for formulating an action plan for proper utilization of plan funds for North-Eastern region. Department of Land Resources has given two reasons for under-utilization of outlay for North-East. First, two programmes of DPAP and DDP are not operational in the North-East region as none of the areas in the North-East is identified as Drought Prone or Desert Regions by the Hanumantha Rao Committee which had identified DPAP and DDP blocks in the country based on scientific parameters *i.e.*, rainfall. The Department has submitted that a Cabinet note was prepared for this purpose. However, it was subsequently felt by the Department that exclusion of Budget allocation of DPAP and DDP for calculating the prescribed 10% allocation for NE States would substantially reduce releases of Department of North Eastern States.

2.67 The other reasons advanced by the Department for low utilization of funds is increasing committed liability on ongoing projects. The Department has attributed the following reasons for less utilization of funds for North-Eastern region:—

- (i) Short working season;
- (ii) Unsettled conditions in some areas of N.E. Region;
- (iii) Delay in release of State share; and
- (iv) Requirement of ensuring proper utilization of funds already released by the Department before releasing the next instalment by way of physical verification etc., in a few areas.

2.68 The Department has further informed that keeping the project and area specific issues in view, proactive efforts are being made to solve the difficulties and expedite the releases. The Department has also been interacting with the Northern Eastern States for speeding up the implementation of ongoing IWDP projects. With the proactive role of the Department, IWDP projects are now being implemented in all the North Eastern States.

2.69 The Committee find that the allocation for North Eastern States has considerably been increased since 2000-2001, when the concept of 10 percent exclusive allocation to North Eastern States was started. They also note that DDP, DPAP Schemes are not applicable in North Eastern States since no such districts were considered as such areas as per the Hanumantha Rao Committee constituted for identification of DDP and DPAP Projects in the country. The Committee find that even then the allocation for these two area specific programmes is being made to the North-Eastern States. The Committee in their earlier Reports had raised this issue and they find from the reply furnished by the Department that if the DDP and DPAP allocation is excluded, North-Eastern States allocation for watershed projects will be considerably reduced. The Committee appreciate the considerable attention and allocation made to North-Eastern States. Further, they would also like that the resources allocated for the development of wastelands should be meaningfully utilised. To appreciate the releases made to North Eastern States, the Committee would like to be apprised about the task being handled in each of the areas of North Eastern States and would like to be apprised about the information in this regard.

2.70 The Committee find from the information furnished by the Department that there are certain problems resulting in lesser utilization of funds in North Eastern Region, like difficult weather conditions, delay in release of States' share etc. The Committee would like that the specific problems from each of the North-Eastern States, should be ascertained expeditiously after interacting with them and proper strategy to take the desired steps in this regard, should be chalked out.

2.71 The Committee note that out of 78.52 lakh hectares, the Department could cover only 6.87 lakh hectares during 9th Plan under IWDP Scheme in North-Eastern States. Similarly, during the first two years of 10th Plan, 5.59 lakh hectares could be developed. Keeping in view the slow pace of coverage, the Committee feel that effective steps need to be taken to cover the total wastelands in North-Eastern States. The Committee in their earlier Reports had recommended to chalk out an

Action Plan to cover the total wastelands in North-Eastern States. They would like to reiterate their earlier recommendation and would like that the desired action in this regard should be taken expeditiously.

CHAPTER III

SCHEME-WISE EVALUATION

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

Integrated Wastelands Development Programme (IWDP)

3.1 IWDP is a Centrally Sponsored Programme for the Department of Land Resources for the development of non-forest wastelands in the country. The basic approach in implementation of this programme has been modified from 1st April, 1995 when the guidelines for Watershed Development through Watershed Approach came into force. Since then, projects for development of wastelands on watershed basis are sanctioned. The projects have to be implemented over a period of five years at an overall cost of Rs. 4,000 per hectare for projects sanctioned up to 31st March, 2000 and at an overall cost of Rs. 6,000 per hectare for projects sanctioned after 1st April, 2000.

3.2 The Guidelines for Watershed Development have been revised in September, 2001. Consequent upon the revision of cost norm from Rs. 4,000 per hectare to Rs. 6000 per hectare, the funding pattern of IWDP has also been modified. The project cost would now be shared at the rate of Rs. 5,500 per hectare and Rs. 500 per hectare between Central and State Governments respectively. Previously, the total cost of the projects under the Programme was funded by the Central Government. The revised guidelines of 2001 were replaced by guidelines for Hariyali *w.e.f.* 1st April, 2003 with a view to empower Panchayati Raj Institutions (PRIs) in planning execution and managing developmental activities relating to all watershed programmes.

Allocation and releases of the funds during 9th Plan and first two years of the 10th Plan Period.

3.3 The year-wise allocation and release of funds during 9th Plan (1999-2000) is as follows:—

(Rs. in crore)

Year	BE	RE	Release
1997-1998	74.50	50.00	53.95
1998-1999	82.10	62.00	62.00
1999-2000	82.00	82.00	83.07
2000-2001	480.00*	387.00	386.90
2001-2002	430.00**	405.00	376.35
Total	1148.60	986.00	962.27

*This includes funds for ongoing EAS Watersheds.

**Includes funds for ongoing EAS (Watershed) and Externally Aided Projects for Andhra Pradesh and Orissa.

3.4 The funds allocated and released during the year 2002-2003, 2003-2004 and 2004-2005 during 10th Plan are as under:—

(Rs. in crore)

Year	BE	RE	Release
2002-03	450.00*	440.00*	413.45
2003-04	402.00**	384.28**	368.17
2004-05	368.00	—	52.96***

*Includes funds for ongoing EAS (Watershed and Externally Aided Projects for Andhra Pradesh and Orissa.

**Includes funds for Externally Aided Projects for Andhra Pradesh and Orissa.

***As on 30.06.2004.

3.5 The reasons for mismatch between BE-RE and release of funds during 9th Plan and during the first two years of 10th Plan, as indicated by the Department are as under :—

“The mismatch between BE and RE is on account of cut imposed by the Ministry of Finance in the overall budget allocation of the Ministry during the 9th Plan and first two years of 10th Plan. As far as the shortfall of releases in the year 2001-02 is concerned, the same is due to less release proposals received from North-Eastern States under IWDP and EAS. During the first two years of 10th Plan, the difference between RE and releases can also be attributed to less proposals received from North-Eastern States. The allocation of 10% of funds to the North-East under Area Development Programmes is only for IWDP projects as no block in the North-Eastern has been identified under DPAP and DDP.”

3.6 The Committee further enquired the reasons for shortfall in total expenditure in comparison with total allocation of 9th Plan, the Department in a written note stated as under:—

BE, RE, Actual releases in respect of IWDP, DFID & EAS in the 9th Plan

(Rs. in crore)

Year		BE	RE	Actual Release
1	2	3	4	5
1997-1998		74.50	50.00	53.95
1998-1999		82.10	62.00	62.00
1997-2000		82.00	82.00	83.07
2000-2001	EAS	350.00	257.00	257.12
	IWDP (including DFID)	130.00	130.00	129.78
	Total	480.00	387.00	386.90

1	2	3	4	5
2001-02	EAS	200.00	200.00	190.15
	IWDP (Other States)	131.00	114.50	127.17
	IWDP (NE States)	79.00	74.00	42.64
	DFID	20.00	16.50	16.39
	Total	430.00	405.00	376.35

3.7 From the above table, it is evident that there is conformity between actual releases and RE in the first 4 years of the 9th Plan. In the fifth year of the 9th Plan, there is no shortfall of financial/physical achievements in respect of Non-North Eastern States but the targets in respect of North-Eastern States have not been fully achieved due to the receipt of less release proposals. Allotment of 10 per cent of funds of all the Area Development Programmes to the North-East for IWDP is not fully utilised/claimed by the States.

3.8 The physical targets *vis-a-vis* achievement under IWDP is as under:—

(In hectares)

Year	Target	Achievement
1997-1998	1,27,000	90,000
1998-1999	1,37,000	1,03,000
1999-2000	1,36,750	1,38,500
2000-2001	3,25,000	3,24,450
2001-2002	4,55,000	4,10,000
Total	11,80,750	10,65,950

3.9 The reasons for the shortfall in physical achievement have been indicated as under:—

“The committed liabilities of EAS watersheds reduced the available funds for IWDP. As a result, most of the funds available were released to meet the committed liabilities of projects under IWDP and less new projects were sanctioned, thereby reducing the number of physical projects.”

No. of projects sanctioned, area and project cost under IX Plan

Year	No. of projects sanctioned	Area (in Ha.)	Total project cost (Rs. in lakh)	Amount of Ist inst. Released (Rs. in lakh)
1997-1998	44	450292	18011.68	2701.75
1998-1999	48	518191	20727.64	3109.15
1999-2000	73	701316	28052.64	4207.90
2000-2001	106	1112072	66724.32	9174.59
2001-2002	125	797891	47873.46	6582.60
Total	396	3579762	181389.74	25775.99

3.10 As regards allocation for IWDP during 10th Plan Period, it came out during the course of examination that as against a proposal of Rs. 1,900 crore, the Planning Commission has allotted Rs. 1,800 crore. Further physical targets *vis-a-vis* achievement of wastelands development during first three years of the 9th and 10th Plan is as under:—

(In hectares)

Year	Target	Achievement
2002-03	5,17,000	3,35,521
2003-04	11,00,000	10,06,500
2004-05	10,00,000	—

3.11 The Department of Land Resources has pointed out, meeting the committed liability of ongoing projects, as a reason for less achievement in physical targets during 2002-2003 and 2003-2004. When

asked about the quantum of committed liability on projects during aforesaid years, the Department has stated:

"On an average, it has been the experience that 65 to 70 per cent of allocated funds are utilized towards committed liabilities and the balance for new projects."

3.12 On the issue of utilisation of funds during 2003-2004 and 2004-2005 the Committee wanted to know whether Department would be able to utilise them fully, the Department in a written note has stated that the expenditure in the North-Eastern States is less due to less proposals received from these States. This has reduced the overall performance of IWDP. Although 10% of the allocation for Area Development Programmes is allocated to North-Eastern States for IWDP alone, the North-Eastern States are unable to absorb such a large quantum of funds.

3.13 In the year 2004-05, Rs. 253 crore and Rs. 115 crore have been allocated for non-North Eastern and North Eastern States respectively. Being demand driven projects, until and unless North Eastern States claim more funds under IWDP during the current financial year, the situation will remain more or less the same. The DoLR takes a proactive role and tries to encourage the North Eastern States to send as many proposals as possible and this has resulted in the consistent improvement in releases to these States over the last few years.

3.14 The Committee conclude from the position of allocation made under IWDP that in North-Eastern States, there is huge underspending. The Committee have dealt with, in details, the position of wastelands in North-Eastern States and the issue of under utilization in the preceding para of the Report. The Committee would like to highlight that with regard to implementation of IWDP, efforts should be made by interacting with various State Governments so that more and more projects from these States are proposed which could result in full utilization of scarce resources.

3.15 As regards the physical achievement under IWDP, the Committee note that during 9th Plan, there was shortfall of 1,148 hectares. They also note that most of the funds available under IWDP are being released to meet the committed liabilities of projects under IWDP thereby resulting in sanctioning of lesser new projects. The Committee are concerned to note that on an average 65 to 70 per cent of allocated funds are utilised towards committed liabilities. To understand the problem of committed liabilities, the Committee would like that the detailed position with regard to committed liabilities for ongoing projects should be analysed and data placed before the Committee. The Committee find that if the existing position with regard to committed liabilities stands, the Department would not be able to achieve the targets set during Tenth Plan. As such the Committee would like the Department to analyse the matter critically and inform the Committee accordingly.

