

24

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON
RURAL DEVELOPMENT
(2006-2007)**

FOURTEENTH LOK SABHA

**MINISTRY OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT
(DEPARTMENT OF LAND RESOURCES)**

**DEMANDS FOR GRANTS
(2006-2007)**

*[Action taken by the Government on the recommendations contained
in the Nineteenth Report of the Standing Committee
on Rural Development (Fourteenth Lok Sabha)]*

TWENTY-FOURTH REPORT



**LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI**

TWENTY-FOURTH REPORT
STANDING COMMITTEE ON
RURAL DEVELOPMENT
(2006-2007)

(FOURTEENTH LOK SABHA)

MINISTRY OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT
(DEPARTMENT OF LAND RESOURCES)

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS
(2006-2007)

*[Action taken by the Government on the recommendations contained
in the Nineteenth Report of the Standing Committee
on Rural Development (Fourteenth Lok Sabha)]*

Presented to Lok Sabha on 16.3.2007

Laid in Rajya Sabha on 16.3.2007



LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI

March, 2007/Phalguna, 1928 (Saka)

C.R.D. No. 030

Price : Rs. 83.00

© 2007 BY LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT

Published under Rule 382 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha (Eleventh Edition) and Printed by Jainco Art India, New Delhi-110 005.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE (2006-2007)	(iii)
INTRODUCTION	(vii)
CHAPTER I Report	1
CHAPTER II Recommendations that have been accepted by the Government	28
CHAPTER III Recommendations which the Committee do not desire to pursue in view of the Government's replies	45
CHAPTER IV Recommendations in respect of which replies of the Government have not been accepted by the Committee	46
CHAPTER V Recommendations in respect of which final replies of the Government are still awaited	61

APPENDICES

I. State-wise number of DPAP and DDP projects for which funding has been stopped	71
II. Number of DPAP and DDP projects sanctioned, completed, funding stopped and projects in progress from 1995-96 to 2005-06	72
III. Extracts of Minutes of the sitting of the Committee held on 27 February, 2007	74
IV. Analysis of action taken by the Government on the recommendations contained in the Nineteenth Report of the Committee (14th Lok Sabha)	76

COMPOSITION OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON
RURAL DEVELOPMENT (2006-2007)

Shri Kalyan Singh — *Chairman*

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

2. Shrimati Susmita Bauri
3. Shri Mani Charenamei
4. Shri V. Kishore Chandra S. Deo
5. Shri Sandeep Dikshit
6. Shri George Fernandes
7. Shri Zora Singh Mann
8. Shri Krishna Murari Moghe
9. Shri Hannan Mollah
10. Shri D. Narbula
11. Shri A. F. G. Osmani
12. Shri T. Madhusudan Reddy
13. Adv. Renge Patil Tukaram Ganpatrao
14. Shrimati Tejaswini Seeramesh
15. Shrimati Jyotirmoyee Sikdar
16. Shri Sita Ram Singh
17. Shri D.C. Srikantappa*
18. Shri Bagun Sumbrui
19. Shri Chandramani Tripathi
20. Shri Beni Prasad Verma
21. Shri Dharmendra Yadav

*Hon'ble Speaker has changed the nomination of Shri D.C. Srikantappa, MP (LS) from Standing Committee on Urban Development to Committee on Rural Development *vice* the vacancy caused due to change of nomination of Shri Shrichand Kriplani MP (LS) from Standing Committee on Rural Development to Standing Committee on Chemicals and Fertilizers *vide* Lok Sabha Bulletin Part II, Para No. 2847 dated August 31, 2006.

Rajya Sabha

22. Shri Balihari
23. Shri Jayantilal Barot
24. Kumari Nirmala Deshpande
25. Shri Pyarelal Khandelwal
26. Dr. Chandan Mitra
27. Shri P.R. Rajan
28. Shri Bhagwati Singh
29. Ms. Sushila Tiriya
30. Vacant
31. Vacant

SECRETARIAT

- | | | |
|---------------------------|---|----------------------------------|
| 1. Shri S.K. Sharma | — | <i>Additional Secretary</i> |
| 2. Shri P.K. Grover | — | <i>Joint Secretary</i> |
| 3. Shrimati Sudesh Luthra | — | <i>Deputy Secretary Grade I</i> |
| 4. Shri A.K. Shah | — | <i>Deputy Secretary Grade II</i> |

INTRODUCTION

I, the Chairman of the Standing Committee on Rural Development (2006-2007) having been authorised by the Committee to submit the Report on their behalf, present the Twenty-fourth Report on the action taken by the Government on the recommendations contained in the Nineteenth Report of the Standing Committee on Rural Development (2005-2006) on Demands for Grants (2006-2007) of the Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development).

2. The Nineteenth Report was presented to Lok Sabha on 18 May, 2006. The replies of the Government to all the recommendations contained in the Report were received on 31 August, 2006.

3. The replies of the Government were examined and the Report was considered and adopted by the Committee at their sitting held on 27 February, 2007.

4. An analysis of the action taken by the Government on the recommendations contained in the Nineteenth Report of the Committee is given in *Appendix IV*.

NEW DELHI;
15 March, 2007

24 Phalgun, 1928 (*Saka*)

KALYAN SINGH,
Chairman,
Standing Committee on
Rural Development.

CHAPTER I

REPORT

This Report of the Committee on Rural Development (2006-2007) deals with the action taken by the Government on the recommendations contained in their Nineteenth Report on Demands for Grants (2006-2007) of the Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development) which was presented to Lok Sabha on 18 May, 2006.

2. Action taken notes have been received from the Government in respect of all the 36 recommendations which have been categorised as follows:

- (i) Recommendations which have been accepted by the Government:

Serial Nos. 2.5, 2.17, 2.18, 2.20, 3.40, 3.43, 3.46, 4.14, 4.24, 4.34, 5.15, 5.16, 5.17, 5.18, 5.25, 5.26 and 5.27.

- (ii) Recommendation which the Committee do not desire to pursue in view of Government's reply:

NIL

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

Serial Nos. 2.26, 2.27, 3.14, 3.25, 3.26, 3.41, 3.44, 4.33, 5.14 and 5.19.

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

Serial Nos. 2.19, 2.21, 3.13, 3.27, 3.42, 3.45, 4.15, 4.25 and 5.20.

3. The Committee note that action with regard to the specific issues raised under the following recommendations has been assured/being taken by the Department as stated in the respective action taken replies. The said recommendations have been categorised under the interim category by the Committee. The Committee would like the Department to expedite the proposed action and final replies in this regard should be furnished to the Committee within three months of the presentation of the Report. The final replies should also address to the observations made by the Committee in the comments (as given in *para nos.2.19, 3.13 and 3.42*) of the report.

- (i) Expediting final view on Parthasarthy Committee Report.
(Recommendation Serial No. 4, Para No.2.19)
- (ii) Involvement of Private Sector for wastelands development in consultation with State Governments and local bodies.
(Recommendation Serial No. 6, Para No.2.21)
- (iii) Need for convergence of watershed programmes for wastelands development.
(Recommendation Serial No. 9, Para No.3.13)
- (iv) Expediting mechanism for monitoring of watershed projects.
(Recommendation Serial No. 13, Para No.3.27)
- (v) Need for coordinating works for watershed development under National Rural Employment Guarantee Act with those of existing schemes for wastelands development through watershed projects.
(Recommendation Serial No. 16, Para No.3.42)
- (vi) Finalisation of amendment to Land Revenue Act.
(Recommendation Serial No. 19, Para No.3.45)
- (vii) Clarification on increasing gestation period of the watershed projects from five to eight years.
(Recommendation Serial No. 22, Para No.4.15)
- (viii) Need for re-identification of blocks under DPAP/DDP scheme.
(Recommendation Serial No. 24, Para No.4.25)
- (ix) Needs for expediting evaluation studies on Computerisation of Land Records by LBSNAA and NIRD.
(Recommendation Serial No. 33, Para No.5.20)

4. The Committee will now deal with action taken by the Government on some of these recommendations in the succeeding paragraphs.

A. Expediting final view on Parthasarthy Committee Report

Recommendation Serial No. 4 (Para No. 2.19)

5. The Committee had noted as below:

“The Committee observe that Parthasarthy Committee has analysed the watershed programmes in detail and given detailed

valuable recommendations. The recommendations of the said Committee should be carefully examined while holding wide-ranging consultations with all concerned and the Department should take the desired action to implement the accepted recommendations of the Committee. The Standing Committee should also be kept apprised of the status of the implementation of the major recommendations of the Parthasarthy Committee."

6. The Government in the action taken reply have stated as under:

"The Parthasarthy Committee report has been circulated to all State Governments and various concerned Ministries of Government of India for their views/comments. The report of the Committee has also been put on the web site of the Department (www.dolr.nic.in) for wide consultations. The Ministry is examining the recommendations of Parthasarthy Committee in depth. The observations /suggestions made by the Standing Committee will be duly taken into account and the outcome will be apprised to the Standing Committee."

7. The Committee in the earlier recommendation had desired that they should be kept apprised about the status of implementation of various recommendations made by the Parthasarthy Committee on watershed programmes. The Department in the action taken reply has stated that the Ministry is examining the recommendations in depth and comments of all State Governments and various concerned Ministries of the Union Government are being sought. The Committee recommend to the Department to expedite consultation with all concerned and implement the accepted recommendations of the Committee. The Committee should also be kept apprised of the developments in this regard.

B. Need for streamlining budget exercise for Plan funds and minimising unspent balances

Recommendation Serial Nos. 7 & 8 (Para Nos. 2.26 and 2.27)

8. The Committee had noted as below:

"The Committee note from the trends of allocation of outlay during the years 2004-05, 2005-06 and 2006-07 that the agreed allocation is lesser than the proposed allocation. During the year 2006-07, the agreed allocation is Rs. 689 crore lesser than the proposed outlay. The Committee find it interesting that whereas the overall allocation for 10th Plan is more than the projections,

the allocations under Annual Plans are lesser than the projections. It is difficult to understand the way the budgeting exercise is being undertaken where there seems to be no planning. The Committee would like to be apprised of the basis of making projections under each of the Annual Plan.

Recommendation (Para No.2.26)

“Whereas the releases from the Centre have been stated to be almost cent per cent of the allocated outlay, the unspent balances to the tune of Rs. 1,405 crore with the implementing agencies is really a matter of concern to the Committee. They are not convinced with the plea given by the Department whereby the Department has tried to justify the unspent amount by stating that the unspent balance do not exceed 10 percent of the project cost at any point of time. The Department holds the view that the balance is necessitated to maintain availability of funds at the implementation level to avoid eventualities of non-payment of wages as wastelands development projects are labour intensive projects. However, the Committee wish to point out that Rs. 1, 405 crore is almost equal to the overall allocation of the Department during the year 2006-07. The Committee feel that the unspent balances should be seen with reference to the allocation made during a particular year and not with reference to the total project cost under different schemes. The projects may continue even after five to seven years. Roll-on money to the tune of 10 to 20 per cent of the allocation under a scheme during a year can be justified on the grounds stated by the Department. The justification of unspent balance corresponding to the total project cost can not be understood. The Committee find that instead of taking stringent measures for keeping the unspent balances to the minimum, the Department has tried to justify it which the Committee really disapprove. The Department should take all the corrective measures and inform the Committee accordingly.”

Recommendation (Para No.2.27)

9. The Government in the action taken replies have stated as under:

“The overall allocation for 10th Plan is more than the projections only because of provision of Rs. 1000 crores under ‘New Initiatives’. In all other schemes (except ‘New Initiatives’) the

approved outlay was less than the proposed outlay as can be seen from the following table:-

(Rs. in crore)			
Sl.No.	Name of Scheme	As proposed by the Department	As agreed by Planning Commission
1.	DPAP	1600	1500
2.	DDP	1200	1100
3.	IWDP	1900	1800
4.	CLR	500	400
5.	SRA&ULR	200	200
6.	EAP	365	365
7.	TDET	100	90
8.	IPS, M&E and Communication	100	71
9.	New Initiatives	Nil	1000
Total		5965	6526

The allocations during Tenth Five Year plan have been utilized by the Department in respect of all Schemes except 'New Initiatives'. The Department makes projections for each of the Annual Plan based on the overall targets under each scheme, demands made by the States, trend of utilization of funds and absorption capacity of the State Governments."

Reply to Recommendation (Para No. 2.26)

"While noting the concern of Hon'ble Standing Committee on unspent balances, it is submitted that all schemes presently implemented by the Department are demand driven. The annual allocations made for different schemes in the Department's budget are not released to States or to Programme Implementing Agencies on allocation basis but on the basis of demand for further instalments in case of ongoing projects or for sanction of new projects. For example in DPAP/DDP & IWDP, the releases are made to ZPs/DRDAs in five installments over a period of five years as per the prescribed procedure. Successive installments are released only after 50 per cent of the funds released in the

previous installment have been utilized. It is also submitted that the roll over opening balance figure of a particular year under these programmes should be compared to the total funds released to the Programme Implementing Agencies upto the previous year. As under DDP, an amount of Rs. 1603.44 crore of Central and State share was released from 1995-96 to 2004-05 and the opening balance as on 1 April, 2005 was reportedly Rs. 261.41 crore. This amounts to 15-16 per cent. More or less same position obtains in the DPAP and IWDP.

Hon'ble Committees' observations are very relevant for timely completion of projects so that all the installments are claimed by Project Implementing Agencies within the project period of five years in accordance with schedule of activities. A number of steps e.g. involvement of States in the monitoring activities, launching of web-based on line monitoring of projects and issue of notices to PIAs of projects where there is delay in claiming the second and subsequent installments have been initiated. All efforts are made to expedite implementation of programmes so that funds released are utilized quickly minimizing the funds in hand for ongoing programme at any point of time."

Reply to Recommendation (Para No.2.27)

10. The Committee in their earlier reports had expressed strong concern over the planning process as well as huge unspent balances with specific reference to the allocations and expenditure of the Department of Land Resources during Tenth Plan. The trends of allocating outlay whereby the overall allocation of the Department during Tenth Plan was more than the projections and during annual plans, the allocation was lesser than the proposed outlay were also pointed out. The Department's response to the strong observations of the Committee is not satisfactory. Rs.1,000 crore was allocated during Tenth Plan for 'New Initiatives' without any idea of the new schemes that were proposed to be launched during Tenth Plan. As recorded in the Para No. 2.10 of the report, the Secretary had informed the Committee that the Department had planned a new programme on Bio-fuel which was still in formulative stage and was not fully operational. Tenth Plan has already concluded and the Department is yet to launch the new schemes for which Rs. 1,000 crore i.e., the substantial allocation was earmarked.

Another surprising fact noticed is that even when the Department did not propose any allocation for new schemes, the Planning

Commission on its own was very generous and allocated Rs. 1,000 crore for 'New Initiatives'. As regards the allocation being lesser than the projections during annual plans, the reply of the Department is quite evasive. It has simply been stated that the projections are made based on the overall targets under each scheme, demand of States, trends of utilisation and capacity of State Governments. The difference between proposed and agreed to allocation *i.e.*, Rs. 689 crore during 2006-2007 is quite noticeable keeping in view the overall allocations of the Department during that year *i.e.*, Rs. 1421.70 crore. Another trend noticed by the Committee was huge unspent balances. Instead of probing the reasons for under utilisation and taking corrective steps, the Department has tried to justify the opening balances. While examining the Demands for Grants, the Department justified 10 per cent of the project cost (refer *para no. 2.24* of the report). When the Committee highlighted that opening balances should be read in connection with the allocation of a particular year and not with the consolidated allocation of so many years considered as the project cost, the Department has evolved another yardstick to justify the opening balances. Now, in the action taken reply, the Department has stated that 15 to 16 per cent of the total allocation made during eight years *i.e.*, 1995-96 to 2004-05 under DDP and so in other schemes is justified as the role-on money is needed to carry on the ongoing projects.

The Committee deplore the way the planning exercise is being undertaken. Moreover, the Committee strongly disapprove the way the Department has tried to justify the trend of allocation and huge opening balances. The Committee while reiterating their concerns expressed in the earlier report would like that such mistakes should not be repeated while making allocations for the Eleventh Plan. The allocation for proposed scheme(s) should be with regard to the specific scheme for which substantial planning and homework has been done. The trend of allocating amount for vague schemes as 'New Initiatives' which were never visualized should not be repeated. Planning Commission/ Ministry of Finance should be apprised of the concerns of the Committee in this regard. As regards under utilisation, instead of finding out ways to justify, the stress should be on locating ways and means to complete the project in time which would ensure utilisation of the scarce resources.

C. Need for convergence of watershed programmes for wastelands development

Recommendation Serial No. 9 (Para No. 3.13)

11. The Committee had noted as below:

"The Committee in their earlier reports have repeatedly been expressing their concern over the multiplicity of programmes/

schemes to tackle the problem of wastelands in the country and have been emphasizing on the need for convergence of the programme. While examining the Demands for Grants, it has repeatedly been brought to the notice of Government but the issue although agreed to in principle lacks unanimity among the various Ministries involved in handling the issue of wastelands development. The Technical Committee in Chapter three of the report has expressed similar concerns. It has been stated that serious differences persist among different Ministries regarding the ownership of the unified programme.

The Committee also note that in the Mid-Term Appraisal document of the Planning Commission, the formula for bringing the watershed activities under one umbrella has been suggested which seems to be not agreeable to the concerned Ministries due to their reluctance to leave the area of activities related to watershed management being undertaken by them. The Committee also note that the proposal has been mooted by the Ministry of Agriculture for a nodal centralized agency *i.e.* Rainfed Area Authority. Again the issue of conflict is the ownership of the aforesaid authority. Further the Committee also find that finally it has been agreed that the said authority would be best located under the umbrella of the PMO. The Committee feel that sufficient time has been lost over the issue of taking decision on the issue of convergence. It is high time to resolve the issue of convergence at the earliest."

12. The Government in the action taken reply have stated as under:

"The Cabinet at its meeting held on 10 August, 2006 has approved the proposal of the Ministry of Agriculture for setting up of the National Rainfed Areas Authority (NRAA)."

13. The Committee have repeatedly been emphasizing the need for convergence of various programmes/schemes with regard to the development of wastelands in the country being undertaken by different Ministries/Departments of the Union Government and bringing the same under one umbrella. With the continuous pursuance of the issue, the Government agreed to the recommendation of the Committee in principle and the formula for bringing the watershed activities under one umbrella was being evolved by the Government. While examining the Demands for Grants of the previous year, when the status of the aforesaid recommendation was sought from the Department, it was stated that

the Ministry of Agriculture had mooted a proposal for a nodal centralized agency *i.e.* 'Rainfed Area Authority'. Considering the conflict with regard to ownership of aforesaid authority the Committee were apprised that the said authority would best be located under the umbrella of PMO. The action taken reply with regard to the aforesaid issue simply mentions that the Cabinet at its meeting held on 10 August, 2006 has approved the proposal of Ministry of Agriculture for setting up of the National Rainfed Area Authority. There is no mention of the disputed area as to under which Ministry/Department the aforesaid authority would be set up. The Committee would like to be informed about the details of the composition, area of activity, the main controlling Ministry/Department etc. of the aforesaid centralised agency. Besides the Committee recommend for early constitution of the authority so as to address the issue of multiplicity of authorities in this regard.

D. Clarification on the data with regard to wastelands developed during the current plan period

Recommendation Serial No. 10 (Para No. 3.14)

14. The Committee had noted as below:

"The Committee note the claim of the Department that the extent of wastelands has come down from 63.85 million hectares to 55.27 million hectares between the period 2000 and 2005. The Committee find that even with the efforts of the Department of Land Resources the target for development of wastelands during five years of Tenth Plan are 18 million hectares. Out of this target, 12.47 hectares of wastelands have already been developed. The other Ministries/Departments of the Union Government as well as State Governments involved with the task of development of wastelands may also be contributing substantially towards the development of major area of wastelands in the country. In this scenario, the Committee find that there is some mismatch between the achievement proclaimed by the Department and the actual area developed. Although the Department seems very optimistic by finding that the wastelands area has declined as found by the updated Atlas, the achievements reflected by the updated Atlas *i.e.* development of only 8.58 million hectares of land during five years period is too meagre even when compared with the targets of five years *i.e.* 18 million hectares only of the Department of Land Resources. If the targets fixed and proclaimed by different Ministries of Union as well as State Governments are added

together, the whole wastelands area would have been developed by now. In view of this scenario, the Committee feel that the achievements reflected under schemes may not be true at the ground level. The Committee would like a clarification of the Department in this regard so as to enable them to understand the position in proper perspective”.

15. The Government in the action taken reply have stated as under:

“The Tenth Plan target of 18 million hectares is for sanctioning of new projects. Achievement of land actually treated would be reflected after these new projects are completed. Reduction in the extent of wastelands by 8.58 million hectares would reflect the development of wastelands under projects sanctioned prior to Tenth Plan. The total area covered by projects under area development projects sanctioned prior to Tenth Plan (1995-96 to 2001-02) is as follows:

IWDP	3.27 million hectares
DPAP	6.90 million hectares
DDP	3.36 million hectares
Total	13.53 million hectares

A study titled “Comprehensive Assessment of Watershed Programmes in India” has been assigned to the International Crops Research Institute for the Semi-Arid Tropics (ICRISAT), Hyderabad to critically assess the impact of various watershed development programmes in India, to identify the drivers of success from the bright spots, to develop suitable institutional and technical recommendations, policy guidelines and suitable data base for sustainable and efficient management of the watershed programmes and to identify the positive factors leading to reduction of wastelands by about 9 million hectares (2.72 per cent of geographical area) over a period of five years as indicated by Wastelands Atlases brought out in 2000 and 2005. The total project period is for two years. ICRISAT study covers programmes of all concerned Departments/Ministries. The study is based on the decision taken in the meeting of National Watershed Committee and funded jointly by this Department and by the Department of Agriculture and Cooperation, Ministry of Agriculture.”

16. The Committee in their earlier recommendation had desired the clarification of the Department with regard to the conflicting data mentioned in respect of the development of wastelands in the country under different schemes. With the setting up of an exclusive Department to deal with the issue of wastelands development, the Department of Land Resources earlier known as the Department of Wastelands Development has been monitoring the overall scenario of development of wastelands in the country. The Atlas and the updated Atlas in this regard have been produced by the Department. The Committee had noted that the updated Atlas indicated development of only 8.58 million hectares of land during five years period which was too meagre even when compared with the targets of the Department of Land Resources alone. The Department in the action taken reply instead of furnishing the clarification in this regard has further indicated another data indicating the projects sanctioned prior to Tenth Plan. It has been stated that the projects to cover 13.53 million hectares were sanctioned between the period 1995-96 to 2001-02 under the three major schemes of the Department *i.e.* IWDP, DPAP and DDP. The main point for consideration as indicated in the recommendation was to consider the efforts made by various quarters *viz*, various Ministries of the Union Government including the Department of Land Resources and the State Governments while having the estimates of wastelands and the data of development of wastelands in a particular period, to which the Department has not furnished the categorical response. In view of this scenario, the Committee feel that there is no mechanism to evaluate the overall position with regard to development of wastelands in the country on a periodic basis.

The Committee further note that now the Department has taken initiative for a study titled "Comprehensive Assessment of Watershed Programmes in India". The study has been assigned to the International Crops Research Institute for the Semi-Arid Tropics (ICRISAT), Hyderabad. The study would cover programmes of all concerned Departments and Ministries. While noting the aforesaid mechanism, the Committee strongly recommend to the Department to also take into consideration the initiatives taken by the State Governments with regard to the development of wastelands by their own schemes. Perhaps the best way to know about the status of wastelands in the country would be updating the information with regard to wastelands based on the district-wise status in the areas

which have large wastelands in the country. Unless the core data in this regard is obtained indicating the ground position, no study would give the actual position in this regard. While reiterating the concerns expressed earlier, the Committee would like to recommend for a permanent mechanism to periodically update the information in this regard. The Department should take the desired initiatives in this regard and apprise the Committee accordingly.

E. Need for incorporating information about foreclosure of projects in Budget Documents

Recommendation Serial No. 11 (Para No. 3.25)

17. The Committee had noted as below:

“The Committee in their 10th and 16th Reports had expressed serious concerns over the issue of foreclosure of projects under the schemes related to wastelands development *i.e.* Integrated Wastelands Development Programme (IWDP), Drought Prone Areas Programme (DPAP), Desert Development Programme (DDP) and Technology Development, Extension and Training (TDET). While examining the action taken replies, the Committee had observed that some of the projects were foreclosed at the last stage when substantial allocation had been released for the project thereby wasting national resources. Detailed analysis of the issue indicate that the system of foreclosure has been given in detail in the watershed guidelines. It has been stated that at the initial phase of a project *i.e.* the first nine to twelve months, if it is considered that the project cannot be implemented successfully for certain unavoidable circumstances and reasons the ZP/DRDA shall recommend for its foreclosure to the State Governments which will consider such requests on merits and send its recommendations to the Department of Land Resources. As reported in 16th Report of the Committee, most of the projects are being foreclosed even at the last stage. The Committee observe that the guidelines do not seem to have been followed while foreclosing projects under different schemes.