3.17 From the above table, it is evident that the funds required

Watershed projects under EAS

3.16 As per the written replies data in respect of EAS watershed releases from 1999-2000 to 2003-2004 is us under:—

EAS Watershed releases from 1999-2000 to 2003-04

Total Area In (Ha.)	Funds required for completion (Rs. in lakhs)	Central Share (Rs. in lakhs)	Funds released (Rs. in Lakhs)				Total Funds released	
			1999- 2000	2000- 2001	2001- 2002	2002- 2003 2003- 2004*		
6356468	148526.53	111920.33	30154.75	25711.5	19015.4	14552.28	634.91	90068.88

*approved during 2002-2003.

have been met to the extent claims were made by the States for eligible projects within the stipulated period (2001-02) and the extended period 2002-03.

3.18 The Department has also furnished that no allocation has been made under EAS projects during 2004-2005 as the scheme has been terminated.

3.19 When asked whether the committed liabilities under the IWDP component of EAS have been fulfilled, it has been submitted by the Department that the committed liability has been fulfilled in all those cases in which claims were made within the stipulated and extended period for those projects meeting all the required criteria and filing the requisite documents.

3.20 The Committee in their earlier Reports had drawn the attention of the Department towards the committed liability for the EAS Watershed projects being implemented earlier by the Department of Rural Development and transferred to the Department of Land Resources during 1999-2000. The Committee in their 53rd Action Taken Report on Demands for Grants (2003-04) had recommended to critically assess the implementation of EAS Watershed projects and urged the Government to tighten monitoring mechanism in the States where the implementation of projects was slow. The Committee are dismayed to note that instead of taking the earnest steps in the right direction, the Department has decided to terminate the above scheme. The Committee find that funds required for completion of EAS watershed projects were Rs. 1,485.26 crore, out of that from 1999-2000 to 2003-2004, Rs. 9.68 crore could be released by the Department. They are further alarmed to note the reply of the Department that the committed liability has been filled in those cases in which claims were made within stipulated and extended period. The Committee are unable to comprehend from the replies the fate of the projects, which were ongoing and for which the State Governments could not come forward to demand for the outlay. The Committee are anguished to note how the different schemes are transferred from one Department to another and the various ongoing projects are being handled by them. The Committee deplore the l a c k a d a i s i c a l approach of the Department and would like to know the fate of the

incomplete EAS projects so as to enable them to analyze the position further.

Drought Prone Areas Programme (DPAP)

3.21 The Drought Prone Areas Programme (DPAP) was launched in 1973-74 to tackle the special problems faced by those fragile areas which are constantly affected by the drought conditions. These areas are characterized by large human and cattle populations which are continuously putting heavy pressure on the already fragile natural resources base for food, fodder and fuel. This continuous biotic pressure is leading to fast and continuous depletion of vegetative cover, increasing soil erosion and fast receding ground water levels due to continuous exploitation without any effort to recharge the underground aquifers.

Objectives

3.22 The basic objective of the programme is to minimize the adverse effects of drought on production of crops and livestock and productivity of land, water and human resources ultimately leading to the drought proofing of the affected areas. The programme also aims to promote overall economic development and improve the socio-economic conditions of the resource poor and disadvantaged sections inhabiting the programme areas.

3.23 As per Department of Land Resources, there are 972 DPAP blocks in the country and DPAP coverage extends to 972 blocks of 182 districts in 16 States having geographical area of about 7.46 lakh sq. kms. At present, there is no proposal to change the coverage under DPAP.

Funding pattern

3.24 Until March 1999 the programme allocation was being shared on 50:50 basis between the Centre and the State Governments. However, with effect from 1st April, 1999, the allocation is shared on 75:25 basis between the Centre and State Government in respect of new projects sanctioned after 1999-2000.

The allocations and utilization during 9th Plan and first three

years of 10th Plan

3.25 During 9th Plan (1997-2002) period, the year-wise allocation and the amount actually released are as under:—

(Rs. in crore)

Year	BE	RE	Amount released
1997-1998	115.00	110.75	90.75
1998-1999	95.00	73.00	73.00
1999-2000	95.00	95.00	94.99
2000-2001	190.00	190.00	189.58
2001-2002	210.00	210.00	208.99
Total	705.00	678.75	657.31

3.26 Budget allocation for 2002-03, 2003-04 and 2004-05 during 10th Plan is as under:—

(Rs. in crore)

Year	BE	RE	Expenditure
2002-2003	250.00	250.00	250.00
2003-2004	295.00	295.00	295.00
2004-2005	300.00	*	28.48**

*Not yet finalised.

**As on 30.6.2004.

3.27 During the course of examination the Committee wanted to know the reasons for the shortfall in financial achievement during the 9th Plan, the Department in written notes stated as under:—

"It may be stated that first batch of watershed projects were sanctioned in 1995-96. During the subsequent years, the number of projects sanctioned were negligible as at that time it was felt that new projects would be sanctioned only after completion or near completion of the projects sanctioned in 1995-96. Thus up to 1998-99, the releases mainly pertain to ongoing projects only. In 1997-98 the outstanding liability of the ongoing projects reduced and the programme being demand driven, the Department did not get expected proposals for release. Thus there was shortfall of release. It is pertinent to point out that the shortfall was only in respect of 1997-98."

3.28 Against the above allocation and utilization of funds during 9th Plan, the Committee wanted to know the physical achievement in regard to DPAP projects sanctioned during 9th Plan period, the Department furnished the following year-wise figures:—

Year	Projects sanctioned
1997-1998	406
1998-1999	880
1999-2000	2278
2000-2001	3371
2001-2002	2050
Total	8987

3.29 The present status of the projects sanctioned under 9th Five Year Plan and the procedure of release of outlay is as under:—

"The funds for projects are released in 7 instalments. The number of instalment released is, therefore, a parameter to determine the status of a project. With reference to instalment released, the status of the projects sanctioned during 9th Five Year Plan is as under:—

No. of instalments released	No. of projects
7	1273
6	519
5	1181
4	922
3	1955
2	1360
1	1777
Total projects sanctioned during 9th Plan	8987

3.30 When asked whether Department has maintained any data regarding closure of non-performing projects, the Department in a written note stated as under:—

“Under DPAP 1637 projects sanctioned during 1995-96 to 1997-98 have been foreclosed. The non-performing projects belonging to 1998-99 are also proposed to be foreclosed during the current year.”

3.31 In the Annual Report 2003-04, it has been stated that though the Programme had a positive effect in effectively containing the adverse effect of drought the result was not found to be very encouraging. In addition, many of the States had also been demanding inclusion of additional areas under the Programme.

About the Corrective steps taken so far, the Department has informed as under:—

- (i) System of mid-term evaluation has been introduced for watershed projects under DPAP;
- (ii) The evaluation has been entrusted to the State Governments;

- (iii) Closure of non-performing projects;
- (iv) Establishment of State level and district level Vigilance Committees comprising of MPs and MLAs to monitor and critically assess the performance of the projects;
- (v) Criteria for allocation of new projects to have weighted proportion for performance of ongoing projects;
- (vi) Quick Intensive Evaluation of the projects by independent evaluators;
- (vii) Due emphasis on exit protocol and convergence with other Rural Development Programmes in treatment plans of watersheds selected under DPAP."

3.32 The physical achievement under DPAP projects is as under:—

"Under DPAP 18803 watershed projects covering an area of approximately 94.10 lakh hectares have been sanctioned from 1995-96. During 2002-03, 2478 new projects were sanctioned to treat an area of 12.39 lakh hectares. The number of new projects sanctioned during 2003-04 was 2535 to bring an area of 12.67 lakh hectares under drought proofing. During these two years, a total of 8.69 lakh hectares was also treated under the ongoing projects."

3.33 During 2004-05, a target of sanctioning 2800 new projects has been fixed.

3.34 When asked about the number of projects that could have been completed by 30 June, 2004, the Department stated 4497 projects could be completed by the said period.

3.35 It came out during the course of examination that an area of 7.46 lakh sq. kms. is under DPAP coverage. The Committee also wanted to know how many blocks/area are proposed to be covered during 10th Plan, the Department in a written note informed:—

"At present there is no proposal to change the coverage under DPAP. DPAP projects are taken up only in the said identified areas. During 10th Plan it is proposed to sanction 13,600 new watershed projects covering an area of 68 lakh hectares."

3.36 The Committee find that a laudable Programme *i.e.*, Drought Prone Areas Programme (DPAP) was started in 1973-74 to tackle special problems in the districts which are constantly affected by severe drought conditions. The objective of the Programme was to provide long term solution through watershed projects for land development, water resources development and afforestation, pasture development, besides promoting overall economic development and improving the socio-economic conditions of the covered areas. From the data indicated above, the Committee note that the Department has tried to project a very bright picture about the releases of the money, according to which there was 100 percent expenditure of the allocated amount during the first two years of the 10th Plan, but the analysis of the implementation of the projects indicates another scenario.

3.37 The Committee are constrained to note that during 1995-96 to 1997-98 as much as 1637 projects were foreclosed. Further, the Department targets to close non-performing projects during 1998-99. The Committee, while expressing their concern over the closure of non-performing projects where huge investments are being made, would like to be informed about the status of the closure of the projects since the Scheme was started to comprehend the position in a better way. Besides, the Committee would also like to be apprised of the reasons for poor performance of the projects alongwith the corrective steps taken by the Department so far. They would also like to recommend here that before sanctioning the projects, the viability of the projects should be ascertained so as to avoid foreclosing of such a great number of projects.

3.38 The Committee find that the Department has taken a positive step of mid-term evaluation which has been entrusted to the State Governments. The Committee, would like to be apprised of the status of the survey alongwith the findings where the survey has been completed.

3.39 The Committee also find that one aspect suggested by the Department to strengthen the monitoring mechanism is the establishment of State Level and District level Vigilance Committees comprising of MPs and MLAs to critically assess the monitoring of the projects. The Committee, would like to be apprised in how many States/districts level Vigilance Committee have so far been constituted. The Committee would also like to be apprised about the work done by such Vigilance Committees.

3.40 The Committee note that DPAP is being implemented in districts identified by High-Level Technical Committee under the Chairmanship of Prof. C.H. Hanumantha Rao, Ex-Member, Planning Commission. The said Committee submitted its Report in 1994. The Committee, note that as per the said Report, the Programme is being implemented in all the

identified 972 DPAP Blocks in the country. The Committee find that identification of DPAP Blocks was done a decade back and since then more and more areas could have become drought prone areas. Further, they also note that the State Governments are demanding the Programme for additional districts. In view of the aforesaid position, the Committee feel that there is an urgent need to identify additional DPAP Blocks that would have converted into drought prone areas after 1994. As such, they would like that further identification of DPAP Projects should be undertaken by the Department. Non only that, a comprehensive Plan indicating the outlay desired for coverage should be drawn.

3.41 The Committee, note that DPAP is being extended in 972 Blocks, since 1994. The Committee, would like to be apprised about the number of blocks which could be provided a permanent solution and which need no further Central Assistance under the Programme so as to enable the Committee to analyse the performance of the Programme in real terms.

Desert Development Programme (DDP)

3.42 Desert Development Programme (DDP) was started both in hot desert areas of Rajasthan, Gujarat and Haryana and the cold deserts of Jammu and Kashmir and Himachal Pradesh in 1977-78. From 1995-96, the coverage has been extended to a few more districts in Andhra Pradesh and Karnataka. Desert Development Programme aims at controlling desertification and to conserve, develop and harness land, water and other natural resources for restoration of ecological balance in the long run and also to raise the level of production, income and employment through irrigation, afforestation, dry land farming etc. Funds are released for projects under the programme on 75:25 sharing basis between the Centre, and the State. There are 235 DDP blocks in the country and the programme is in operation in all 235 blocks in 40 districts of 7 States. For the 10th Plan a target of sanctioning 8,800 new projects has been laid down.