The Committee further find from the data furnished by the Department that for a large number of projects under DPAP and DDP funding has been stopped. The Committee would like to be informed about the difference between the funding stopped

and foreclosure of the projects since two different data have been indicated in the Budget documents. The Committee would also like the Department to furnish information with regard to the date of sanction, funds earmarked and date of foreclosure/when funds were stopped in each of the foreclosed project scheme-wise so as to enable the Committee to analyse the position in detail. The Committee would also like to recommend that such information about the foreclosure/funding stopped should regularly be maintained and indicated in the Budget documents.”

18. The Government in the action taken reply have stated as under:

“It is submitted that the term ‘foreclosure’ refers to provision of ‘probation period’ in the watershed guidelines, which provides that when a project fails to even take off during the probation period (initial 9-12 months) as the required village level institutions to steer the project implementation are not grounded due to conflicting interest groups in the project area and the project can not be implemented successfully, the same may be recommended by ZP/DRDA for ‘foreclosure’ to the State Government which will consider such requests on merits and send its recommendations to Department of Land Resources (DoLR). The unspent funds should be refunded to DoLR when the projects are foreclosed. The “funding stopped projects” of IWDP/DPAP/DDP are those where complete implementation could not take place in the scheduled project period due to inordinate delay in implementation of the project. The delayed-projects are duly considered and given extension of 1-2 years. In fact, many such projects were completed in extension period but in those, which still could not be completed, further funding was stopped. Utilization Certificate (UC) for the funds already released is obtained and State Government is supposed to fund the remaining part of the project. If funds released are not properly utilized recovery is effected. Seven projects under IWDP were closed for various reasons such as conflict amongst various groups, cases being sub-judice leading to undue delay etc. In most cases, such closed projects are followed by fresh projects to avoid deprivation of benefits to the people of that area. Recovery of Rs. 72.23 lakh has been effected in one case. Efforts are being made to recover funds in other cases.

The Ministry has initiated action on the following lines to streamline procedure of foreclosure and extension of projects:

1. Foreclosure

- a. In addition to mid-term evaluation by the State Government a concurrent evaluation of the project in the second year of the implementation shall be got done to find out whether the required village level institutions have been grounded and the necessary institutional mechanism for execution of project has been established.
- b. The evaluation shall also indicate whether the technical features of the project including physical location, layout and alignment of the components are *prima facie* sound and suggest modifications for recasting, if required.
- c. A State level committee shall be constituted for examining the report and recommending action for foreclosure or continuance of the project to Department of Land Resources.
- d. The committee shall also fix responsibility in all cases of financial embezzlement or other implementation lapses.
- e. The formal closure shall be by Department of Land Resources and unspent amount has to be returned to the Department of Land Resources.

2. Extension

A review of all ongoing projects requiring extension shall be done by a State level Committee. The Committee shall examine each project on merit and submit a report/recommendation to Department of Land Resources at least 90 days before expiry of stipulated period. The State committee may also recommend either rescheduling of the remaining project activities to be completed within the originally sanctioned project period or an extended project period. The report/recommendation of the State Government on foreclosure and extension of projects shall be examined by the Project Sanctioning Committee (PSC) in Department of Land Resources/Ministry of Rural Development for granting extension or closing the project.

Besides, monitoring of claiming the second instalment by Project implementing agencies is key to implementation of programmes. Accordingly, these will be monitored strictly and show cause notices issued to PIA/State Government wherever there is delay

in claiming the second installment (after approval of the project report, work plan and community mobilization) and the fourth installment (after Mid-Term Evaluation of the project).

The details of foreclosed / funding-stopped IWDP projects are as under:

(Rs. in lakh)							
Sl. No.	Name of the District	Date of Sanction	Total Area (in hectares)	Total cost (Rs. in lakh)	Total released (Rs. in lakh)	Year of foreclosure/ funding stopped	Remarks
1.	Unnao-I	21.98	12041	481.64	216.73	1999-2000	CBI case for misappropriation / misutilisation of funds by NGO as PIA
2.	Rae-Bareli	25.6.98	12100	484.00	172.60	1999-2000	
3.	Unnao-II	23.3.98	12054	482.16	72.32	1999-2000	
4.	Kathua-II	20.3.02	5987	481.56	49.39	2003-04	
5.	Sultanpur	23.3.98	12039	359.22	72.23	2000-01	Money refunded as the project could not take off
6.	E. Sikkim-III	27.3.98	5669	222.76	55.53	2004-05	Un-utilised money refunded and projects have been reframed
7.	E. Sikkim-IV	24.3.99	11900	476.00	71.40	2004-05	
TOTAL			71790	2987.34	661.00		

The relevant details of 'DPAP/DDP funding stopped projects' are submitted in Appendix – I & II."

19. In pursuance of the recommendation of the Committee, the Department has furnished the information with regard to foreclosure of projects under various watershed development schemes viz IWDP, DPAP and DDP. While analyzing the data in this regard, the Committee note that under DDP and DPAP, a large number of projects are being foreclosed. Under DPAP as many as 1,764 projects were foreclosed. Under DDP 300 projects were foreclosed. Not only that, the disturbing data indicated in the statement is that many projects are being foreclosed when as many as six installments were released under a particular project. Under DPAP, out of 1764 projects, for 400 projects even the sixth installment was released. Similarly,

under DDP out of 300 projects, for 110 projects, the sixth installment was released. The Committee do not understand releasing money to a project for so many years when it is not performing well. There is an urgent need to evaluate the projects on a regular basis. In this regard, the Committee in their earlier recommendation had also recommended that the detailed information of the foreclosed projects *viz* the date of sanction, funds earmarked, date of foreclosure when funds were stopped should invariably be indicated in the Budget documents. The Department has not responded to the aforesaid recommendation of the Committee. While reiterating their earlier recommendation, the Committee would like to emphasize that such a data should also be indicated invariably at the website of the Department. This would ensure further transparency and put pressure on the implementing agency for better performance of the projects. The Committee hope that the required information would be indicated in the Budget documents for the year 2007-08.

Further the Committee observe that in respect of IWDP, the number of projects foreclosed is quite less *i.e.* seven projects were foreclosed so far. Besides the data indicated with regard to IWDP mentions about the steps taken *viz* the recovery of unutilized amount in respect of the foreclosed projects. Such information about the action taken has not been indicated in respect of DDP and DPAP projects. The Committee would like the Department to indicate similar position of the action taken with regard to the foreclosed projects specifically indicating the unspent amount lying with the specific implementing agency of a project at the time of foreclosed project and whether it was surrendered or not should also be indicated. Besides the data with regard to the foreclosed projects under IWDP *vis-a-vis* DPAP and DDP should further be analyzed so as to know about the reasons of a higher number of projects being foreclosed under DPAP and DDP as compared to IWDP. The results of such study should be furnished for the information of the Committee.

- F. Pursuing with State Governments to refund the unspent balances for projects under Employment Assurance Scheme (EAS) merged with IWDP**

Recommendation Serial No. 12 (Para No. 3.26)

20. The Committee had noted as below:

“As regards the projects transferred from erstwhile Employment Assurance Scheme of the Department of Rural Development to

the Department of Land Resources during the year 1999-2000, the Committee note that the initial committed liability in case of these projects was Rs. 1,500 crore. As regards the total funds released to these projects, Rs. 900.68 crore have been released so far for these projects. The Committee further find that the Department has no information with regard to the status of projects and the physical achievements for these projects. Not only that, simply releasing the outlay with regard to claims made by States is considered as completion of the project. It has further been stated that the details of physical and financial achievements for these projects seem the merger of watershed component of EAS in IWDP. The Committee deplore the way the monitoring of the project is being undertaken by the Department. To analyse the position with regard to EAS projects transferred from the Department of Rural Development to the Department of Land Resources, the Committee would like to be apprised about the number of projects transferred, outlay earmarked, the area developed in each of the project district-wise so as to enable the Committee to have a proper analysis."

21. The Government in the action taken reply have stated as under:

"As a part of an exercise aimed at rationalizing the structure of various schemes, EAS was retained mainly as a Wage Employment Scheme and sanctioning of new watershed projects was discontinued *w.e.f.* 1 April, 1999. Prior to 1 April, 1999, 40 per cent of the EAS funds were earmarked for water and soil conservation and 20 per cent for minor irrigation works. District Collectors/Deputy Commissioners of the Districts sanctioned these projects taking into account block-wise requirement of works for generation of wage employment. Funds were allocated among the blocks by District Collector/Deputy Commissioner for the shelf of projects obtained from Gram Sabhas/Panchayats and the Departments. The Ministry of Rural Development did not sanction project-wise funds for watershed nor monitored project-wise details.

In April, 1999 the Department of Wastelands was renamed as Department of Land Resources and DDP and DPAP and watershed component of projects sanctioned prior to 1 April, 1999 under EAS were transferred to the Department of Land Resources. The Department undertook an exercise to determine the committed liabilities for only those works which were truly a watershed under the strict definition of the guidelines issued

by this Ministry and where the money was transferred to watershed committees prior to 1 April, 1999. Thus States submitted the district-wise requirement of funds to complete the projects. The total area taken up under EAS period to 31 March, 1999 for completion of watershed development projects was estimated at 63.50 lakh hectares and the committed liabilities were worked out to be Rs.1500 crore out of which the Central share was 75 per cent i.e. Rs. 1125 crore. It was also decided that the Central share of committed liabilities of the EAS amounting to Rs.1125 crore will be released by the Department of Land Resources in six half yearly installments during the next three years i.e. 1999-2000, 2000-2001, 2001-2002. As the average size of each project was 500 hectares the number of projects was very large. The installments were not released project-wise but these were released to the districts on the basis of consolidated utilisation certificate and audited statement of accounts submitted by them. The next instalment was released only when the unutilized balance with the district was less than 50 per cent of the last release. As all the States could not claim the due Central share by 2001-02, it was agreed for continuation of projects upto March, 2003. An amount of Rs. 900.69 crores was released upto March, 2004.. The States which could not claim the balance committed liabilities were asked to complete the projects from their own resources. The States were asked to submit completion report and refund the unspent balances. The completion reports have been received from some States and an amount of Rs. 902.15 lakhs has been refunded by the States so far. The Department is pursuing the matter with the States for submission of remaining completion reports. The data on area developed for the projects in all the districts is therefore, not available as the final reports are awaited from the States."

22. The Committee note that the Employment Assurance Scheme being implemented by the Department of Rural Development was discontinued from the year 1999-2000 and the issue of committed liability with regard to the ongoing projects under the aforesaid scheme was transferred from the Department of Rural Development to the Department of Land Resources. Both the Departments are the sister Departments under the jurisdiction of the Ministry of Rural Development. On the issue of monitoring the projects for which the committed liability was transferred from the Department of Rural Development to the Department of Land Resources, the Committee have consistently been pursuing with the Department in the various reports. While examining Demands for Grants of the previous year,

the Committee had again taken up this issue and directed the Department to furnish information about the number of projects transferred, outlay earmarked, the area developed in each of the project district-wise so that the Committee could analyze the position in this regard. In spite of the continuous pursuance of the issue, the action taken replies furnished by the Department are vague. It does not address issues raised by the Committee. The details of the committed liability already known to the Committee have been reproduced in the action taken replies. Besides, the disturbing information provided by the Department is that the Ministry did not sanction project-wise funds for watershed projects nor monitor project-wise details under Employment Assurance Scheme. The installments were being released to the districts on the basis of the requests made by the various districts. The Department has also informed that the completion reports with regard to various projects being undertaken under Employment Assurance Scheme have been received from some of the States and an amount of Rs. 902.15 lakhs has been refunded by the States so far. The Committee note that there is contradiction in the replies furnished by the Department. On the one hand, it has been stated that project-wise monitoring is not being done by them, on the other hand it has been submitted that the completion reports are being received from States. In the absence of detailed and focused reply, the Committee are unable to draw any conclusion with regard to the projects being undertaken under the erstwhile Employment Assurance Scheme. The Committee deplore the way the issue of committed liability under Employment Assurance Scheme is being undertaken and they would like to reiterate their earlier recommendation to furnish the desired information with regard to the number of projects transferred, outlay earmarked, the area developed in each of the project district-wise so as to enable the Committee to have a proper analysis.

G. Expediting Perspective Plan for wastelands development with different State Governments

Recommendation Serial No. 15 (Para No. 3.41)

23. The Committee had noted as below:

“The Committee have repeatedly been recommending to the Department to get the perspective plans finalised from various State Governments on the issue of development of wastelands. They find from the replies that none of the States is ready with the perspective plan. Only two States i.e. Tamil Nadu and Kerala

have submitted the perspective plans in respect of few districts. The Committee feel that there is an urgent need to have a fair idea of the task in hand and the task to be handled in future with regard to wastelands development in the country. Further as observed in the preceding paras of the report there are varying estimates with regard to the area falling under wastelands as well as the task of development of wastelands handled by the Government initiatives. The exact idea of the wastelands area, work involved can be known when the perspective plans are ready. Besides perspective plans as submitted by the State Governments can be a better input to formulate the national plan. In view of this, the Committee strongly recommend to pursue further with the State Governments to finalise the perspective plans so that the same can be used while deciding the strategy for the Eleventh Five Year Plan"

24. The Government in the action taken reply have stated as under:

"As recommended by the Committee, the Department of Land Resources is pursuing the matter of preparation of perspective plans by the States so as to formulate a national plan and decide the strategy of Eleventh Five Year Plan. Some States have however, expressed financial constraints and have requested for funds to prepare these plans. The Government is contemplating to modify the Hariyali guidelines to allow some administrative funds at State level for Information, Education and Communication (IEC), monitoring and planning including preparation of perspective plans."

25. The Committee have repeatedly been emphasizing on the perspective plans by various State Governments on the issue of development of wastelands. In response to the recommendation of the Committee, the Department has pursued the matter with various State Governments. It has been mentioned in the action taken replies that some States have expressed financial constraints and requested for funds to prepare these plans. The Government is contemplating to modify the Hariyali guidelines to allow some administrative funds at State level for Information, Education and Communication (IEC), monitoring and planning including preparation of perspective plans. The Committee would like the Department to take the final decision in this regard expeditiously so that the issue of perspective plans by the States can be addressed which can work as an input for the Eleventh Plan.

H. Need for coordinating works for watershed development under National Rural Employment Guarantee Act with those of existing schemes for wastelands development through watershed projects

Recommendation Serial No. 16 (Para No. 3.42)

26. The Committee had noted as below:

“The Committee further note that as indicated by Technical Committee Rs. 1,50,000 crore would be required to treat the estimated land of 125 million hectares. The Technical Committee has suggested to double the current programme outlay. Further it has also been stated that the allocation made under ‘National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme’ would supplement the outlay provided by different Government schemes for the development of wastelands. The Committee find that the outlay for National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme has been separately allocated by the Department of Rural Development. Rs. 11,300 crore during 2006-2007 have been earmarked for 200 districts which have been covered by the Guarantee Scheme. Till the scheme is not made applicable nation-wide, it is difficult to know how far the outlay provided for NREGS could supplement the Government initiatives taken under different wastelands programmes. Besides there is an urgent need to have some sort of coordinating mechanism for the schemes being undertaken under NREGS related to watershed activities and the schemes taken under the Department of Rural Development or some other Ministries of Union Government or State Governments. The Committee feel that Gram Sabha is the best mechanism to coordinate the activities related to wastelands development. The Committee would like to be apprised of the action taken by the Department in this regard.”

27. The Government in the action taken reply have stated as under:

“The Area Development Programmes under DDP, DPAP and IWDP are implemented by the Panchayati Raj Institutions under the Hariyali Guidelines. The NREGS is also implemented by the PRIs. There is a provision in both to dovetail in order to achieve greater impact at the implementation level. The mechanism to coordinate the activities related to wastelands development is therefore inbuilt in these schemes. However, NREGA is not applicable country-wide and the NREGS depends on demand for work, which may be seasonal. As far as the recommendation of Parthasarathy Committee on this issue is concerned, the same

is being examined by the Ministry in depth. The observations/ suggestions made by the Standing Committee will, however, be duly taken into account and the outcome will be apprised to the Standing Committee."

28. On the suggestion of the Technical Committee to double the current outlay being provided for the development of wastelands in the country, the Committee in the earlier recommendation had proposed for some sort of coordinating mechanism with regard to the works undertaken under the different existing watershed schemes and the National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme keeping in view the fact that most of the activities being undertaken under the Guarantee Scheme relate to treatment and development of land. The Committee had also suggested that Gram Sabhas can be the best mechanism to coordinate the various activities related to wastelands development. On this issue, the Department has assured that the suggestion of the Committee will be taken into account and outcome will be apprised accordingly. The Committee hope that the mechanism of coordination as suggested in the earlier recommendation of the Committee would be evolved expeditiously and they would like to be kept apprised in this regard.

I. Expeditious finalisation of amendment to outdated Land Acquisition Act, 1894

Recommendation Serial No. 18 (Para No. 3.44)

29. The Committee had noted as below:

"The Committee wish to point out that Land Acquisition Act 1894 is an old and outdated enactment which needs considerable amendments keeping in view the changed circumstances. The Committee have repeatedly been stressing for bringing amendments to this Act. The Committee understand that proposal for the amendment of Land Acquisition Act is under consideration with the Department for a long time. They find from the submission made by the Secretary during the course of oral evidence that much emphasis is not being given to finalise the proposals for the amendment of the said Act. The Committee are not convinced by the Statement made by the Secretary that land is a State subject and the Central Act will not become effective unless the State accepts it. The Committee note that Central Acts are the model for the State Governments on which they draft their policies and laws. State Governments are waiting for the amendments in Land Acquisition Act. The old and outdated Act

has been a hindrance for implementation of various projects where acquisition of land is required. In view of this, the Committee strongly recommend to the Department to finalise the proposals for amendment to the aforesaid Act and bring the same before the Parliament at the earliest."

30. The Government in the action taken reply have stated as under:

"Some proposals for amendment in the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 are under consideration. The need for amendment of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 has been felt to meet the ever-growing demand for land because of industrialisation and urbanisation specially after adoption of New Economic Policy and for ensuring both higher compensation to landowners as well as for time bound and effective acquisition of land. Accordingly, a draft of the Land Acquisition (Amendment) Bill, 2004 was circulated to State Governments in 2004 for obtaining their views on some proposed amendments of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 to make the acquisition process time bound and effective. However, responses of all States have not been received. Hence, the proposals have not been finalized so far."

31. The Committee find with dismay that amendments to outdated Land Acquisition Act of 1894 have not been finalised by the Government so far. Non-receipt of views from different State Governments has been attributed a reason for non-finalisation of amendments to the aforesaid Act. The Committee observe that there is lack of will power on the part of Government to bring about the necessary amendments even though there is a need for making the acquisition process time bound and effective in the light of ever growing demand for land because of industrialisation and urbanisation specially after adoption of New Economic Policy and for ensuring higher compensation to land owners. The Committee, therefore, reiterate that proposed amendments to the aforesaid Act should be finalised expeditiously paving the way for a new law to be enacted by Parliament in keeping with the proposed rehabilitation policy.

J. Studying international experience for wastelands development

Recommendation Serial No. 25 (Para No. 4.33)

32. The Committee had noted as below:

"The Technology Development, Extension and Training (TDET) Scheme is an important scheme, the foremost objective of which

is operationalisation of cost effective and proven technologies and dissemination of research findings and appropriate technologies for the development of various categories of wastelands. From the date furnished by the Department with regard to financial achievement the Committee find that even the meager outlay *i.e.* Rs. 15 crore during 2004-05 and Rs. 17 crore during 2005-06 could not be utilized fully. Various reasons like beneficiaries contribution, delay in the release of State share, delay in submission of progress reports and non-receipt of fresh proposals have been cited as the reasons for shortfall in utilisation of funds. The Committee also note that even the few number of projects undertaken are not being successfully implemented. Out of 161 projects, as many as 22 projects were foreclosed. The Committee feel exclusive that there is an urgent need for detailed interaction with the various research institutes like ICAR, State Agricultural Universities which are basically involved with the research in this field. Besides there is an urgent need to motivate these institutions to initiate more and more projects. There is an urgent need to study the international experience with regard to wastelands development. The Committee desire some concrete action in this regard to be taken by Government."

33. The Government in the action taken reply have stated as under:

"TDET Scheme is being implemented in a project mode on the basis of proposals received from implementing agencies and sanctioned by the Project Sanctioning Committee (PSC). The lower utilisation than the budgetary allocation was only during 2002-03 and 2003-04 due to non-receipt of appropriate fresh proposals, timely progress report, utilisation certificate beneficiary contribution and Audited Statement of Accounts under ongoing projects from various implementing agencies. Nevertheless, efforts were made during 2004-05 and 2005-06 to monitor progress of the projects. As a result, funds allocated to the programme during 2004-05 (Rs. 15 crore) and 2005-06 (Rs. 17 crore) were fully utilised. The ICAR, State Agricultural Universities, IITs and other research organizations are fully involved in implementation of TDET Schemes. A senior officer of ICAR (Head Quarters) is a member of PSC of the Scheme

However, to further strengthen interactions with various research institutes, Department proposed to organize regional level workshops involving various research organizations working on development and dissemination of wastelands development technologies."

34. The Committee note that the reply of the Government is silent on the issue of studying international experience for the purpose of wastelands development. The Committee would like the categorical response of the Department in this regard.

K. Need for State-specific reasons for under utilization of funds for maintenance and updation of Land Records

Recommendation Serial No. 27 (Para No. 5.14)

35. The Committee had noted as below:

“Maintenance and updation of land records is an important area which needs to be addressed urgently. Land records are the basic document of the property owned by an individual as well as by the group of people and Government at various levels. The importance of land records is immense not only for an individual but also for Government for the future planning. Once the land records are properly maintained, it will bring transparency and a mechanism to have an idea of Benami landholdings. The Committee find that a laudable scheme Computerisation of Land Records has been initiated by the Union Government with 100 per cent Central assistance since 1988-89. The outlay provided so far *i.e.* Rs. 416.06 crore could not be utilized fully by the State Governments. The utilisation upto 31 January, 2006 is Rs. 256.71 crore. The Committee feel that under-spending of around 40 per cent of the outlay is a major area of concern. Further the Committee note that the allocation during the year 2005-06 was double as compared to previous year. The Committee also find from the replies that sincere efforts have not been made to find out the reasons for huge under-spending. It has simply been stated that the scheme is demand driven. The Committee while expressing their concern over the under-utilisation of funds would like the Department to find out specific reasons for under-spending State-wise and inform the Committee accordingly.”

36. The Government in the action taken reply have stated as under:

“Under the scheme of Computerisation of Land Records, different activities *viz.* development of suitable software as per the State’s requirement, undertaking basic data entry work, verification/ validation and backlog of data entry work, site preparation and setting up of computer centres at tehsil/sub-division level and porting of data from foxbase to window platform and operationalisation of the scheme are time consuming. Accordingly,

States are taking time in utilization of funds released for implementation of the scheme. However, in the mean time, the utilization position has improved from the earlier 60 per cent to 64 per cent.

The implementation of the Scheme was reviewed in the Conference of Revenue Secretaries held on 7th June, 2006. The State Governments were requested for expeditious utilization of funds and for effective implementation of the Scheme so that it is completed at the earliest and the benefits reached grass root level. Minister (RD) has also written to the Chief Ministers for giving priority to the implementation of the Scheme so that it is completed at the earliest."

37. The Committee in their earlier recommendation while expressing concern over the huge under-spending of around 40 per cent of the outlay during the year 2005-06 under one of the important 100 per cent Centrally Sponsored Programme i.e. Computerization of Land Records had desired State specific reasons in this regard. The Department instead of probing the reasons for huge under-spending has tried to justify the under-spending by stating that different activities undertaken under the Scheme are time consuming. The Department has also furnished the updated information with regard to the utilization of funds according to which the utilization has improved from 60 per cent to 64 per cent. Even if the latest data is taken into consideration, 36 per cent of the under-utilization is a matter of concern. The Committee deplore the way such a serious issue has been addressed in the action taken reply. They reiterate their earlier recommendation to know the State specific reasons and would like the Department to take necessary action and apprise the Committee accordingly.