Allocation and utilisation during 9th Plan and first two years of 10th Plan

3.43 The year-wise allocation and the amount actually released during 9th Plan Period are as under:—

(Rs. in Crore)

Year	Amount allocated	Amount released
------	------------------	-----------------

	BE	RE	
1997-1998	70.00	70.00	70.01
1998-1999	90.00	80.00	79.80
1999-2000	85.00	85.00	84.99
2000-2001	135.00	135.00	134.99
2001-2002	160.00	150.00	149.88

3.44 The Budget Estimates, Revised Estimates and actual expenditure for the years 2002-03, 2003-04 and Budget Estimates for 2004-05 are as under:—

Year	BE	RE	Expenditure
2002-2003	185.00	185.00	185.00
2003-2004	215.00	215.00	215.00
2004-2005	215.00	*	3.94**

*Not yet finalised.

**As on 30.6.2004

3.45 As regards physical achievement the following information has been furnished:—

"During 2002-03 & 2003-04, 1602 & 1562 projects have been sanctioned respectively. The area targeted for treatment is 8.01 lakh hectares and 7.81 lakhs hectares respectively. During these two years, a total of 9.11 lakhs hectares was also treated under the ongoing projects".

3.46 In this regard statement showing number of districts, number of blocks and projects sanctioned (State-wise) during the period 1995-96 to 30.06.2004 are given at *Appendix-VI*.

3.47 When asked about the present status of the projects sanctioned under 9th Five Year Plan, the Department has stated

that during 9th Five Year Plan, 4,954 projects were sanctioned. Out of these, entire central funds have been released for 217 projects and 1,207 projects are at 80% completion stage. 36 projects have been foreclosed.

3.48 As regards the position of committed liabilities, the following information has been furnished:—

“A watershed project sanctioned under DDP takes 5 years to complete. As such every year, there is an outstanding liability on the projects sanctioned in the previous years. Besides, new projects are sanctioned every year and the first instalment (15% of Central share) is released alongwith the sanction of project. This has ensured full utilization of allocation under DDP during 9th Plan and will also ensure the same during 10th Plan period. Since, the programme is demand driven, it has been observed that not all claims (in respect of ongoing projects) due for central share are received every year from the ZPs/DRDAs. Therefore, the funds are utilised in the ratio of about 70-75% and 25-30% on account of meeting the liability of ongoing projects and 1st instalment of new projects sanctioned every year”.

3.49 When asked about proposed strategy of the Department to ensure 100% utilization of outlay of Rs. 1100 crore earmarked for DDP during 10th Plan, specifically during the year 2004-2005, the Department has stated as under:—

“The releases for ongoing projects and first instalment of the new projects will ensure 100% utilization of outlay earmarked for DDP during 10th Plan. For 2004-05, target for sanction of new project is 1800. This will involve Rs. 60.75 crore. Besides, there are more than 7,850 on-going projects. The release of instalments for these on-going projects would ensure 100% utilization of funds during 2004-05.”

Impact of DDP on Watershed Treatment

3.50 When asked about the impact of DDP in providing permanent solution for the treatment of lands where the projects are being implemented, the Department has stated that the watershed projects create positive impact in checking soil erosion, increasing water table, crop area and overall productivity as revealed in Mid-Term Evaluation

exercises and Impact Assessment Studies.

3.51 DDP has been envisaged as an essentially land based activity with the following objectives:—

- (i) Combating drought and desertification;
- (ii) Mitigating the adverse effects of drought;
- (iii) Encouraging restoration of ecological balance by conserving, developing and harnessing land, water livestock and human resources;
- (iv) Promoting economic development of village community; and
- (v) Improving socio-economic conditions of the resource poor and disadvantaged sections of village community *viz.*, assetless and women through creation and equitable distribution of resources and increased employment opportunities.

3.52 When asked as to how far the programme has resulted in achieving the aforesaid objectives, the Department has replied as under:—

"From 1995-96 to 2003-04, 9876 projects covering an area of 49.38 lakh hectares have been sanctioned. In respect of projects sanctioned during 1995-96 to 1997-98, which have either been completed or are nearing completion, the Ministry had commissioned impact evaluation studies through independent organizations. Some of these studies have since been completed and the results indicate that with the implementation of watershed projects the overall productivity of land and water table have increased and there has been a positive and significant impact on overall economic development in the project areas. The studies also revealed that green vegetative cover has also improved in watershed areas that would have a positive impact in checking soil erosion by water and wind. The availability of fuel wood and fodder has also increased. The impact assessment studies reveal positive outcome of the programme and thus it has the potential to achieve its objectives."

3.53 The Committee in their Report on Demands for Grants (2003-2004) and Action Taken Report on the said Demand had raised the various issues as given below:

- (i) 10 percent of the total identified DDP area is at present being tackled by the Scheme and as such recommended for adequate allocation under the Programme;
- (ii) Huge investments are required for committed liability for ongoing projects and as such there is less scope for additional areas to be covered under DDP.

3.54 The Committee find that inspite of their recommending strongly to enhance outlay, the status-quo with regard to Budget Estimates during 2004-2005 has been maintained as compared to the previous year. The Committee, feel that there is an urgent need to provide adequate allocation to DDP areas and as such would like that their concerns in this regard should be brought before the Planning Commission/Ministry of Finance.

3.55 While recommending for higher outlay, the Committee feel that emphasis has to be given in strengthening the monitoring mechanism so as to improve the implementation of the Programme. From the position of implementation as given by the Department, it seems that there are certain problems. Foremost is the issue of foreclosing projects. They find that during 9th Plan, full allocation for 217 projects was made. Out of that, 36 projects were foreclosed. To enable the Committee to comprehend the position of foreclosure further, they would like to be apprised about the reasons for such foreclosure. The Committee would also like to be apprised about the number of projects foreclosed during each of the years of 10th Plan. The Committee feel that there is some serious lacuna in implementation of such a priority Scheme due to which after making heavy investments on projects, some are being foreclosed, thus wasting the valuable resources.

3.56 The Committee also feel that viability of the projects is not being ascertained by the Implementing Agencies. The Committee, would like the Department to have a detailed analysis of the position and explain the Committee accordingly.

Technology Development, Extension & Training Scheme

3.57 The technological support is very critical for the development of wastelands. Proper area specific strategy has to be developed keeping in view the agro-climatic conditions and capability of the soil. The Central Sector Scheme of Technology Development, Extension & Training (TDET) was launched during the year 1993-94 to develop/ reclamation of wastelands for sustainable production of food, fuel wood, fodder etc.

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

3.59 As per the written replies the following are the actuals for 2002-2003 and BE, RE and releases for 2003-04 and BE for 2004-05 under the scheme:—

(Rs. in crore)

Year	Amount
Actual (2002-2003)	13.70
BE (2003-2004)	17.00
RE (2003-2004)	14.00
Releases (2003-2004)	15.08
BE (2004-2005)	15.00
Releases (upto 30.06.2004)	0.26

3.60 As against the actuals of Rs. 13.70 crore for 2002-2003 and Revised Estimate of Rs. 14.00 crore during 2003-2004, Rs. 15.00 crore have been proposed for 2004-2005.

3.61 The Committee have been informed that Technology Development, Extension & Training (TDET) Scheme is not meant for routine development activities. Under the scheme, small pilot projects are taken up for testing and validating relevant technologies for wastelands development, which when found successful are expected to be widely

adopted in the regular developmental programmes by the State Governments and all other agencies concerned. Since a considerable extent of action research is involved in these pilot projects, only experienced research organizations have the capacity and expertise to implement these pilot projects. With this limited scope, funds sought for the scheme are adequate. Further, funds have been sought keeping in view the expenditure pattern during previous years.

3.62 Further, the Department have been informed that upto March 2004, 148 projects have been sanctioned under the scheme. Out of that, 41 projects have been completed and 22 projects foreclosed and out of the ongoing 85 projects, 35 projects are expected to be completed during the year 2004-2005 and remaining projects are expected to be completed by 2007-2008.

3.63 As per the written replies in order to develop database DOLR in collaboration with National Remote Sensing Agency (NRSA) Hyderabad has brought out an Wastelands Atlas of India. A project has been sanctioned to NRSA, Hyderabad for updation of the Wastelands Atlas of India. It is expected that the updated version of the Atlas would be brought out by the NRSA by the end of this year.

3.64 When asked whether TDET scheme coordinate with implementing agencies of different area development programmes of IWDP, DPAP and DDP in various States, the Department has stated that there is no formal mechanism for coordinating with implementing agencies of different area development programmes in various States. However, the Wastelands Atlas of India is being utilised by the implementing agencies for identifying wastelands to be developed under different area development programmes. Further, Technical Brochures (TBs) brought out by the DOLR on various technologies for development of different categories of wastelands have also been circulated to all stakeholders for use in planning and implementing wastelands development projects. So far, the following TBs have been brought out by the Department on the basis of successful pilot projects sanctioned under TDET scheme and inputs by relevant research organizations.

1. Rehabilitation of Gullied and Ravine Lands.
2. Reclamation and Management of Waterlogged Salt Affected Soils.

3. Reclamation of Areas Degraded by Mining and Industrial Waste.
4. Rehabilitation of Wastelands of Arid Ecosystem.
5. Making Waterlogged Areas Productive through Drainage.
6. Development of Lands Affected by Shifting Cultivation.
7. Agro-Forestry Species of Silviculture, Horticulture, Pasture and Medicinal Plants for different Agro-eco Regions of India.

3.65 The Committee in their Report on Demands for Grants of the year 2003-2004 had recommended for enhanced outlay keeping in view the objectives of the programme *i.e.*, technology development, extension and training to farmers, extension officials of the State Departments, etc. The Committee find from the information furnished by the Department that they are satisfied with the existing allocations. To enable the Committee to appreciate the position of the Department, the Committee would like the Department to furnish the information with regard to the work done under the scheme indicating *inter-alia*, the number of farmers or extension officials trained so far, demonstration of the technologies undertaken in the field, etc. The Committee would like to know categorically the achievements made with regard to the objectives enshrined under this programme in the Performance Budget 2004-2005 (P.28) so as to assess the viability and effectiveness of the scheme in future and to forestall the reasons for closure of the projects.

B. SCHEME-WISE EVALUATION OF PROGRAMMES UNDER LAND REFORMS DIVISION

Computerisation of Land Records (CLR)

3.66 The Centrally Sponsored Scheme on Computerisation of Land Records (CLR) was started in 1988-89 with 100 percent financial assistance as a pilot project in eight States with a view to removing the problems inherent in the manual systems of maintenance and updating of Land Records and with the sole objective of ensuring issue of timely and accurate copy of records of rights to the land owners. The Committee have been informed that the total number of districts in the country are

593 and tehsils/taluks about 4500. So far 582 districts, 3142 tehsils/taluks/blocks and 201 Sub-divisions have been covered under the Scheme. The remaining 11 districts which are not covered are in the State of Meghalaya and UTs of Andaman & Nicobar, Diu and Lakshadweep. It is also submitted by the Department that remaining 11 districts are proposed to be covered during the 10th Plan Period within the approved outlay. Hence, no additional funds will be required.

3.67 During the 9th Plan Period, against the outlay of Rs. 150.00 crore, the revised estimate was Rs. 171 crore out of which the expenditure was Rs. 169.14 crore.

3.68 During 10th Plan Period the outlay under the Scheme is Rs. 400 crore.

3.69 The details regarding BE, RE and expenditure incurred during the first three years of the 10th Plan are as under:—

(Rs. in crore)

Year	BE	RE	Expenditure
2002-2003	55.00	35.00	31.18
2003-2004	40.00	40.00	35.77
2004-2005	50.00	—	8.87 (upto 30.6.04)

3.70 When asked for the reasons for getting lesser allocation at R.E. stage and further shortfall in expenditure during 2002-2003 and 2003-2004, the Department has replied that the scheme of Computerisation of Land Records is a demand-driven scheme and proposals are received from the Revenue Departments of the State as per their requirement and capacity to utilize the available funds. During implementation of the Scheme, some of the States find difficulty to utilize the released funds in time due to various reasons. Therefore, they do not request for additional funds under the Scheme. In view of this, allocation at the Revised Estimates (RE) has been reduced.