L. Funds for imparting computer training to revenue officials in different States

Recommendation Serial No. 32 (Para No. 5.19)

38. The Committee have noted as below:

"The Committee find that 15 States have been provided funds for imparting computer awareness training to revenue officials. The Committee would like to be apprised of the details of the funds earmarked for training to these States. The Committee would also like to be informed about the module of training and the agencies involved for imparting training. They would like to suggest that similar initiatives should be taken in other States also."

39. The Government in the action taken reply have stated as under:

“Funds are being provided to State Governments under the CLR Scheme as per demands received for imparting training to revenue officials. However, earmarking of funds for this purpose is not made. The training is being organized by the State Units of the National Informatics Centre (NIC) as per the requirement of the States.”

40. The Committee while examining Demands for Grants had been informed that 15 States were provided funds for imparting computer awareness training to revenue officials. While taking interest in the aforesaid issue, the Committee had desired the details of funds earmarked for training to these States, module of training and the agencies involved in imparting training. Besides, the Committee also recommended for similar initiatives in other States also. The action taken reply submitted by the Department is silent on the issues raised by the Committee. It has simply been stated that the training is being organized by the State unit of National Informatic Centre as per the requirement of the States. The Committee while reiterating the issues raised earlier would like a categorical and focussed reply in this regard.

CHAPTER II

RECOMMENDATIONS THAT HAVE BEEN ACCEPTED BY THE GOVERNMENT

Recommendation Serial No. 1 (Para No. 2.5)

The Committee note that the primary objective of inserting direction 73A in the Directions by the Speaker was to make the Government more accountable for implementation of the various recommendations of the Committee. The Committee are concerned to note that even after lapse of around six months when the statement on Tenth Report has fallen due and about three months when the Ministry was requested for making the revised statement in respect of Second Report, the statements are yet to be made by the Hon'ble Minister. The Committee find that the Department is taking the desired action to make the statements in the Second part of the Seventh Session. The Committee recommend to the Department to ensure that the statements are made at the earliest during the Second part of the Seventh Session. The Committee further strongly recommend to the Department to ensure that the statements on each of the reports are made within the specified period *i.e.* six months after the presentation of the Report to Parliament as per direction 73A of the Directions by the Speaker, in future.

Reply of the Government

Minister's Statement on Second and Tenth Reports of the Standing Committee have been made in both Houses of Parliament on the following dates:

II Report on 12.5.2006 in Lok Sabha

II Report on 17.5.2006 in Rajya Sabha

X Report on 12.5.2006 in Lok Sabha

X Report on 17.5.2006 in Rajya Sabha

Copies of both the Statements have also been sent to the office of Parliamentary Standing Committee on Rural Development. The Committee's recommendation has been noted for compliance in future.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development),
O.M. No.Z-11014/2/2006-GC, Dated: 31 August, 2006]

Recommendation Serial No. 2 (Para No. 2.17)

The Committee find from the data indicated for 9th and 10th Plan that there is huge mismatch between the proposed allocation and agreed to allocation. Whereas during 9th Plan, the allocation as agreed to is around 40 per cent of the proposed outlay, the agreed to allocation during 10th Plan is Rs. 561 crore more than the proposed outlay. The Department has submitted new guidelines as a reason for slow utilisation and getting lesser allocation during 9th Plan. The reasons put forth by the Department for getting around 40 per cent of the proposed allocation during 9th Plan are not convincing. The plea accorded by the Department for getting more than the proposed allocation during Tenth Plan is that Rs. 1,000 crore was provided for 'New Initiatives' and thus the outlay agreed for Tenth Plan would come up to Rs. 5,526 crore which is Rs. 439 crore lesser than the proposed outlay. Even if it is accepted, the projected outlay during 10th Plan was Rs. 580.46 crore lesser than proposed outlay during 9th Plan.

The Committee are surprised to find that the proposed allocation during 9th Plan was higher when the guidelines were new but during 10th Plan, the projections were reduced, even when the field agencies had adapted themselves to the new guidelines. The Committee conclude that the projections are not properly presented to the Planning Commission/Ministry of Finance for different plans. Even the Secretary during the course of the oral evidence has admitted that somewhere the mistake is there. The Committee strongly recommends that the Department should take utmost care while making projections for 11th Plan. The perspective plans for wastelands development should be prepared by the various State Governments after due consultations with the Implementing Agencies. Not only that district level plans should be prepared after taking into consideration the total work to be undertaken keeping in view the area of wastelands in that area, the capacity of the implementing agencies etc. while holding key consultations at the grass-root level and at the Panchayat level. With regard to other schemes for land records also the projections should be made keeping in view the work completed and the pending work. The projections should be realistic to the extent possible. Besides, the outlay, strategy and priorities during 11th Plan should be chalked out well before the start of the 11th Plan *i.e.* the year 2007-08, so as to ensure meaningful utilisation of outlay. The early finalisation of outlay for the 11th Plan would further enable the State Governments/ implementing agencies to make timely allocations under different schemes/programmes.

Reply of the Government

The Department would make all efforts to finalise projections for the XI Five Year Plan as per recommendations of the Committee. The outlays would be finalized well before the beginning of 2007-08, based on recommendations of the two Working Groups on Rainfed Areas and Land Relations, and perspective plans of the State Governments. These Working Groups have been constituted by the Planning Commission for 11th Five Year Plan to prepare approach paper and action plan in respect of each Department. The approach paper and Action Plan for the total Plan Period are discussed and finalized in the Steering Committee in Planning Commission.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development),
O.M. No.Z-11014/2/2006-GC, Dated: 31 August, 2006]

Recommendation Serial No. 3 (Para No. 2.18)

The Committee further find from the data of allocation of outlay that whatever may be the case of placing projections for different schemes of the Department, it is certain that adequate priority has been accorded by the Government while finalising the outlay for 10th Plan. It is very rare when any Ministry/Department has been allocated resources more than the projections. The Committee also observes that the focused and balanced development of wastelands is imperative keeping in view the decline in the availability of land per person over the years. Further, the facts revealed by the Parthasarthy Committee establish that there is concentration of poverty in the dry lands of the country. From the position as indicated above, the Committee find that more attention needs to be given for the development of wastelands in the country. The wastelands when developed can be a major source for fulfilling the need for food and water security. Not only that it can be a major source for providing employment to the poorest of poor in the country. The detailed scheme-wise position of outlay, expenditure and physical achievement has been analysed in the succeeding chapter of the report. Here the Committee would like to recommend for adequate outlay for different schemes of wastelands in the country. Besides recommending for higher outlay, there is an urgent need for successful implementation of the schemes/programmes which has been reviewed by the Committee in detail in the succeeding chapter of the report.

Reply of the Government

The Ministry is examining the recommendations of Parthasarathy Committee in depth. The observations/suggestions made by the

Standing Committee will be duly taken into account and the outcome apprised to the Standing Committee. The Department will propose enhanced outlays during 11th Plan for the schemes of wasteland development in accordance with need. All efforts are being made for successful implementation of various schemes of the department.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development),
O.M. No.Z-11014/2/2006-GC, Dated: 31 August, 2006]

Recommendation Serial No. 5 (Para No. 2.20)

The Committee further find from the information provided by the Department that Rs. 1,000 crore was earmarked for new initiatives during 10th Plan. Even when the 10th Plan is coming to an end no new initiative could be finalized. The new programme 'Bio-fuel' proposed by the Department is still at a nascent stage. The Committee in their earlier reports on Demands for Grants had repeatedly been expressing concern over the way new schemes are proposed. The Committee express strong concern over the way the scarce resources are being blocked for the new schemes, which are not implemented. The blocking of resources in this way clearly means depriving the other schemes/programmes of their due share. The Committee hold the strong view that the new schemes should be properly planned and the allocation should be earmarked only when the spadework has been done and all the paraphernalia to implement the scheme is ready.

Reply of the Government

During the year 2003-04, an amount of Rs. 100 crore was proposed under "new initiatives" by the Department. Only a token provision of Rs. 1 crore was agreed to by the Planning Commission. There was no expenditure against this allocation. Under "New Initiatives", two new schemes *viz.* Pradhan Mantri Grameen Jal Samvardhan Yojana and Bio-Fuels were proposed during 2004-05 and Rs. 200 crore and Rs. 10 crore were proposed for the two schemes respectively which were agreed to by the Planning Commission. These funds could not be utilized and were reallocated at RE stage.

So far as scheme of Bio-diesel is concerned, approval on Detailed Project Report on Demonstration phase has been obtained in-principle, from Planning Commission. Against the proposed amount of Rs. 200 crore, a budget provision of Rs. 50 crores was made during 2005-06 for the programme. The Departmental EFC approved Jatropha Nursery Programme at a cost of Rs. 49 crore. Accordingly, Rs. 49.00 crore has been released to different States for raising Jatropha nurseries.

Similarly, against the proposed amount of Rs. 200 crore, the Planning Commission has allocated Rs. 50 crore for this scheme during the current financial year (2006-07). The Memorandum for the EFC amounting to Rs. 1301.00 crore for the Demonstration Phase of National Mission on Bio-diesel has been circulated on 14.8.2006.

The recommendation of the Committee is noted for future compliance.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development),
O.M. No.Z-11014/2/2006-GC, Dated: 31 August, 2006]

Recommendation Serial No. 14 (Para No. 3.40)

The committee note that different data with regard to total wastelands in the country which need to be developed has been indicated in the different documents. As per the initial Atlas brought out by the Department in the year 2000, total wastelands has been indicated as 63.85 million hectares. Further the Technical Committee in its report has stated that 45.58 million hectares have been treated so far since 8th Plan by the initiatives of the Union Government. It has further been stated that excluding the 46 million hectares as already treated, the areas remaining to be treated are 125 million hectares. While appreciating the fact that there are various estimates with regard to wastelands development and it is difficult to find out the exact data in this regard, the Committee feel that there is an urgent need to have some data indicating the minimum wastelands area that needs to be developed so as to enable the Government to prepare an action plan. The answer to this issue is the perspective plans by the different State Governments.

Reply of the Government

The area of wastelands indicated in the Atlas brought out by the Department in 2000 and 2005 is based on scientific study, carried out by NRSA by using remote sensing technology, and not empirical. The total extent of wastelands is 55.27 million hectares (as per one time IRS data of the year 2003). Out of this, 43.15 million hectares is treatable. During the 10th Plan, 18 million hectares will be treated. Thus, the area remaining for treatment is 25.15 Million hectares.

The Technical Committee in its report has stated that around 170 million hectares of degraded land needs watershed treatment. This includes all type of degraded lands including wastelands. The Technical Committee report also says that 45.58 million hectares land has been

treated on watershed basis by various Ministries of Government of India since the beginning of 8th Plan. Thus, leaving around 125 million hectares of degraded lands to be treated on watershed basis.

As recommended by the Committee, the Department of Land Resources is pursuing the matter of preparation of perspective plans by the States so as to formulate a national plan and decide the strategy of Eleventh Five Year Plan.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development),
O.M. No.Z-11014/2/2006-GC, Dated: 31 August, 2006]

Recommendation Serial No. 17 (Para No. 3.43)

The Committee find that some initiatives are being taken for formulating the National Land Resource Management Policy. The Committee would like the Government to pursue the matter further so that there is proper direction in land management.

Reply of the Government

At national level, an apex body under the chairmanship of Prime Minister namely National Land Use and Wastelands Development Council (NLWC) was set up in 1985 whose main function was to serve as a policy, planning, coordination and monitoring agency for issues concerning management of the country's land resources. Under this NLWC, three boards namely (i) National Land Use and Conservation Board (NLCB) in Department of Agriculture & Cooperation, (ii) National Wastelands Development Board (NWDB) in Department of Land Resources and (iii) National Afforestation & Eco-Development Board (NAEB) in Ministry of Environment & Forests were set up. The NLWC, in its meeting held in February, 1986, approved the National Land Use Policy Outlines, having following 19 Action Points :—

1. Lands Use Boards at the State level should be revitalized. Wherever they do not exist, they must be created.
2. Land Use Policy must be evolved by all users of land within Government jointly and must be enforced on the basis of both legislation for enforcing land use as well as their promotional and preserving methods.
3. Urban Policy must be restructured so as to ensure that highly productive land is not taken away. Town planning should also provide for green belts.

4. A national campaign should be launched for educating the farmers and Government Departments about the need to conform to an integrated land use policy.
5. Cropping pattern should be reviewed specially in drought prone/desert areas, so that maximum advantage is taken of improved soil and water management practices.
6. Land and soil surveys should be completed and inventory of land resources should be prepared in each State so that resources allocation is based on a reliable data base.
7. Heavy penalties should be imposed against those who interfere with land resources and its productivity. It must be recognized that environmental protection cannot succeed unless this is done.
8. The problems of water logging, salinity and alkalinity must be brought under control by the use of appropriate technologies and by the adoption of proper water management practices.
9. The management of Command Areas should be reviewed, restructured and revitalized within a specified time so that water is used efficiently. Necessary investments for treating the catchments must be met to prevent the collapse of irrigation system due to premature siltation.
10. Technologies relating to dry farming, land shaping and water harvesting must be propagated and adopted in the interest of moisture conservation and optimal use.
11. Special programme of conservation and afforestation in the desert areas and of reclamation and rehabilitation in the ravine areas must be launched with greater vigour in order to prevent wind and water erosion.
12. The practice of shifting cultivation should be controlled in order to protect valuable forests.
13. Land use planning should be integrated with rural employment programmes in such a manner that loans and subsidies are given only for those productive activities which represent efficient land use.
14. Rights of tribal and poorer sections on common land should be protected through legal and administrative structures.
15. Stall feeding should be popularized, especially in such areas where grazing land is already degraded.

16. Special fodder Development Programme in selective blocks should be launched together with a Livestock Development Programme. The aim should be to limit the Livestock population to economically productive stock.
17. Plantations for meeting commercial and industrial needs should preferably be located far away from the habitat.
18. The policy of supply forest raw materials on subsidized basis to users other than the rural poor should be reviewed so that raw material is supplied at the prevailing market price, with a view to induce such users to go in for massive afforestation programmes, as also to motivate small and marginal farmers to grow forest based raw material for industry at remunerative prices.
19. The user of alternative packaging material, such as corrugated card boards, plastic bags, etc. instead of wooden packaging, must be explored and encouraged.

The approach towards formulation of a National Land Resources Management Policy is likely to be finalized as per the directions of the National Rainfed Area Authority recently constituted by Government of India under the chairmanship of the Prime Minister. Further action will be taken in the matter as per the decisions of the Authority.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development),
O.M. No.Z-11014/2/2006-GC, Dated: 31 August, 2006]

Recommendation Serial No. 20 (Para No.3.46)

The Committee find that land is the basic constraint in implementation of some of the major schemes of the Department specifically Indira Awaas Yojana where it is difficult to extend the benefit to the landless persons. The possibility of using wastelands for setting up agricultural universities and for constructing houses under Government schemes for the landless persons should be discussed with the various State Governments and the Committee apprised about the feedback received in this regard.

Reply of the Government

It is accepted policy of the Government that wasteland at the disposal of government should be distributed among the eligible rural poor. Accordingly, State Governments have been requested from time

to time for distribution of Govt. wastelands by preparation of time-bound action plans.

The matter was also discussed during the Conference of the Revenue Secretaries of the States/UTs held on 7th June, 2006 in New Delhi under the Chairmanship of Minister (Rural Development). Minister (RD) requested the State Governments for distribution of all available wastelands to the rural poor. He suggested that degraded wastelands should be developed under the NREGA Scheme and distributed to landless. Minister also mentioned about the good practice followed in some States of distribution of house-sites to poor by purchasing land. Subsequently, Minister (RD) has requested the Chief Ministers of the States for taking appropriate action for implementation of the programme of distribution of Govt. wastelands so that the number of land less and homestead less families in the country could be reduced.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development),
O.M. No.Z-11014/2/2006-GC, Dated: 31 August, 2006]

Recommendation Serial No. 21 (Para No. 4.14)

The Committee note that IWDP is the most important programme of the Department for the development of wastelands in the country. The status of financial achievement during 9th and 10th Plan as given above indicate that there has not been major enhancement in the outlay under the Scheme. The outlay for Rs. 450 crore during the year 2002-03 has been enhanced to Rs. 565 crore during 2006-07. But the allocation earmarked has not been fully utilized during each year of 9th and 10th Plan. Under-spending is the recurring feature of this programme. As regards the physical achievement the data indicate that almost half of the projects sanctioned are still continuing. The number of projects taken up during 10th Plan are almost double the projects undertaken during 9th Plan. Further, there are problems like unspent balance, non-submission of Utilisation Certificate and misutilisation of funds as pointed out in C&AG Report for which certain recoveries were to be made. The Committee conclude that there are serious problems in implementation of IWDP programme which needs to be addressed urgently. Taking into consideration the gigantic task of development of wastelands in the country the Committee strongly recommend to enhance the allocation under IWDP which is one of the major schemes of the Department. While recommending for higher outlay the Committee would also like the Department to ensure that the allocation earmarked in a year is utilized fully.

Reply of the Government

The trend of under utilization of funds under IWDP has been checked and during 2005-06 the total outlay of Rs.485 crore has been completely utilized. While demanding budget under IWDP, the absorption capacity of States is also kept in view. However, the Department will make all out efforts to utilise the allocation completely, in future.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development),
O.M. No.Z-11014/2/2006-GC, Dated: 31 August, 2006]

Recommendation Serial No. 23 (Para No. 4.24)

The Committee find from the information furnished above that foreclosure and stopping of funds to the projects is a major problem under DDP and DPAP blocks. The issue has been dealt with in detail in the preceding paras of the report. Here the Committee may highlight that the number of projects foreclosed and for which funds have been stopped is more than in the case of IWDP schemes. As recommended in the earlier part of the report, the Committee would like the information about the year of foreclosure, funds allocated at the time of foreclosure of each project so as to enable the Committee to make proper analysis.

Reply of the Government

The Department has taken steps to streamline procedure for foreclosure and extension of projects as indicated in the reply to the Recommendation at Serial No.11 (para 3.25). The relevant details of 'DPAP/DDP funding stopped projects' are submitted in **Appendix I&II**.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development),
O.M. No.Z-11014/2/2006-GC, Dated: 31 August, 2006]

Recommendation Serial No. 26 (Para No. 4.34)

Besides initiating research studies one of the objectives of the programme is dissemination of research findings and appropriate technologies. The Committee would like to be apprised of the number of demonstration projects undertaken under the aforesaid schemes. Besides, the initiatives taken for dissemination of research findings and technologies by the Department should also be intimated to the Committee to enable them to analyse the performance of the scheme.

Reply of the Government

The majority of projects sanctioned under the TDET Scheme are demonstration projects. The DRDAs/State Governments have to replicate suitable technologies in implementation of watershed programmes. After successful implementation of the projects, the Department selects a few best projects for documentation and dissemination of information. Accordingly, Department has published following bulletins on wastelands development and circulated to State Governments:

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. Technical Brochure, DoLR, MoRD—01/2003 | Rehabilitation of Gullied and Ravine Lands |
| 2. Technical Brochure, DoLR, MoRD—02/2003 | Reclamation and Management of Waterlogged Salt Affected Soils |
| 3. Technical Brochure, DoLR, MoRD—03/2003 | Reclamation of Areas Degraded by Mining & Industrial Wastes |
| 4. Technical Brochure, DoLR, MoRD—04/2003 | Rehabilitation of Wastelands of Arid Ecosystem |
| 5. Technical Brochure, DoLR, MoRD—05/2003 | Making Waterlogged Areas Productive through Drainage |
| 6. Technical Brochure, DoLR, MoRD—06/2003 | Development Lands Affected by Shifting Cultivation |
| 7. Technical Brochure, DoLR, MoRD—07/2003 | Agro forestry Species of Silviculture, Horticulture, Pasture and Medicinal Plants for different Agro-Ecoregions of India. |

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development),
O.M. No.Z-11014/2/2006-GC, Dated: 31 August, 2006]

Recommendation Serial No. 28 (Para No. 5.15)

The Committee further note that States of Karnataka, Tamil Nadu, Goa and Gujarat have fully operationalised the system and made online updation through computerised system. Besides many other States such as Madhya Pradesh, Rajasthan, Uttar Pradesh, West Bengal, Sikkim, Maharashtra, Chattisgarh have also taken necessary steps in this direction by affecting regular mutation/updation of land records. Few other States have also completed the basic data entry work and started regular updation of land records. The worst performing State is Meghalaya and some Union Territories *viz.* Andaman & Nicobar Islands

and Lakshadweep. The Committee appreciate the efforts made by some of the States like Karnataka, Tamil Nadu, Goa and Gujarat who could not only fully computerize the land records but also could make updation possible through computerised system. The Committee would like the Department to pursue the matter with other States so that the objectives of the programme can be achieved in these States.

Reply of the Government

State Governments have been requested from time to time for taking suitable steps for effective implementation of the Scheme. The progress is also reviewed from time to time at various fora including the Conferences of Revenue Ministers & Revenue Secretaries of the States.

The implementation of the Computerisation of Land Records Scheme was also reviewed during the Conference of Revenue Secretaries held on 7th June, 2006. Minister (RD) stressed the need for better implementation of the Scheme in the States where significant progress has not been made so that they could reach to the level of better performing States. In the mean time Minister (RD) has also written to the Chief Ministers of the States for giving priority to the implementation of the Scheme so that it is completed at the earliest.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development),
O.M. No.Z-11014/2/2006-GC, Dated: 31 August, 2006]

Recommendation Serial No. 29 (Para No. 5.16)

The Committee further note that some progress has been made with regard to maintenance of land records in North Eastern States. As informed by the Department the basic data entry work in the States of Assam, Manipur, Mizoram, Nagaland, Arunachal Pradesh and Tripura have already been started. The work is likely to be completed in March 2007. The State of Sikkim has already completed the data entry work. In the case of Meghalaya, the scheme has not yet been started due to non-availability of proper land records. The Committee would like the Department to further pursue with these North Eastern States so that the work relating to computerisation of land records is completed.

Reply of the Government

The States including North Eastern States have been requested from time to time for taking suitable steps for effective implementation

of the Scheme of Computerisation of Land Records. Further, the progress was reviewed during the aforesaid Conference of Revenue Secretaries held on 7th June, 2006 and subsequently Minister (RD) has also written to the Chief Ministers of all the States for giving priority to the implementation of the Scheme so that it is completed at the earliest.

Meghalaya has not so far been covered under the Scheme because land tenure system in Meghalaya is different in its form and practice compared to the system prevailing in other parts of the country. The land is owned and vested with the private individuals and the community except few plots where the State Govt. exercises its powers. Accordingly, there are no proper land records in the State. However, the State Govt. has been requested for taking initiatives to start the Scheme of CLR with the existing land records data. Further, they have been requested for taking basic survey by employing modern technology to create land records by availing assistance under the Scheme of Strengthening of Revenue Administration & Updating of Land Records (SRA & ULR). The State Govt. has now indicated their willingness to take up survey and settlement work in the State.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development),
O.M. No.Z-11014/2/2006-GC, Dated: 31 August, 2006]

Recommendation Serial No. 30 (Para No. 5.17)

The Committee further note from the replies furnished by the Department that one of the important tasks for the successful implementation of programme is to stop issue of manual copies of Records of Rights and to provide legal sanctity to computerised copies of RoR by amending the necessary revenue rules/regulations. Whereas the States of Goa, Gujarat, Karnataka, Tamil Nadu, Uttar Pradesh and West Bengal have already amended the necessary revenue rules/regulations in this regard, the action is pending in other States. Various reasons like lack of administrative and political will at State level, waiting for complete stabilization of computerised system etc. have been indicated as the reasons for not providing legal sanctity to computerised copies of RoR in these States. The Committee feel that more interaction through various seminars, conferences is required with the State Governments to persuade them to amend the revenue rules/regulations so that the computerised system of land records may be given legal sanctity. Besides the Committee feel that once the land records are computerised and the people are made aware of the system, the other issues related to giving legal sanctity to computerised copies

of RoR would automatically be demanded by the public at large. As such there is an urgent need to first complete the system of computerisation by the initiatives of the Centrally Sponsored Schemes and make maintenance as well as updation of land records a reality. The Committee hope that the Department would take the desired action in this regard.