3.71 The reasons for shortfall of expenditure during 2002-2003 and 2003-2004 are that funds of Rs. 5 crore earmarked each year for the

North Eastern States could not be utilised fully because of non-receipt of proposals from these States.

3.72 However, since inception of the scheme Rs. 17.19 crore has been released to North Eastern States under the scheme of CLR, out of which Rs. 10.88 crore has been utilized.

3.73 The Department has stated in written replies that since inception of the Scheme Rs. 300.51 crore has been released to States, out of which Rs. 204.41 crore (68 per cent) has been utilized.

3.74 When asked about the monitoring of the Scheme, the Department has stated that most of the States are furnishing Quarterly Progress Reports (QPRs) except the States of Assam, Manipur, Tripura, Arunachal Pradesh, Nagaland, J&K, Punjab, Bihar, Jharkhand and the UTs of Dadra & Nagar Haveli, Chandigarh, who are not submitting QPRs regularly.

3.75 As per the written replies, Lal Bahadur Shastri National Academy of Administration (LBSNAA), Mussoorie has been entrusted to evaluate the implementation of the CLR Scheme in the States of Karnataka, Rajasthan, West Bengal, Haryana and Tamil Nadu and submitted its Report to the Department for the State of Karnataka.

3.76 The Evaluation Study Report reveals that the programme of computerization is a successful application of information technology in Karnataka which has succeeded in converting a "closed system" into a "transparent system". It has brought accountability in the Revenue Administration, checked corruption and reduced harassment to the extent possible and provided easy accessibility of land and related data to all concerned.

3.77 In the 47th Report (2003) of the Committee, the Department has submitted that the States *viz.* Assam, Bihar, Jharkhand, Jammu & Kashmir, Punjab, Manipur and Uttaranchal are lagging behind in the implementation of the Computerisation of Land Records Scheme. When asked about the latest position of the implementation of the Scheme in the above mentioned States it has been stated in the written note that these States have not shown much progress in the implementation of the Scheme of CLR as compared to last year.

3.78 The Department has also submitted that they are in the process of revising the guidelines of CLR in consultation with the officials of the National Informatics Centre (NIC) and the State Governments. However, the same have not yet been finalized.

3.79 The Committee in their earlier Reports on Demands for Grants had expressed their concern over the under utilization of outlay under the Computerisation of Land Records (CLR). They find that no progress seems to have been made in the under performing States as has been admitted by the Department. The Committee are constrained to note that the underspending is a recurrent feature as noticed year after year. They find from the data furnished by the Department that since inception of the Scheme, only 68 per cent of the funds could be utilised. Similar is the position in the North Eastern States, where out of Rs. 17.19 crore, Rs. 10.88 crore could be utilised. The Committee, further note that the Evaluation Study Report in case of Karnataka has revealed the positive impact of the Programme, whereby it has resulted in accountability in the revenue administration, checking corruption and reducing harassment to the extent possible. In view of the aforesaid scenario, the Committee would like the Department to analyse the position State-wise and find the difficulties being experienced by them in the implementation of the Programme and apprise the Committee accordingly.

3.80 The Committee further note Lal Bahadur Shastri National Academy of Administration, Mussoorie has been entrusted with the evaluation of the Scheme in the States of Karnataka, Rajasthan, West Bengal, Haryana and Tamil Nadu. They also note that in the case of Karnataka, the Evaluation Study Report has been received. The Committee, would like that similar evaluation in the remaining States should be undertaken and they should be apprised about the findings of the Study, when completed.

3.81 The Committee also note that the Department is in the process of revising the guidelines of Computerisation of Land Records. The Committee, would like that their recommendations made in the respective Reports should be considered while revising the aforesaid guidelines.

Strengthening of Revenue Administration and Updating of Land Records (SRA&ULR)

3.82 With a view to assisting the States/UTs in the task of updating of Land Records, a new scheme was started in 1987-88 namely, "Strengthening of Revenue Administration and Updating of Land Records" (SRA&ULR) as a Centrally Sponsored Scheme. Under this Scheme, financial assistance is provided to the States on a 50:50 sharing basis between the Centre and the State. However,

some Union territories are given 100% financial assistance under the scheme.

3.83 As per the written note, the Financial Achievement during 9th Plan is as below:—

(Rs. in crore)

Period during 9th Plan	Amount
BE	92.60
RE	87.60
Expenditure	86.18

3.84 During the 10th Plan Period, the outlay under the Scheme is Rs. 200 crore against the proposed amount of Rs. 350 crore.

3.85 The details regarding BE, RE and expenditure incurred during the first three years of 10th Plan are as under:—

Year	BE	RE	Expenditure
2002-2003	35.00	20.00	20.73
2003-2004	35.00	25.00	24.46
2004-2005	20.00	—	5.34 (upto 30.6.04)

3.86 As per the written note all the States/UTs have been covered under the Scheme and Government of India has released Rs. 265.97 crore to States/UTs as the Central share, out of which Rs. 174.58 crore (66 per cent) has been utilised.

3.87 When asked about the reasons for huge underspending with the States/UTs, the Department has stated that due to resource crunch some States are not providing their matching share of 50% in time which resulted in unspent balance with the State.

3.88 The Department has further stated that the States of Assam, Manipur, Meghalaya, Nagaland and Tripura have not utilised their share fully.

3.89 When asked about the position of land records in North-Eastern States, the Department has stated that the system of land records and land administration prevalent in the rest of the country does not exist in the hilly and tribal areas of the North-Eastern States, because cadastral survey has not been done no land records exist. In some of these States, there is no legislation regarding land and land related matters. Though individual ownership of land has been developed in some areas, a good deal of land is still owned communally. North-Eastern States have been requested to carry out survey and settlement where it has not been done. State Government of Mizoram and Nagaland have started survey and settlement with the financial support from Govt. of India under the scheme of SRA&ULR.

3.90 In the 53rd Report (2003) of the Committee, the Department has submitted that to make SRA & ULR Scheme more successful Government of India is considering revising the existing funding ratio of 50:50 to 75:25 between the Centre and the State and 90:10 for the North-Eastern States.

3.91 When asked about the final decision taken by the Department regarding revision in the existing funding pattern of the Scheme of SRA & ULR, the Department has stated that the Planning Commission has not agreed to the proposal and in view of it, the Government is not considering a change in the existing ratio of funding under the Scheme of SRA&ULR.

3.92 The Committee note that although during the years 2002-2003, 2003-2004, the allocation available at RE stage could be fully utilised, there was huge cut at RE stage. The Committee, further note that out of the allocation of Rs. 265.97 crore, so far under the Scheme Rs. 174.58 crore *i.e.* 66 percent could be utilised. The Committee, feel that underspending is a recurrent feature for which the allocation has been reduced at RE stage. The Committee, would like that the Department should find out the reasons for underspending from each of the States/Union Territories and take the corrective action in this regard. The Committee should be intimated about this.

3.93 The Committee have repeatedly been expressing their concern over the sorry state of affairs of land records in North-Eastern States, where even the cadastral survey has not been done so far. They are constrained to note that in North Eastern States, no land records exist. Further alarming is the situation that there is no legislation regarding land and land related

matters. In spite of repeatedly recommending, the North Eastern States have yet to come forward to maintain the land records. The Committee feel that the Union Government has to play a proactive role in this regard after consultation with the North Eastern States. They should be impressed upon the urgency of having land records.

3.94 The Committee note that the Government had a proposal to revise the existing funding ratio of 50:50 to 75:25 between the Centre and the States and 90:10 for the North Eastern States. They also find that Planning Commission has not agreed to the said proposal. The Committee feel that the States which could not come forward for the Programme may have the main problem of providing 50 percent of the State's share. In view of this, the Committee would like the Department to interact with the under performing States and accordingly place the position before the Planning Commission so as to enable them to appreciate the proposals of the Department in this regard. The Committee should also be apprised about the final decision taken in this regard.

17 ; , 2004 ,
 26 , 1926 () .

APPENDIX I

STATEMENT SHOWING OUTLAY AND CORRESPONDING EXPENDITURE DURING NINTH & TENTH PLANS (FROM 1997-98 TO 2004-05)

(Rs. in crore)

Sl. No.	Name of Scheme	9th Plan		10th Plan		2001-2002			
		Plan Outlay	Actual Exp.	As Proposed	As agreed by Planning Commission	Exp. As on 30.6.04	BE	RE	Actual Exp.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1.	Drought Prone Areas Programme	400.00	399.52	1600.00	1500.00	573.47	210.00	210.00	209.52
2.	Desert Development Programme	295.00	285.03	1200.00	1100.00	439.20	160.00	150.00	150.03
3.	Computerisation of Land Records	95.00	92.21	500.00	400.00	75.81	45.00	45.00	44.36
4.	SRA&ULR	55.00	48.93	200.00	200.00	50.28	30.00	25.00	23.94
5.	Consolidation of Land Holdings	2.00	0.00	0.00	—	—	1.00	0.00	0.00
6.	I.W.D.P.*	910.00	763.25	1900.00	1800.00	834.58	430.00	405.00	376.35
7.	Tech. Dev. Ext. and Training Centre	27.00	20.91	100.00	90.00	29.04	15.00	12.00	9.93

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
8.	Investment Promotional Scheme	1.00	0.22	0.00	—	—	0.50	0.20	0.12
9.	Support to NGOs/Vas Scheme	1.00	0.40	0.00	—	—	0.00	0.00	0.00
10.	Appraisal, Monitoring and Evaluation	6.00	0.25	100.00	71.00	4.133	5.00	0.20	0.05
11.	Communication	2.50	1.12	0.00	—	—	0.50	0.50	0.26
12.	Board Secretariat	5.50	4.05	0.00	—	—	3.00	2.10	1.67
13.	New Initiatives	0.00	—	—	1000.00	—	—	—	—
	Pradhan Mantri Grameen Jal Samvardhan Yojana	0.00	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	Bio Fuels	0.00	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	TOTAL PLAN	1800.00	1615.89	5600.00	6526.00	2007.10	900.00	850.00	816.23
1.	NON-PLAN								
	Secretariat Economic Services	1.89	1.67	—	—	6.256	0.99	0.97	0.83
	Total Plan & Non-Plan	1801.89	1617.56	5600.00	6526.00	2013.36	900.99	850.97	817.06

*Includes Externally Aided Projects.

APPENDIX I Contd.

STATEMENT SHOWING OUTLAY AND CORRESPONDING EXPENDITURE
DURING NINTH & TENTH PLANS (FROM 1997-98 TO 2004-05)

(Rs. in crore)

Sl. No.	Name of Scheme	2002-2003			2003-2004			2004-2005		
		BE	RE	Actual Exp.	BE	RE	Actual Exp.	Proposed Outlay	BE	Actual Exp. as on 30.6.04
1	2	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19
1.	Drought Prone Areas Programme	250.00	250.00	250.00	295.00	295.00	294.99	432.00	300.00	28.48
2.	Desert Development Programme	185.00	185.00	185.00	265.00	195.00	214.80	330.00	215.00	39.4
3.	Computerisation of Land Records	55.00	35.00	31.18	40.00	40.00	35.77	65.00	50.00	8.86
4.	SRA&ULR	35.00	20.00	20.73	25.00	25.00	24.21	35.00	20.00	5.34
5.	Consolidation of Land Holdings	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	—	—	—	—	—
6.	I.W.D.P.*	450.00	440.00	413.45	401.00	380.00	368.17	460.00	448.00	52.96
7.	Tech. Dev. Ext. and Training Centre	17.00	16.00	13.70	17.00	14.00	15.08	15.00	15.00	0.26

1	2	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19
8.	Investment Promotional Scheme	1.00	0.10	0.02	0.10	0.10	0.10	—	0.10	—
9.	Support to NGOs/Vas Scheme	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	—	—	—	—	—
10.	Appraisal, Monitoring and Evaluation	5.95	2.95	3.11	4.85	0.54	0.523	6.00	1.20	0.02
11.	Communication	1.05	0.95	—	1.05	0.36	0.34	—	1.70	0.14
12.	Board Secretariat	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	—	—	—	—	—
13.	New Initiatives	—	—	—	1.00	—	—	—	—	—
	Pradhan Mantri Grameen Jal Samvardhan Yojana	—	—	—	—	—	—	200.00	200.00	—
	Bio Fuels	—	—	—	—	—	—	10.00	10.00	—
	TOTAL PLAN	1000.00	950.00	917.19	1050.00	950.00	954.45	1553.00	1261.00	135.46
	NON-PLAN	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	Secretariat Economic Services	3.81	3.62	2.68	3.66	—	2.826	—	3.48	0.75
	Total Plan & Non-Plan	1003.81	953.62	919.87	1053.66	—	957.28	1553.00	1264.48	136.21

*Includes Externally Aided Projects.

APPENDIX II

OVERALL POSITION OF THE PROPOSED, AGREED TO ALLOCATION DURING EACH YEAR OF 9TH AND 10TH PLANS AND PHYSICAL AND FINANCIAL PROGRESS SCHEME-WISE

(Rs. in crore)

Scheme	9th Plan Allocations		10th Plan Allocations	
	Proposed	Agreed/ Actual	Proposed	Agreed/ Actual
IWDP	3360.00	1148.60	1900.00	1800.00
DPAP	700.00	705.00	1600.00	1500.00
DDP	1430.00	540.00	1200.00	1100.00
CLR	332.46	178.00	500.00	400.00
SRA & ULR	326.00	92.60	200.00	200.00
TDET	106.00	51.00	100.00	90.00
Others	291.00	52.10	100.00	71.00
Externally Aided Projects	—	—	365.00	365.00
New Initiatives	—	—	—	1000.00
Total	6545.46	2767.30	5965.00	6526.00

FINANCIAL PROGRESS

(Rs. in crore)

Scheme	9th Plan		10th Plan	
	Targets	Achievements	Targets	Achievements (up to 31.3.2004)
1	2	3	4	5
IWDP	910.00	763.25	1800.00	781.63

1	2	3	4	5
DPAP	400.00	399.50	1500.00	545.00
DDP	295.00	285.03	1100.00	400.00
CLR	95.00	92.21	400.00	66.95
SRA & ULR	55.00	48.93	200.00	45.19
TDE & T	27.00	20.91	90.00	28.78

PHYSICAL PROGRESS

(Area in lakh hectares)

Scheme	9th Plan		10th Plan	
	Targets	Achievements (Area covered)	Targets (New Projects) to be taken up)	Achievements (up to 31.3.2004)
IWDP	11.81	10.24	68.00	13.420
DPAP	*	44.935	68.00	25.065
DDP	*	24.77	44.00	15.820
CLR	*	259 districts	*	
SRA&ULR	*		*	
TDET	0.18	0.339	0.35	0.301

*Not fixed.

APPENDIX III

STATE-WISE EXTENT OF WASTELANDS IDENTIFIED

(Area in m.ha.)

Sl. No.	State	No. of districts covered	Total Geog. Area of districts covered	Total wastelands area in districts covered	% of wastelands to total geog. Area
1	2	3	4	5	6
1.	Andhra Pradesh	23	27.50	5.17	18.81
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	13	8.37	1.83	21.88
3.	Assam	23	7.84	2.00	25.52
4.	Bihar	55	17.38	2.09	12.08
5.	Goa	02	0.37	0.06	16.57
6.	Gujarat	25	19.60	4.30	21.95
7.	Haryana	19	4.42	0.37	8.45
8.	Himachal Pradesh	12	5.57	3.16	56.87
9.	Jammu & Kashmir*	14	10.14	6.54	64.55
10.	Karnataka	27	19.18	2.08	10.87
11.	Kerala	14	3.88	0.14	3.73
12.	M.P.	62	44.34	6.97	15.72
13.	Maharashtra	32	30.77	5.35	17.38
14.	Manipur	09	2.23	1.29	58.00
15.	Meghalaya	07	2.24	0.99	44.16

1	2	3	4	5	6
16.	Mizoram	03	2.11	0.41	19.31
17.	Nagaland	07	1.65	0.84	50.69
18.	Orissa	30	15.57	2.13	13.71
19.	Punjab	17	5.03	0.22	4.42
20.	Rajasthan	32	34.22	10.56	30.87
21.	Sikkim	04	0.71	0.36	50.30
22.	Tripura	04	1.05	0.13	12.17
23.	Tamil Nadu	29	13.00	2.30	17.70
24.	Uttar Pradesh	83	29.44	3.88	13.17
25.	West Bengal	18	8.87	0.57	6.44
26.	Union Territories	20	1.09	0.05	5.23
Total		584	316.64	63.85	20.17

*Un-surveyed area (J&K) 12.0849

Total Geographical Area 328.7263

APPENDIX IV

THE STATEMENT REGARDING THE FUNDS RELEASED UNDER IWDP IN THE
NORTH EASTERN STATES FOR THE PROJECTS APPROVED SINCE 1995-96

(Rs. in lakh)

Sl. No.	Name of the State	No. of Projects	Project Area (in ha.)	Project Cost (Rs. in lakhs)	Funds released under IWDP during the period			
					1995-1996	1996-1997	1997-1998	1998-1999
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
NORTH-EASTERN STATES								
1.	Arunachal Pradesh	20	95971	5728.26	0.00	0.00	0.00	9.00
2.	Assam	54	373688	21735.70	0.00	0.00	36.78	24.52
3.	Manipur	19	148968	7608.72	0.00	0.00	135.10	285.52
4.	Meghalaya	14	62725	3543.28	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
5.	Mizoram	22	193803	11628.18	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
6.	Nagaland	29	275930	15035.80	15.00	102.00	120.00	445.00
7.	Sikkim	12	96006	4649.78	0.00	20.82	105.41	90.18
8.	Tripura	4	19423	1165.38	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
9.	CAPART							
	Total of NE	174	1266514	71095.10	15.00	122.82	397.29	854.22

APPENDIX IV *Contd.*

THE STATEMENT REGARDING THE FUNDS RELEASED UNDER IWDP IN THE
NORTH EASTERN STATES FOR THE PROJECTS APPROVED SINCE 1995-96

(Rs. in lakh)

Sl. No.	Name of the State	Funds released under IWDP during the period							Total Releases
		1999-2000	2000-2001	2001-2002	2002-2003	2003-2004	2004-2005		
1	2	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	
NORTH-EASTERN STATES									
1.	Arunachal Pradesh	0.00	—	85.85	458.54	351.89	—	905.28	
2.	Assam	197.69	520.01	1619.93	1440.19	1729.91	270.948	5839.98	
3.	Manipur	167.56	329.56	327.99	642.18	313.25	167.49	2368.65	
4.	Meghalaya	65.09	142.28	53.37	23.68	443.65	—	728.07	
5.	Mizoram	0.00	451.32	481.91	1156.16	612.44	67.75	2769.58	
6.	Nagaland	264.42	992.00	1162.69	1740.56	1868.31	—	6709.98	
7.	Sikkim	261.56	203.00	371.88	332.62	268.98	—	1654.45	
8.	Tripura	0.00	0.00	160.23	0.00	31.61	31.27	223.11	
9.	CAPART	—	—	—	—	1000.00	—	1000.00	
Total of NE		956.32	2638.17	4263.85	5793.93	6620.04	537.46	22199.10	

APPENDIX V

UNSPENT OUTLAYS OF DEPARTMENT OF LAND RESOURCES FOR NORTH EASTERN AREAS

RELEASES TO NON-NE AND NE STATES FROM 2000-2001 TO 2003-2004

(Rs. in crore)

Sl. No.	Name of the Scheme	Non-NE States N.E. States	2000-2001					2001-2002				
			B.E.	R.E.	Releases	Savings w.r.t. REs	Savings w.r.t. BEs	B.E.	R.E.	Releases	Savings w.r.t. REs	Savings w.r.t. BEs
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
1.	Drought Prone Areas Programme Total-DPAP	Non-NE States NE States	190.00 0.00	190.00 0.00	190.00 0.00	0.00 0.00	0.00 0.00	210.00 0.00	210.00 0.00	209.52 0.00	0.48 0.00	0.48 0.00
2.	Desert Development Programme Total-DDP	Non-NE States NE States	135.00 0.00	135.00 0.00	135.00 0.00	0.00 0.00	0.00 0.00	160.00 0.00	150.00 0.00	150.03 0.00	-0.03 0.00	9.97 0.00
3.	Computerisation of Land Records Total-CLR	Non-NE States NE States	45.00 5.00	45.50 2.50	45.35 2.50	0.15 0.00	-0.35 2.50	40.00 5.00	40.00 5.00	40.24 4.12	-0.24 0.88	-0.24 0.88
			50.00	48.00	44.35	3.64	5.64	45.00	45.00	44.36	0.64	0.64

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
4.	Strengthening of Revenue Administration & Up-dating of Land Records	Non-NE States NE States	22.50 2.50	21.90 3.10	21.89 3.10	0.01 0.00	0.61 -0.60	25.00 5.00	20.00 5.00	19.65 4.29	0.35 0.71	5.35 0.71
	Total-SRA&ULR		25.00	25.00	24.99	0.01	0.01	30.00	25.00	23.94	1.06	6.06
5.	Consolidation of Land Holdings	Non-NE States NE States	0.90 0.10	0.00 0.00	0.00 0.00	0.00 0.00	0.90 0.10	1.00 0.00	0.00 0.00	0.00 0.00	0.00 0.00	1.00 0.00
	Total-CLH		1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00
6.	Integrated Wastelands Development Programme	Non-NE States NE States	398.80 81.20	365.22 21.78	360.12 26.78	5.10 -5.00	38.68 54.42	351.00 79.00	331.00 74.00	333.71 42.64	-2.71 31.36	17.29 36.36
	Total-IWDP		480.00	387.00	386.90	0.10	93.10	430.00	405.00	376.35	28.65	53.65
7.	Technology Development Extension & Training Scheme	Non-NE States NE States	10.80 1.20	10.80 0.07	10.91 0.07	-0.11 0.00	-0.11 1.13	14.00 1.00	11.00 1.00	9.30 0.63	1.70 0.37	4.70 0.37
	Total-TDE&T		12.00	10.87	10.98	-0.11	1.02	15.00	12.00	9.93	2.07	5.07
8.	Others	Non-NE States NE States	7.00 0.00	4.13 0.00	3.94 0.00	0.19 0.00	3.06 0.00	9.00 0.00	3.00 0.00	2.10 0.00	0.90 0.00	6.90 0.00
			7.00	4.13	3.94	0.19	3.06	9.00	3.00	2.10	0.90	6.90
	Total Non-NE States	Non-NE States	810.00	772.55	767.21	5.34	42.79	810.00	765.00	764.55	0.45	45.45
	Total NE States	NE States	90.00	27.45	32.45	-5.00	57.55	90.00	85.00	51.68	33.32	38.32
	Total Non NE+NE		900.00	800.00	799.66	0.34	100.34	900.00	850.00	816.23	33.77	83.77

APPENDIX V—Contd.