Reply of the Government

State Governments have been requested for taking suitable steps for completion of all the activities under the Scheme of CLR in a time-bound manner. During the Conference of Revenue Secretaries held on 7th June, 2006, Minister (RD) emphasized that the aim of the Scheme is to provide secure access to correct and up-to-date copies of Record of Rights (RoRs) on demand with least scope of rent seeking. This would happen by ensuring that the RoRs are certifiable directly by the computer system and legally acceptable in that form, and available on demand, may be downloaded by the individual themselves through a web-based format. Discontinuation of the manual issue of RoRs, abolition of stamp papers, online and secure access to land-related information and records, integration of registration and mutation processes would reduce unnecessary harassment to the common people in the hands of the revenue functionaries.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development),
O.M. No.Z-11014/2/2006-GC, Dated: 31 August, 2006]

Recommendation Serial No. 31 (Para No. 5.18)

The Committee further note the laudable idea given by the Secretary, Department of Land Resources whereby a thought is being given to link up the land record information with the computers of the lending bankers so that the farmer does not even need to procure the copy of land records every time. The bankers can access the land record directly without any charge. The Committee appreciate the idea and feel that if it is made possible, it will help the general public specifically farmers. Not only it will reduce the transaction cost, but also would be a great relief for the poor persons whose applications are rejected by the banks due to non-availability of proper copy of land records. Besides, the assistance under various Centrally Sponsored Schemes provided through banks like Swarnajyanti Gram Swarozgar Yojana (SGSY) can easily be made available.

Reply of the Government

One of the main objectives of the CLR Scheme is to ensure that the landowners get computerized copies of ownership, crop and

tenancy and updated copies of Records of Rights (RoRs) on demand. The issue of easy accessibility to land records data was also discussed during the Conference of the Revenue Secretaries held on 7.6.2007. State Governments were requested to provide connectivity and access to the land data to the financial institutions, particularly the Cooperative Banks, which will enable them to process credit requests more efficiently, and will give the needed boost to the rural, agricultural and cooperative credit operations. Some States like Andhra Pradesh, Goa, Madhya Pradesh, Orissa, Rajasthan and Chattisgarh have already put the data on the website and other States are also likely to put the same on the website.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development),
O.M. No.Z-11014/2/2006-GC, Dated: 31 August, 2006]

Recommendation Serial No. 34 (Para No. 5.25)

The Committee find from the data with regard to allocation under the scheme Strengthening of Revenue Administration and Updating of Land Records (SRA & ULR) that out of Rs. 311.77 crore provided to the States/UTs as Central share upto 31 January, 2006, the utilisation position is Rs. 228.01 crore. Thus around 27 per cent of the funds could not be utilized. The Committee also note that the inability of State Governments to provide 50 per cent matching share is the basic concern for implementation of the programme. The Committee also note that the matter of reviewing the financial pattern from existing 50:50 to 90:10 was taken up by the Department with the Planning Commission who have stated that the 12th Finance Commission Report has provided more resources. The said issue was addressed in detail by the Committee in their 10th and 16th Report. The Committee had also observed that there is no specific mention about additional amount for the purpose of land records in the 12th Finance Commission Report. In view of this, the Committee would like the Government to take up the matter again with the Planning Commission in the light of the observations made by the Committee and impress upon them to change the funding pattern.

Reply of the Government

The Schemes of SRA & ULR and CLR are inter-related. Accordingly, with a view to combining the two Schemes, a new Scheme *viz.* Comprehensive Modernization of Land Records (CMLR) with 100 per cent Central assistance is being formulated. The Scheme envisages integration of computerization of land records with survey & settlement, carrying out survey, revisional or original survey using modern

technology, digitization of cadastral maps and registration. CMLR will deliver outcomes in terms of updated land records to establish clear land titles. After obtaining requisite approvals, it is proposed to take up the scheme on pilot project basis in one district of each State.

The implementation strategy of the new Scheme was also discussed during the above mentioned Conference of Revenue Secretaries and commitment of the States was requested for this purpose. Thereafter, Minister (RD) has requested the Chief Ministers of the States for looking into the issue so that revenue functionaries are ready to formulate proposals for seeking Central assistance under the Scheme and for its execution. After successful implementation of the Scheme in pilot districts, it will be extended to other Districts. As 100 per cent Central assistance for implementation of the Scheme, except for computerization of registration offices, is proposed, the issue of State share would no longer be relevant.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development),
O.M. No.Z-11014/2/2006-GC, Dated: 31 August, 2006]

Recommendation Serial No. 35 (Para No.5.26)

The Committee further note that two schemes SRA & ULR and Computerisation of Land Records are inter-related. The land records can be computerised only when the land records are properly available. Thus availability of land records is the basic issue. In view of this, the Committee would like to be apprised by the Department how the coordination between these two schemes is being maintained.

Reply of the Government

The Schemes of SRA & ULR and CLR are inter-related. Accordingly, with a view to combining the two Schemes, a new Scheme *viz.* Comprehensive Modernization of Land Records (CMLR), which will formalize this inter-relation as well as inter-relation of registration process and updating of land records has been formulated. The Scheme envisages integration of computerization of land records with survey & settlement, carrying out survey, re-visional or original survey using modern technology, digitization of cadastral maps, computerization of registration and inter linking registration with record-of-right process. CMLR will deliver outcomes in terms of updated land records to establish clear land titles. After obtaining requisite approvals, it is proposed to take up the scheme on the basis of 100 per cent central funding except for computerization of registration offices, which is proposed at 75:25 sharing basis between the Centre and the States.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development),
O.M. No.Z-11014/2/2006-GC, Dated: 31 August, 2006]

Recommendation Serial No. 36 (Para No.5.27)

The Committee find 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 North Eastern States. In most of the areas even the cadastral survey has not been done and so no land records exist. With regard to the programme 'Computerisation of Land Records', the Committee have been informed that the basic data entry work in the States of Assam, Manipur, Mizoram, Nagaland, Arunachal Pradesh and Tripura has already started. The Committee observe that Computerisation of Land Records is not possible when the basic data of land records is not available in an area. In this situation the Committee wonder how the programme of Computerisation of Land Records is progressing when even the cadastral survey in these States has not been done and no land records exist. The clarification in this regard may be furnished to enable the Committee to review the position of Computerisation of Land Records and SRA & ULR schemes in North Eastern States.

Reply of the Government

The Schemes of CLR and SRA & ULR are already under implementation in all the North Eastern States except Meghalaya. As indicated in reply to recommendation No 5.16, Govt. of Meghalaya has been requested for taking initiatives to start the Scheme of CLR with the existing land records data. Further they have been requested for taking basic survey by employing modern technology to create land records by availing assistance under the Scheme of Strengthening of Revenue Administration & Updating of Land Records (SRA & ULR). The State Govt. has now indicated their willingness to take up survey and settlement work in the State. Further, survey & settlement operations have been taken up by the States of Arunachal Pradesh, Assam and Mizoram in some areas. Keeping in view the wide variety of tenurial and cultivating arrangements, largely reflecting the customary laws and practices of different tribes, sub-tribes and clans, survey/resurvey work in North Eastern States is likely to take time.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development),
O.M. No.Z-11014/2/2006-GC, Dated: 31 August, 2006]

CHAPTER III

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

—Nil—

CHAPTER IV

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

Recommendation Serial No. 7 (Para No.2.26)

The Committee note from the trends of allocation of outlay during the years 2004-05, 2005-06 and 2006-07 that the agreed allocation is lesser than the proposed allocation. During the year 2006-07, the agreed allocation is Rs. 689 crore lesser than the proposed outlay. The Committee find it interesting that whereas the overall allocation for 10th Plan is more than the projections, the allocations under Annual Plans are lesser than the projection. It is difficult to understand the way the budgeting exercise is being undertaken where there seems to be no planning. The Committee would like to be apprised of the basis of making projections under each of the Annual Plan.

Reply of the Government

The overall allocations for 10th Plan is more than the projections only because of provision of Rs. 1000 crores under 'New Initiatives'. In all other schemes (except 'New Initiatives') the approved outlay was less than the proposed outlay as can be seen from the following table:-

(Rs. in crores)		
Sl.No. Name of Scheme	As proposed by the Deptt.	As agreed by Planning Commission
1. DPAP	1600	1500
2. DDP	1200	1100
3. IWDP	1900	1800
4. CLR	500	400
5. SRA&ULR	200	200
6. EAP	365	365
7. TDET	100	90
8. IPS, M&E and Communication	100	71
9. New Initiative	Nil	1000
Total	5965	6526

The allocations during 10th Five Year plan have been utilized by the Department in respect of all Schemes except 'New Initiatives'. The Department makes projections for each of the Annual Plan based on the overall targets under each scheme, demands made by the States, trend of utilization of funds and absorption capacity of the State Governments.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development),
O.M. No.Z-11014/2/2006-GC, Dated: 31 August, 2006]

Comments of the Committee

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

Recommendation Serial No. 8 (Para No.2.27)

Whereas the release from the Centre have been stated to be almost cent per cent of the allocated outlay, the unspent balances to the tune of Rs. 1, 405 crore with the implementing agencies is really a matter of concern to the Committee. They are not convinced with the plea given by the Department whereby the Department has tried to justify the unspent amount by stating that the unspent balance do not exceed 10 percent of the project cost at any point of time. The Department holds the view that the balance is necessitated to maintain availability of funds at the implementation level to avoid eventualities of non-payment of wages as wastelands development projects are labour intensive projects. However, the Committee wish to point out that Rs. 1, 405 crore is almost equal to the overall allocation of the Department during the year 2006-07. The Committee feel that the unspent balances should be seen with reference to the allocation made during a particular year and not with reference to the total project cost under different schemes. The projects may continue even after five to seven years. Roll-on money to the tune of 10 to 20 per cent of the allocation under a scheme during a year can be justified on the grounds stated by the Department. The justification of unspent balance corresponding to the total project cost can not be understood. The Committee find that instead of taking stringent measures for keeping the unspent balances to the minimum, the Department has tried to justify it which the Committee really disapprove. The Department should take all the corrective measures and inform the Committee accordingly.

Reply of the Government

While noting the concern of Hon'ble Standing Committee on unspent balances, it is submitted that all schemes presently

implemented by the department are demand driven. The annual allocations made for different schemes in the Department's budget are not released to States or to Programme Implementing Agencies on allocation basis, but on the basis of demand for further instalments in case of ongoing projects, or for sanction of new projects. For example, in DPAP/DDP & IWDP, the releases are made to ZPs/DRDAs in 5 installments over a period of five years as per the prescribed procedure. Successive installments are released only after 50% of the funds released in the previous installment have been utilized. It is also submitted that the roll over opening balance figure of a particular year under these programmes should be compared to the total funds released to the Programme Implementing Agencies upto the previous year. As under DDP, an amount of Rs. 1603.44 crore of central and state share was released from 1995-96 to 2004-05 and the opening balance as on 1.4.2005 was reportedly Rs. 261.41 crore. This amounts to 15-16%. More or less same position obtains in the DPAP and IWDP.

Hon'ble Committees' observations are very relevant for timely completion of projects so that all the installments are claimed by Project Implementing Agencies within the project period of five years, in accordance with schedule of activities. A number of steps e.g. involvement of States in the monitoring activities, launching of web-based on line monitoring of projects and issue of notices to PIAs of projects where there is delay in claiming the second and subsequent installments have been initiated. All efforts are made to expedite implementation of programmes so that funds released are utilized quickly minimizing the funds in hand for ongoing programme at any point of time.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development),
O.M. No.Z-11014/2/2006-GC, Dated: 31 August, 2006]

Comments of the Committee

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

Recommendation Serial No. 10 (Para No.3.14)

The Committee further note the claim of the Department that the extent of wastelands has come down from 63.85 million hectares to 55.27 million hectares between the period 2000 and 2005. The Committee find that even with the efforts of the Department of Land Resources the target for development of wastelands during five years

of 10th Plan are 18 million hectares. Out of this target, 12.47 hectares of wastelands have already been developed. The other Ministries/ Departments of the Union Government as well as State Governments involved with the task of development of wastelands may also be contributing substantially towards the development of major area of wastelands in the country. In this scenario, the Committee find that there is some mismatch between the achievement proclaimed by the Department and the actual area developed. Although the Department seems very optimistic by finding that the wastelands area has declined as found by the updated Atlas, the achievements reflected by the updated Atlas *i.e.* development of only 8.58 million hectares of land during five years period is too meager even when compared with the targets of five years *i.e.* 18 million hectares only of the Department of Land Resources. If the targets fixed and proclaimed by different Ministries of Union as well as State Governments are added together, the whole wastelands area would have been developed by now. In view of this scenario, the Committee feel that the achievements reflected under schemes may not be true at the ground level. The Committee would like a clarification of the Department in this regard so as to enable them to understand the position in proper perspective.