UNSPENT OUTLAYS OF DEPARTMENT OF LAND RESOURCES FOR NORTH EASTERN AREAS
RELEASES TO NON-NE AND NE STATES FROM 2000-2001 TO 2003-2004

(Rs. in crore)

Sl. No.	Name of the Scheme	Non-NE States N.E. States	2002-2003					2003-2004				
			B.E.	R.E.	Releases	Savings w.r.t. RES	Savings w.r.t. BEs	B.E.	R.E.	Releases	Savings w.r.t. RES	Savings w.r.t. BEs
1	2	3	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23
1.	Drought Prone Areas Programme Total-DPAP	Non-NE States NE States	250.00 0.00	250.00 0.00	250.00 0.00	0.00 0.00	0.00 0.00	295.00 0.00	295.00 0.00	295.00 0.00	0.00 0.00	0.00 0.00
2.	Desert Development Programme Total-DDP	Non-NE States NE States	185.00 0.00	185.00 0.00	185.00 0.00	0.00 0.00	0.00 0.00	265.00 0.00	215.00 0.00	215.00 0.00	0.00 0.00	50.00 0.00
3.	Computerisation of Land Records Total-CLR	Non-NE States NE States	50.00 5.00	31.15 5.00	31.10 0.08	0.05 4.92	18.90 4.92	35.00 5.00	35.00 5.00	34.74 1.03	0.26 3.97	0.26 3.97
			55.00	36.15	31.18	4.97	23.82	40.00	40.00	35.77	4.23	4.23

1	2	3	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23
4.	Strengthening of Revenue Administration & Up-dating of Land Records	Non-NE States NE States	30.00 5.00	16.85 5.00	16.31 4.42	0.04 0.58	13.19 0.58	20.00 5.00	20.00 5.00	19.55 4.91	0.45 0.09	0.45 0.09
	Total-SRA&ULR		35.00	21.85	21.23	0.62	13.77	25.00	25.00	24.46	0.54	0.54
5.	Consolidation of Land Holdings	Non-NE States NE States	0.00 0.00	0.00 0.00	0.00 0.00	0.00 0.00	0.00 0.00	0.00 0.00	0.00 0.00	0.00 0.00	0.00 0.00	0.00 0.00
	Total-CLH		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
6.	Integrated Wastelands Development Programme	Non-NE States NE States	362.00 88.00	357.00 83.00	357.00 56.45	0.00 26.55	5.00 31.55	314.00 88.00	301.28 83.00	301.98 66.20	-0.70 16.80	12.02 21.80
	Total-IWDP		450.00	440.00	413.45	26.55	36.55	402.00	384.28	368.18	16.10	33.82
7.	Technology Development Extension & Training Scheme	Non-NE States NE States	15.00 2.00	12.50 2.00	12.50 1.20	0.00 0.80	2.50 0.80	15.00 2.00	12.53 2.00	12.53 2.55	0.00 -0.55	2.47 -0.55
	Total-TDE&T		17.00	14.50	13.70	0.80	3.30	17.00	14.53	15.08	-0.55	1.92
8.	Others	Non-NE States NE States	8.00 0.00	2.50 0.00	2.48 0.63	0.02 -0.63	5.52 -0.63	6.00 0.00	1.44 0.00	0.96 0.00	0.48 0.00	5.04 0.00
			8.00	2.50	3.11	-0.61	4.89	6.00	1.44	0.96	0.48	5.04
	Total Non-NE States	Non-NE States	900.00	855.00	854.89	0.11	45.11	950.00	880.25	879.76	0.49	70.24
	Total NE States	NE States	100.00	95.00	62.78	32.22	37.22	100.00	95.00	74.69	20.31	25.31
	Total Non NE+NE		1000.00	950.00	917.67	32.33	82.33	1050.00	975.25	954.45	20.80	95.55

APPENDIX VI

DESERT DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME

**STATEMENT SHOWING NUMBER OF DISTRICTS, NO. OF BLOCKS,
AND PROJECTS SANCTIONED (STATE-WISE)
DURING 1995-96 TO 30.06.2004**

Sl. No.	Name of the State	No. of Districts	No. of Blocks	Projects sanctioned
1.	Andhra Pradesh	1	16	662
2.	Gujarat	6	52	1974
3.	Haryana	7	45	772
4.	Himachal Pradesh	2	3	420
5.	Jammu & Kashmir	2	12	577
6.	Karnataka	6	22	998
7.	Rajasthan	16	85	4473
Total		40	235	9876

APPENDIX VII

MINUTES OF THE FIRST SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE HELD ON WEDNESDAY, THE 11 AUGUST, 2004

The Committee sat from 1100 hrs. to 1315 hrs. and 1430 hrs. to 1600 hrs. in Committee Room 'E', Basement, Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi.

PRESENT

Shri Kalyan Singh—*Chairman*

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

2. Shri V. Kishore Chandra S. Deo
3. Shri Sandeep Dikshit
4. Shri Mohan Jena
5. Shri Subhash Maharia
6. Shri Hannan Mollah
7. Shri Dawa Narbula
8. Shri A.F. Golam Osmani
9. Shri K.C. Palanisamy
10. Shri Anna Saheb M.K. Patil
11. Shrimati Tejaswini Seeramesh
12. Shri P. Chalapathi Rao
13. Shri Nikhilananda Sar
14. Shri Mohan Singh
15. Shri Sita Ram Singh
16. Shri D.C. Srikantappa
17. Shri Bagun Sumbrai

Rajya Sabha

18. Kumari Nirmala Deshpande
19. Prof. Alka Balram Kshatriya

20. Shri Penumalli Madhu
21. Shri Kalraj Mishra
22. Dr. Faguni Ram
23. Prof. R.B.S. Varma

SECRETARIAT

- | | | |
|---------------------------|---|-----------------------------|
| 1. Shri P.D.T. Achary | — | <i>Additional Secretary</i> |
| 2. Shri V.K. Sharma | — | <i>Joint Secretary</i> |
| 3. Shri K. Chakraborty | — | <i>Director</i> |
| 4. Shrimati Sudesh Luthra | — | <i>Deputy Secretary</i> |
| 5. Shrimati Veena Sharma | — | <i>Under Secretary</i> |
| 6. Shri A.K. Shah | — | <i>Assistant Director</i> |

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

1. Shri M. Shankar, Secretary
2. Shri J. Harinarayan, Additional Secretary
3. Shrimati Lalitha Kumar, Joint Secretary

- | | | |
|--------|-----|-----|
| 2. *** | *** | *** |
| 3. *** | *** | *** |
| 4. *** | *** | *** |
| 5. *** | *** | *** |

[The Committee then adjourned again to take up the evidence of representatives of Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development) on Demands for Grants (2004-2005)]

6. The Committee took oral evidence of the representatives of Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development) on

Demands for Grants 2004-2005. The Secretary, Land Resources then in brief explained to the Committee the overall position with regard to the allocation and expenditure of the Department as well as the projection of the Department during 10th Plan period. He also outlined the features and indicated the problems being faced in regard to the implementation of schemes of the Department. The Committee then discussed in detail the various issues related to the examination of the Demands for Grants (2004-2005) of the Department with special attention to major Centrally Sponsored Schemes of the Department. The representatives of the Department clarified to the queries of the Members.

[The Committee then adjourned to take up the evidence of representatives of Ministry of Panchayati Raj on Demands for Grants 2004-2005].

7. *** *** ***

A record of verbatim proceedings has been kept.

The Committee then adjourned.

APPENDIX VIII

MINUTES OF THE THIRD SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE HELD ON FRIDAY, THE 13 AUGUST, 2004

The Committee sat from 1100 hrs. to 1345 hrs. in Committee Room 'B', Ground Floor, Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi.

PRESENT

Shri Kalyan Singh—*Chairman*

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

2. Shri V. Kishore Chandra S. Deo
3. Shri Sandeep Dikshit
4. Shri Subhash Maharia
5. Shri Hannan Mollah
6. Shri A.F. Golam Osmani
7. Shri Nikhilananda Sar
8. Shri Mohan Singh
9. Shri Sita Ram Singh
10. Shri Bagun Sumbrai

Rajya Sabha

11. Prof. Alka Balram Kshatriya
12. Dr. Faguni Ram
13. Prof. R.B.S. Varma

SECRETARIAT

- | | | |
|---------------------------|---|-----------------------------|
| 1. Shri P.D.T. Achary | — | <i>Additional Secretary</i> |
| 2. Shri V.K. Sharma | — | <i>Joint Secretary</i> |
| 3. Shri K. Chakraborty | — | <i>Director</i> |
| 4. Shrimati Sudesh Luthra | — | <i>Deputy Secretary</i> |
| 5. Shrimati Veena Sharma | — | <i>Under Secretary</i> |
| 6. Shri A.K. Shah | — | <i>Assistant Director</i> |

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

The Committee, thereafter, also considered and adopted the draft Report on Demands for Grants (2004-2005) of the Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development) with a slight modification.

3. The Committee then authorised the Chairman to finalise the aforesaid Draft Reports on the basis of factual verification from the concerned Ministry/Department and present the same to both the Houses of Parliament.

The Committee then adjourned.

APPENDIX IX

STATEMENT OF RECOMMENDATIONS/OBSERVATIONS

Sl. No.	Para No.	Recommendations/Observations
1	2	3
1.	2.12	<p>The Committee note that the Government has furnished two different types of information with regard to BE and actual expenditure during 9th Plan. By examining the two different types of data, the underspending according to one type of data comes to 184.33 crore whereas according to other type of information given, the underspending is around Rs.300 crore. While examining Demands of the previous year, the Committee were informed that the underspending was Rs.184.33 crore. The Committee would like the Department to furnish the accurate data with regard to 9th Plan outlay, revised estimates and actual expenditure, so as to enable the Committee to come to the right conclusions. Besides, the Committee would also emphasise that while furnishing information before Parliament as well as before the Standing Committee, utmost care should be taken to ensure that the data furnished is accurate.</p>
2.	2.13	<p>As could be seen from the aforesaid analysis, the underspending of the outlay is the recurring feature during 9th Plan as well as during the first two years of Tenth Plan. However, the Committee note with satisfaction that the Planning Commission/Ministry of Finance have enhanced the allocation of the Department considerably due to the additional responsibilities given to the</p>

1	2	3
		<p>Department. The Department, during Tenth Plan, has got Rs.926 crore more than what was proposed. While appreciating the increased allocation of the Department, the Committee would like to emphasise the proper and effective utilization of the scarce resources earmarked for each of the schemes of the Department. In no case there should be underspending and efforts should be made to go deep at the root of underspending and create a positive ground for optimum utilization of the scarce resources. The Committee would also like to emphasise that while projecting outlay to the Ministry of Finance / Planning Commission, it should be ensured that projections are neither on the higher side nor on the lower side. The projections to the extent possible should be realistic.</p>
3.	2.14	<p>Further analysis of the data indicate that whereas the overall position of the outlay indicates more than proposed allocation as has been mentioned above, the individual schemes of the Departments indicate another picture. In the major schemes of the Department like IWDP, DPAP DDP, CLR, SRA & ULR, the allocation is Rs.100 crore less than what was proposed to Planning Commission. Similarly, under TDET and other the Department has got the reduced allocation. The Committee find that Tenth Plan allocation has been enhanced due to Rs.1000 crore earmarked for 'New Initiatives'. While analyzing the position of expenditure under 'New Initiatives' the Committee find that Rs.210 crore were allocated during 2004-2005 to implement special projects that would be required to meet certain objectives that otherwise would not have been made through the regular Watershed Devel-</p>

1	2	3
		<p>opment Projects. The Committee are unable to comprehend the reasons for making separate allocations for Watershed Development Projects, when three comprehensive schemes IWDP, DDP, DPAP are the regular schemes of the Department. Not only that, DDP, DPAP cater to the special requirements of DDP, DPAP areas. The Committee fail to understand why a plethora of schemes have been launched by the Department to achieve a single objective. The Committee are of the view that this approach of the Department should be discouraged. The emphasis should be more on the strengthening of the delivery mechanism in the existing schemes and to get better results by more allocation as well as effective monitoring of the implementation.</p>
4.	2.15	<p>Further, the Committee note that under 'New Initiatives' two schemes like (i) Renovation of Traditional Water Bodies, (ii) Development of Bio-fuel are proposed to be launched but no expenditure has been incurred under this head. The Committee appreciate the launching of the aforesaid schemes specifically when the ground water is fast depleting and the Government has to think over reviving the traditional water bodies. However, they note that no planning on the part of the Government is being made before launching a new scheme for which Rs. 1000 crore has been allocated during Tenth Plan and almost half of the time has already elapsed and no expenditure could be made for the 'New Initiatives'. The Committee would like the Department to finalise the guidelines of the scheme expeditiously. They would also like that in future, proper planning should be made before launching and earmarking allocation for</p>

1	2	3
		the new schemes so that the existing schemes do not suffer in the resources starved economy of the country.
5.	2.16	<p>The Committee have analysed the performance of each of the schemes in detail in the subsequent chapters of the Report. The Committee would like to highlight here that in major schemes of the Department like IWDP, DDP and DPAP, there is shortfall in achievement of targets as may be seen from the position given in Appendix-II. Not only in 9th Plan, but also in the two years of Tenth Plan that have passed, the performance of the schemes is not very satisfactory. For example, under IWDP, against the target of 68 lakh hectares, the actual covered area is 13.42 lakh hectares during the half of the time that has passed since the Tenth Plan was launched. The Committee would like the Department to analyze the reasons for the shortfall in targets and take the corrective steps expeditiously. The Committee further note that under DPAP, DDP, CLR, SRA & ULR during 9th Plan and under SRA & ULR and CLR during 10th Plan, no targets could be fixed by the Department. The Committee fail to understand how the achievements under the schemes could be assessed in the absence of targets fixed for the schemes. The Committee would like the Department to indicate the reasons for not fixing the targets under the aforesaid schemes.</p>
6.	2.17	<p>The Committee note that a new scheme is proposed to be launched for renovation of traditional water bodies on a pilot basis, the estimated cost of which is Rs.100 crore. They also find that funds for pilot projects would</p>

1	2	3
		<p>be drawn from the existing programme such as SGRY, PMGSY, DPAP, DDP & IWDP. While the Committee appreciate the proposal of launching the scheme for renovation of traditional water bodies which is the need of the hour, they do not approve of the implementation of the scheme at the cost of the other major schemes of the Department. The Committee deplore the way the planning on the part of the Government is made. They would like that before launching any new schemes, the financial implications should be properly ascertained so that the allocation for other schemes is not disturbed.</p>
7.	2.24	<p>The Committee are happy to note that the Department could exceed the projected targets during 9th Plan period. Against the target of 5 million hectares, the Department could achieve 8.02 million hectares of wasteland during 9th Plan. The Committee further note that during Tenth Plan, the Department has projected to cover 15 million hectares. They find that during the first two years of Tenth Plan 5.460 million hectares could be covered. Similarly, the Committee note that although the targets during Tenth Plan are three times of the targets of 9th Plan, the commensurate allocation during Tenth Plan has not been provided.</p>
8.	2.25	<p>During 9th Plan under the three area development schemes of the Department <i>i.e.</i>, DDP, DPAP and IWDP, Rs.1605 crore were earmarked. Against this during Tenth Plan Rs.4,400 crore have been allocated which is less than three times of what was given during 9th Plan. They also find that the cost of treating wastelands has increased and</p>

1	2	3
		<p>allocation of the Department has also been enhanced from Rs.4,000 to Rs.6,000 per hectare. In view of this scenario, the Committee find that it will not be possible to achieve the targets set during Tenth Plan. The Committee strongly recommend to convince the Ministry of Finance and Planning Commission to provide the adequate allocation to the Department so as to enable them to achieve the set targets during Tenth Plan. While recommending for higher outlay, the Committee would also like the Department to gear up their pace of implementation as the physical achievement during the first two years is not up to the mark. The Committee note that the Department has itself admitted that the physical annual targets of 2.5 million hectares of wastelands have to be doubled in the coming years to achieve the desirable level and as such, doubling of the financial allocation for the area development programmes would be required.</p>
9.	2.26	<p>The Committee are surprised to note that the Government has never tried to analyse the position of wastelands development and technology being used by the other countries for the wastelands development for the reasons best known to them. In Committee's opinion, such a review can help in evolving cost effective and efficient technologies for wastelands development in years to come. The Committee, therefore, recommend the Government to undertake a review of development of wastelands and technologies being used in other countries in the context of wastelands development within the country and apprise the Committee accordingly.</p>

1	2	3
10.	2.32	<p>The Committee find that there is no clarity with regard to objectives of launching Investment Promotional Schemes. On the one side, the Department states that the scheme was started to stimulate involvement of corporate sector/ financial institutions; on the other hand, it has been mentioned that the scheme was meant to help poor land owners who own small wastelands by way of subsidy. The Committee would like to be apprised about the clear position in this regard so as to enable them to comprehend the position with regard to discontinuation of the scheme by the Planning Commission/Ministry of Finance.</p>
11.	2.33	<p>The Committee in their earlier reports had repeatedly been emphasizing to take certain steps to attract private sector/corporate sector in the field of development of wastelands. As regards, the steps taken by the Department in this direction, the Committee feel that these are not sufficient. Only one correspondence was made with the Chairman/Chief Executive of user industries/major corporate houses in the country. In this direction, the Committee further find that as per the Government's own admission, the representatives of Ministry, NABARD, Private sector, Corporate sector, CII, ASSOCHAM, in the various workshops/seminars had assured that they would submit proposals within a short time. It has also been mentioned that nothing came of it later on. The Committee find from the aforesaid position that some sort of enthusiasm was expressed by corporate sector during the meetings but the need was to further pursue with them and convince them with the appropriate strategy as given by the</p>

1	2	3
		Committee in their earlier report as stated above so as to really motivate them to this sector.
12.	2.37	From the survey results, the Committee find that in some of the States the survey indicates positive trends by way of availability of fuel, fodder, increase in vegetative cover and above all in generation of wage employment. The studies reveal that 60per cent of the expenditure in the execution of watershed projects generate wage employment. The Committee also find that as per the Minimum Needs Programme of UPA Government to the assurance of 100 days wage employment to each bread earner of the family has been given. The Committee conclude from the a f o r e s a i d position that development of wastelands is an option to provide wage employment to the poor strata of society. The need of the hour is to chalk out a strategy in coordination with all the Ministries involved in the task and after interaction with State Governments, Panchayats and through them public at large, private sector etc., involved in the task. The Committee would like the Government to ponder over it and chalk out the strategies expeditiously. The Committee should be kept informed about the steps taken.
13.	2.38	The Committee further find that a survey to know about the impact of assessment studies by State Governments is being undertaken. The Committee would like to be informed about the results of the said survey. Besides the Committee feel that after the survey results are available, the same should be revalidated by some independent evaluator and the follow up action with the suitable strategy and

1	2	3
		corrective action should be undertaken so that the big challenge of developing huge wastelands in the country can be successfully met.
14.	2.41	The Committee feel that to analyse the problem related to development of wastelands in the country, it is imperative to know about the ownership status of wastelands. They note that no steps have been taken to maintain the data with regard to wastelands under Common Property Resources. The Committee recommend the Government to take steps to collect the necessary data on ownership basis so as to enable them to address the specific problems of Government CPRs, privately owned land etc.
15.	2.44	The Committee note that important observations have been made by the Planning Commission with regard to functioning of watershed development projects for wastelands development in the country. From the reply furnished by the Government, the Committee feel that in some States like Karnataka, Andhra Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh, Chhattisgarh, Orissa and Tamil Nadu, real work on watershed development projects is already under way. The Committee feel that the work done by these States needs to be emulated by other States in order to address the concerns of the Planning Commission adequately. The Committee hope that the Department of Land Resources being nodal Department will take necessary action in this regard. The Committee are informed that under the guidelines for Hariyali, PRIs have been given a pivotal role to secure greater participation of the people. The Committee would like to know the achievements made in

1	2	3
		<p>this regard. Mere assignment of the role is not enough. The concerns expressed by Planning Commission with regard to watershed programmes need serious introspection. The reply of the Ministry is not adequate. They need to address the observation of Planning Commission categorically to have the remedies.</p>
16.	2.51	<p>The Committee are happy to note that in major wastelands development schemes of the Department, there is an in-built mechanism for the capacity building of Panchayats. Five per cent of outlay under IWDP, DDP and DPAP is earmarked for the purpose. The Committee feel that besides making provision in this regard, there is an urgent need to monitor that the earmarked outlay is spent for the desired purpose for which strict monitoring by the Department is required. The Committee hope that State Government would come forward in this regard and after taking the benefit of this allocation and pooling in other Union and State resources meant for Panchayati Raj empowerment, the schemes will be implemented by PRIs in the true spirit of the Constitution.</p>
17.	2.52	<p>The Committee also like that the similar in-built provision in other schemes of the Department meant for updation of Land Records be made and the Committee informed accordingly.</p>
18.	2.56	<p>The Committee for the last six years have been recommending strongly to bring the various schemes meant for the development of wastelands at present being handled by different Ministries of Government of India under one umbrella. By noting the latest</p>

1	2	3
		<p>position in this regard, the Committee feel that 'in principle' issue of convergence has been agreed to by the concerned Ministries. However, the main reservation expressed by the Ministries is their unwillingness to transfer area of activity being undertaken by them in this regard. The Committee also find that Department of Land Resources, has again submitted a Cabinet Note on setting up of like 'Lok Nayak Jayaprakash Narayan Watershed Mission' under which all the activities related to watershed and soil conversion would be brought. They also note that the matter for the time being has been deferred. The Committee further note that in the absence of convergence, the Government has not been able to make some integrated planning on the huge task of developing wastelands in the country. In view of this scenario, the Committee again emphatically recommend to take this issue seriously and the matter regarding various reservations of respective Ministries should be sorted out by discussing the matter across the table and the issue should be finalised expeditiously. The Committee would also like that their concerns in this regard should be brought to the notice of the Cabinet Secretariat.</p>
19.	2.58	<p>The Committee find that even the enhanced allocation of Rs.6,000 per hectare being provided for the development of wastelands under IWDP, DDP and DPAP is not justified keeping in view the actual higher per hectare cost involved in this task. To appreciate the position further, the Committee would like to be apprised of the actual rate of expenditure involved in developing per hectare of land.</p>

1	2	3
		<p>Further, the Committee find that due to regional imbalances, the cost of developing wasteland in hilly areas may be much more. As such the Committee may also like to be apprised of the actual cost of developing land per hectare in such difficult areas so as to enable the Committee to come to the right conclusion and to recommend for higher outlay.</p>
20.	2.69	<p>The Committee find that the allocation for North Eastern States has considerably been increased since 2000-2001, when the concept of 10 per cent exclusive allocation to North Eastern States was started. They also note that DDP, DPAP Schemes are not applicable in North Eastern States since no such districts were considered as such areas as per the Hanumantha Rao Committee constituted for identification of DDP and DPAP Projects in the country. The Committee find that even then the allocation for these two area specific programmes is being made to the North Eastern States. The Committee in their earlier Reports had raised this issue and they find from the reply furnished by the Department that if the DDP and DPAP allocation is excluded, North Eastern States allocation for watershed projects will be considerably reduced. The Committee appreciate the considerable attention and allocation made to North Eastern States. Further, they would also like that the resources allocated for the development of wastelands should be meaningfully utilised. To appreciate the releases made to North Eastern States, the Committee would like to be apprised about the task being handled in each of the areas of North Eastern States and would like to be apprised about the information in this regard.</p>

1	2	3
21.	2.70	The Committee find from the information furnished by the Department that there are certain problems resulting in lesser utilization of funds in North Eastern Region, like difficult weather conditions, delay in release of States' share etc. The Committee would like that the specific problems from each of the North Eastern States, should be ascertained expeditiously after interacting with them and proper strategy to take the desired steps in this regard, should be chalked out.
22.	2.71	The Committee note that out of 78.52 lakh hectares, the Department could cover only 6.87 lakh hectares during 9th Plan under IWDP Scheme in North Eastern States. Similarly, during the first two years of 10th Plan, 5.59 lakh hectares could be developed. Keeping in view the slow pace of coverage, the Committee feel that effective steps need to be taken to cover the total wastelands in North Eastern States. The Committee in their earlier Reports had recommended to chalk out an Action plan to cover the total wastelands in North Eastern States. They would like to reiterate their earlier recommendation and would like that the desired action in this regard should be taken expeditiously.
23.	3.14	The Committee conclude from the position of allocation made under IWDP that in North-Eastern States, there is huge underspending. The Committee have dealt with, in detail, the position of wastelands in North-Eastern States and the issue of under utilization in the preceding para of the Report. The Committee would like to highlight that with regard to implementation of IWDP, efforts should be

1	2	3
		made by interacting with various State Governments so that more and more projects from these States are proposed which could result in full utilization of scarce resources.
24.	3.15	As regards the physical achievement under IWDP, the Committee note that during 9th Plan, there was shortfall of 1,148 hectares. They also note that most of the funds available under IWDP are being released to meet the committed liabilities of projects under IWDP thereby resulting in sanctioning of lesser new projects. The Committee are concerned to note that on an average 65 to 70 percent of allocated funds are utilised towards committed liabilities. To understand the problem of committed liabilities, the Committee would like that the detailed position with regard to committed liabilities for ongoing projects should be analysed and data placed before the Committee. The Committee find that if the existing position with regard to committed liabilities stands, the Department would not be able to achieve the targets set during Tenth Plan. As such the Committee would like the Department to analyse the matter critically and inform the Committee accordingly.
25.	3.20	The Committee in their earlier Reports had drawn the attention of the Department towards the Committed liability for the EAS Watershed projects being implemented earlier by the Department of Rural Development and transferred to the Department of Land Resources during 1999-2000. The Committee in their 53rd Report on Demands for Grants (2003-04) had recommended to critically assess the implementation of EAS Watershed projects and urged the Government to tighten monitoring

1	2	3
		<p>mechanism in the States where the implementation of projects was slow. The Committee are dismayed to note that instead of taking the earnest steps in the right direction, the Department has decided to terminate the above scheme. The Committee find that funds required for completion of EAS Watershed projects were Rs. 1,485.26 crore, out of that from 1999-2000 to 2003-2004, Rs.9.68 crore could be released by the Department. They are further alarmed to note the reply of the Department that the committed liability has been filled in those cases in which claims were made within stipulated and extended period. The Committee are unable to comprehend from the replies the fate of the projects, which were ongoing and for which the State Governments could not come forward to demand for the outlay. The Committee are anguished to note how the different schemes are transferred from one Department to another and the various ongoing projects are being handled by them. The Committee deplore the lackadaisical approach of the Department and would like to know the fate of the incomplete EAS projects so as to enable them to analyze the position further.</p>
26.	3.36	<p>The Committee find that a laudable Programme i.e, Drought Prone Areas Programme (DPAP) was started in 1973-74 to tackle special problems in the districts which are constantly affected by severe drought conditions. The objective of the Programme was to provide long term solution through watershed projects for land development, water resources development and afforestation, pasture development, besides promoting overall economic development and improving the socio-economic</p>

1	2	3
		<p>conditions of the covered areas. From the data indicated above, the Committee note that the Department has tried to project a very bright picture about the releases of the money, according to which there was 100 per cent expenditure of the allocated amount during the first two years of the 10th Plan, but the analysis of the implementation of the projects indicates another scenario.</p>
27.	3.37	<p>The Committee are constrained to note that during 1995-96 to 1997-98 as much as 1637 projects were foreclosed. Further, the Department targets to close non-performing projects during 1998-99. The Committee, while expressing their concern over the closure of non-performing projects where huge investments are being made, would like to be informed about the status of the closure of the projects since the Scheme was started to comprehend the position in a better way. Besides, the Committee would also like to be apprised of the reasons for poor performance of the projects alongwith the corrective steps taken by the Department so far. They would also like to recommend here that before sanctioning the projects, the viability of the projects should be ascertained so as to avoid foreclosing of such a great number of projects.</p>
28.	3.38	<p>The Committee find that the Department has taken a positive step of mid-term evaluation which has been entrusted to the State Governments. The Committee, would like to be apprised of the status of the survey along with the findings where the survey has been completed.</p>
29.	3.39	<p>The Committee also find that one aspect</p>

1	2	3
		<p>suggested by the Department to strengthen the monitoring mechanism is the establishment of State Level and District level Vigilance Committees comprising of MPs and MLAs to critically assess the monitoring of the projects. The Committee, would like to be apprised in how many States/districts level Vigilance Committees have so far been constituted. The Committee would also like to be apprised about the work done by such Vigilance Committees.</p>
30.	3.40	<p>The Committee note that DPAP is being implemented in districts identified by High-Level Technical Committee under the Chairmanship of Prof. C.H. Hanumantha Rao, Ex-Member, Planning Commission. The said Committee submitted its Report in 1994. The Committee, note that as per the said Report, the Programme is being implemented in all the identified 972 DPAP Blocks in the country. The Committee find that identification of DPAP Blocks was done a decade back and since then more and more areas could have become drought prone areas. Further, they also note that the State Governments are demanding the Programme for additional districts. In view of the aforesaid position, the Committee feel that there is an urgent need to identify additional DPAP Blocks that would have converted into drought prone areas after 1994. As such, they would like that further identification of DPAP Projects should be undertaken by the Department. Not only that, a comprehensive Plan indicating the outlay desired for coverage should be drawn.</p>
31.	3.41	<p>The Committee, note that DPAP is being</p>

1	2	3
		<p>extended in 972 Blocks, since 1994. The Committee, would like to be apprised about the number of blocks which could be provided a permanent solution and which need no further Central Assistance under the Programme so as to enable the Committee to analyse the performance of the Programme in real terms.</p>
32.	3.54	<p>The Committee find that inspite of their recommending strongly to enhance outlay, the <i>status-quo</i> with regard to Budget Estimates during 2004-2005 has been maintained as compared to the previous year. The Committee, feel that there is an urgent need to provide adequate allocation to DDP areas and as such would like that their concerns in this regard should be brought before the Planning Commission/Ministry of Finance.</p>
33.	3.55	<p>While recommending for higher outlay, the Committee feel that emphasis has to be given in strengthening the monitoring mechanism so as to improve the implementation of the Programme. From the position of implementation as given by the Department, it seems that there are certain problems. Foremost is the issue of foreclosing project. They find that during 9th Plan, full allocation for 217 projects was made. Out of that, 36 projects were foreclosed. To enable the Committee to comprehend the position of foreclosure further, they would like to be apprised about the reasons for such foreclosure. The Committee would also like to be apprised about the number of projects foreclosed during each of the years of 10th Plan. The Committee feel that there is some serious lacuna in implementation of such a priority Scheme due to which after making heavy investments on projects,</p>

1	2	3
		some are being foreclosed, thus wasting the valuable resources.
34.	3.56	The Committee also feel that viability of the projects is not being ascertained by the Implementing Agencies. The Committee, would like the Department to have a detailed analysis of the position and explain the Committee accordingly.
35.	3.65	The Committee in their Report on Demands for Grants of the year 2003-2004 had recommended for enhanced outlay keeping in view the objectives of the programme <i>i.e.</i> , technology development, extension and training to farmers, extension officials of the State Departments, etc. The Committee find from the information furnished by the Department that they are satisfied with the existing allocations. To enable the Committee to appreciate the position of the Department, the Committee would like the Department to furnish the information with regard to the work done under the scheme indicating <i>inter-alia</i> , the number of farmers or extension officials trained so far, demonstration of the technologies undertaken in the field, etc. The Committee would like to know categorically the achievements made with regard to the objectives enshrined under this programme in the Performance Budget 2004-2005 (P. 28) so as to assess the viability and effectiveness of the scheme in future and to forestall the reasons for closure of the projects.
36.	3.79	The Committee in their earlier Reports on Demands for Grants had expressed their concern over the under-utilisation of outlay under the Computerisation of Land Records

1	2	3
		<p>(CLR). They find that no progress seems to have been made in the under performing States as has been admitted by the Department. The Committee are constrained to note that the underspending is a recurrent feature as noticed year after year. They find from the data furnished by the Department that since inception of the Scheme, only 68 percent of the funds could be utilised. Similar is the position in the North Eastern States, where out of Rs.17.19 crore, Rs.10.88 crore could be utilised. The Committee, further note that the Evaluation Study Report in case of Karnataka has revealed the positive impact of the Programme, whereby it has resulted in accountability in the revenue administration, checking corruption and reducing harassment to the extent possible. In view of the aforesaid scenario, the Committee would like the Department to analyse the position State-wise and find the difficulties being experienced by them in the implementation of the Programme and apprise the Committee accordingly.</p>
37.	3.80	<p>The Committee further note that Lal Bahadur Shastri National Academy of Administration, Mussourie has been entrusted with the evaluation of the Scheme in the States of Karnataka, Rajasthan, West Bengal, Haryana and Tamil Nadu. They also note that in the case of Karnataka, the Evaluation Study Report has been received. The Committee, would like that similar evaluation in the remaining States should be undertaken and they should be apprised about the findings of the Study, when completed.</p>

1	2	3
38.	3.81	The Committee also note that the Department is in the process of revising the guidelines of Computerisation of Land Records. The Committee, would like that their recommendations made in the respective Reports should be considered while revising the aforesaid guidelines.
39.	3.92	The Committee note that although during the years 2002-2003, 2003-2004, the allocation available at RE stage could be fully utilised, there was huge cut at RE stage. The Committee, further note that out of the allocation of Rs.265.97 crore, so far under the Scheme Rs.174.58 crore <i>i.e.</i> 66 percent could be utilised. The Committee, feel that underspending is a recurrent feature for which the allocation has been reduced at RE stage. The Committee, would like that the Department should find out the reasons for underspending from each of the States/Union Territories and take the corrective action in this regard. The Committee should be intimated about this.
40.	3.93	The Committee have repeatedly been expressing their concern over the sorry state of affairs of land records in North-Eastern States, where even the cadastral survey has not been done so far. They are constrained to note that in North Eastern States, no land records exist. Further alarming is the situation that there is no legislation regarding land and land related matters. In spite of repeatedly recommending, the North Eastern States had yet to come forward to maintain the land records. The Committee feel that the Union Government has to play a pro-active role in this regard after consultation with the North Eastern States. They should be impressed upon the urgency

1	2	3
		of having land records.
41.	3.94	<p>The Committee note that the Government had a proposal to revise the existing funding ratio of 50 : 50 to 75:25 between the Centre and the States and 90:10 for the North Eastern States. They also find that Planning Commission has not agreed to the said proposal. The Committee feel that the States which could not come forward for the Programme may have the main problem of providing 50 percent of the State's share. In view of this, the Committee would like the Department to interact with the under performing States and accordingly place the position before the Planning Commission so as to enable them to appreciate the proposals of the Department in this regard. The Committee should also be apprised about the final decision taken in this regard.</p>