Reply of the Government

The X Plan target of 18 million ha. is for sanctioning of new projects. Achievement of land actually treated would be reflected after these new projects are completed. Reduction in the extent of wastelands by 8.58 million ha. would reflect the development of wasteland under projects sanctioned prior to X Plan. The total area covered by projects under area development projects sanctioned prior to 10th Plan (1995-96 to 2001-02) is as follows:

IWDP	3.27 million ha.
DPAP	6.90 million ha.
DDP	3.36 million ha.
Total	13.53 million ha.

A study titled "Comprehensive Assessment of Watershed Programmes in India" has been assigned to the International Crops Research Institute for the Semi-Arid Tropics (ICRISAT), Hyderabad to critically assess the impact of various watershed development programmes in India; to identify the drivers of success from the bright

spots; to develop suitable institutional and technical recommendations, policy guidelines and suitable data base for sustainable and efficient management of the watershed programmes and to identify the positive factors leading to reduction of wastelands by about 9 million hectares (2.72 % of geographical area) over a period of 5 years as indicated by Wastelands Atlases brought out in 2000 and 2005. The total project period is for 2 years. ICRISAT study covers programmes of all concerned Departments/Ministries. The study is based on the decision taken in the meeting of National Watershed Committee and funded jointly by this Department and by the Department of Agriculture & Cooperation, Ministry of Agriculture.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development),
O.M. No.Z-11014/2/2006-GC, Dated: 31 August, 2006]

Comments of the Committee

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

Recommendation Serial No. 11 (Para No. 3.25)

The Committee in their 10th and 16th Reports had expressed serious concerns over the issue of foreclosure of projects under the schemes related to wastelands development *i.e.* Integrated Wastelands Development Programme (IWDP), Drought Prone Areas Programme (DPAP), Desert Development Programme (DDP) and Technology Development, Extension and Training (TDET). While examining the action taken replies, the Committee had observed that some of the projects were foreclosed at the last stage when substantial allocation had been released for the project thereby wasting national resources. Detailed analysis of the issue indicate that the system of foreclosure has been given in detail in the watershed guidelines. It has been stated that at the initial phase of a project *i.e.* the first nine to twelve months, if it is considered that the project cannot be implemented successfully for certain unavoidable circumstances and reasons the ZP/DRDA shall recommend for its foreclosure to the State Governments which will consider such requests on merits and send its recommendations to the Department of Land Resources. As reported in 16th Report of the Committee, most of the projects are being foreclosed even at the last stage. The Committee observe that the guidelines do not seem to have been followed while foreclosing projects under different schemes.

The Committee further find from the data furnished by the Department that for a large number of projects under DPAP and DDP funding has been stopped. The Committee would like to be informed about the difference between the funding stopped and foreclosure of the projects since two different data have been indicated in the Budget documents. The Committee would also like the Department to furnish information with regard to the date of sanction, funds earmarked and date of foreclosure/when funds were stopped in each of the foreclosed project scheme-wise so as to enable the Committee to analyse the position in detail. The Committee would also like to recommend that such information about the foreclosure/funding stopped should regularly be maintained and indicated in the Budget documents.

Reply of the Government

It is submitted that the term 'foreclosure' refers to provision of 'probation period' in the watershed guidelines, which provide that when a project fails to even take off during the probation period (initial 9-12 months) as the required village level institutions to steer the project implementation are not grounded due to conflicting interest groups in the project area and the project can not be implemented successfully, the same may be recommended by ZP/DRDA for 'foreclosure' to the State Government which will consider such requests on merits and send its recommendations to Department of Land Resources (DoLR). The unspent funds should be refunded to DoLR when the projects are foreclosed. The "funding stopped projects" of IWDP/DPAP/DDP are those where complete implementation could not take place in the scheduled project period due to inordinate delay in implementation of the project. The delayed-projects are duly considered and given extension of 1-2 years. In fact, many such projects were completed in extension period but in those, which still could not be completed, further funding was stopped. Utilization Certificate (UC) for the funds already released is obtained and State Government is supposed to fund the remaining part of the project. If funds released are not properly utilized recovery is effected. 7 projects under IWDP were closed for various reasons such as conflict amongst various groups, cases being sub-judice leading to undue delay etc. In most cases, such closed projects are followed by fresh projects to avoid deprivation of benefits to the people of that area. Recovery of 72.23 lakh has been effected in one case. Efforts are being made to recover funds in other cases.

The Ministry has initiated action on the following lines to streamline procedure of foreclosure and extension of projects:—

1. Foreclosure

- (i) In addition to mid-term evaluation by the State Government a concurrent evaluation of the project in the second year of the implementation shall be got done to find out whether the required village level institutions have been grounded and the necessary institutional mechanism for execution of project has been established.
- (ii) The evaluation shall also indicate whether the technical features of the project including physical location, layout and alignment of the components are *prima facie* sound and suggest modifications for recasting, if required.
- (iii) A State level committee shall be constituted for examining the report and recommending action for foreclosure or continuance of the project to Department of Land Resources.
- (iv) The committee shall also fix responsibility in all cases of financial embezzlement or other implementation lapses.
- (v) The formal closure shall be by department of land resources and unspent amount has to be returned to the Department of Land Resources.

2. Extension

A review of all ongoing projects requiring extension shall be done by a State level committee. The committee shall examine each project on merit and submit a report/recommendation to Department of Land Resources at least 90 days before expiry of stipulated period. The State committee may also recommend either rescheduling of the remaining project activities to be completed within the originally sanctioned project period or an extended project period. The report/recommendation of the State Government on foreclosure and extension of projects shall be examined by the Project Sanctioning Committee (PSC) in DoLR/MoRD for granting extension or closing the project.

Besides, monitoring of claiming the second instalment by Project implementing agencies is key to implementation of programmes. Accordingly, these will be monitored strictly and show cause notices issued to PIA/ State Government wherever there is delay in claiming

the second instalment (after approval of the project report, work plan and community mobilization) and the fourth instalment (after Mid-Term Evaluation of the project).

The details of foreclosed/funding-stopped IWDP projects are as under:—

(Rs. in lakh)

Sl. No.	Name of the District	Date of Sanction	Total Area (in ha.)	Total cost	Total releases	Date of foreclosure/ funding stopped	Remarks
1.	Unnao-I	2.1.98	12041	481.64	216.73	1999-2000	CBI case for misappropriation/ mis-utilisation of funds by NGO as PIA
2.	Raebareli	25.6.98	12100	484.00	172.60	1999-2000	
3.	Unnao-II	23.3.98	12054	482.16	72.32	1999-2000	
4.	Kathua-II	20.3.02	5987	481.56	49.39	2003-04	
5	Sultanpur	23.3.98	12039	359.22	72.23	2000-01	Money refunded as the project could not take off
6	E. Sikkim-III	27.3.98	5669	222.76	55.53	2004-05	Un-utilised money refunded and projects have been reframed
7	E. Sikkim-IV	24.3.99	11900	476.00	71.40	2004-05	
TOTAL			71790	2987.34	661.00		

The relevant details of 'DPAP/DDP funding stopped projects' are submitted in **Appendix-I & II**.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development),
O.M. No.Z-11014/2/2006-GC, Dated: 31 August, 2006]

Comments of the Committee

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

Recommendation Serial No. 12 (Para No. 3.26)

As regards the projects transferred from erstwhile Employment Assurance Scheme of the Department of Rural Development to the

Department of Land Resources during the year 1999-2000, the Committee note that the initial committed liability in case of these projects was Rs. 1500 crore. As regards the total funds released to these projects, Rs. 900.68 crore have been released so far for these projects. The Committee further find that the Department has no information with regard to the status of projects and the physical achievements for these projects. Not only that, simply releasing the outlay with regard to claims made by States is considered as completion of the project. It has further been stated that the details of physical and financial achievements for these projects seem the merger of watershed component of EAS in IWDP. The Committee deplore the way the monitoring of the project is being undertaken by the Department. To analyse the position with regard to EAS projects transferred from the Department of Rural Development to the Department of Land Resources, the Committee would like to be apprised about the number of projects transferred, outlay earmarked, the area developed in each of the project district-wise so as to enable the Committee to have a proper analysis.

Reply of the Government

As a part of an exercise aimed at rationalizing the structure of various schemes, EAS was retained mainly as a Wage Employment Scheme and sanctioning of new watershed projects was discontinued w.e.f. 1.4.99. Prior to 1.4.99, 40% of the EAS funds were earmarked for water and soil conservation and 20% for minor irrigation works. District Collectors/Deputy Commissioners of the Districts sanctioned these projects taking into account block-wise requirement of works for generation of wage employment. Funds were allocated among the blocks by District Collector/Deputy Commissioner for the shelf of projects obtained from Gram Sabhas/Panchayats and the departments. The Ministry of Rural development did not sanction project-wise funds for watershed nor monitored project-wise details.

In April, 99 the Department of Wastelands was renamed as Department of Land Resources and DDP and DPAP and watershed component of projects sanctioned prior to 1.4.99 under EAS were transferred to the Department of Land Resources. The department undertook an exercise to determine the committed liabilities for only those works which were truly a watershed under the strict definition of the guidelines issued by this Ministry and where the money was transferred to watershed committees prior to 1.4.99. Thus States submitted the district-wise requirement of funds to complete the projects. The total area taken up under EAS period to 31.03.99 for

completion of watershed development projects was estimated at 63.50 lakh ha. and the committed liabilities were worked out to be 1500 crores out of which the Central share was 75% *i.e.* Rs. 1125.00 crores. It was also decided that the Central share of committed liabilities of the EAS amounting to Rs.1125.00 crores will be released by the DoLR in six half yearly installments during the next three years *i.e.* 1999-2000, 2000-01, 2001-02. As the average size of each project was 500 ha. the number of projects was very large. The installments were not released project-wise but these were released to the districts on the basis of consolidated utilisation certificate and audited statement of accounts submitted by them. The next instalment was released only when the unutilized balance with the district was less than 50% of the last release. As all the States could not claim the due Central share by 2001-02, it was agreed for continuation of projects upto March, 2003. An amount of Rs. 900.69 crores was released upto March, 2004. The States which could not claim the balance committed liabilities were asked to complete the projects from their own resources. The States were asked to submit completion report and refund the unspent balances. The completion reports have been received from some States an amount of Rs. 902.15 lakhs has been refunded by the States so far. The Department is pursuing the matter with the States for submission of remaining completion reports. The data on area developed for the projects in all the districts is therefore, not available as the final reports are awaited from the States.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development),
O.M. No.Z-11014/2/2006-GC, Dated: 31 August, 2006]

Comments of the Committee

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

Recommendation Serial No. 15 (Para No. 3.41)

The Committee have repeatedly been recommending to the Department to get the perspective plans finalised from various State Governments on the issue of development of wastelands. They find from the replies that none of the States is ready with the perspective plan. Only two States *i.e.* Tamilnadu and Kerala have submitted the perspective plans in respect of few districts. The Committee feel that there is an urgent need to have a fair idea of the task in hand and the task to be handled in future with regard to wastelands development in the country. Further as observed in the preceding paras of the report there are varying estimates with regard to the area falling under wastelands as well as the task of development of wastelands

handled by the Government initiatives. The exact idea of the wastelands area, work involved can be known when the perspective plans are ready. Besides perspective plans as submitted by the State Governments can be a better input to formulate the national plan. In view of this, the Committee strongly recommend to pursue further with the State Governments to finalise the perspective plans so that the same can be used while deciding the strategy for the Eleventh Five Year Plan.

Reply of the Government

As recommended by the Committee, the Department of Land Resources is pursuing the matter of preparation of perspective plans by the States so as to formulate a national plan and decide the strategy of Eleventh Five Year Plan. Some States have however, expressed financial constraints and have requested for funds to prepare these plans. The Government is contemplating to modify the Hariyali guidelines to allow some administrative funds at State level for Information, Education and Communication (IEC), monitoring and planning including preparation of perspective plans.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development),
O.M. No.Z-11014/2/2006-GC, Dated: 31 August, 2006]

Comments of the Committee

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

Recommendation Serial No. 18 (Para No. 3.44)

The Committee wish to point out that Land Acquisition Act 1894 is an old and outdated enactment which needs considerable amendments keeping in view the changed circumstances. The Committee have repeatedly been stressing for bringing amendments to this Act. The Committee understand that proposal for the amendment of Land Acquisition Act is under consideration with the Department for a long time. They find from the submission made by the Secretary during the course of oral evidence that much emphasis is not being given to finalise the proposals for the amendment of the said Act. The Committee are not convinced by the Statement made by the Secretary that land is a State subject and the Central Act will not become effective unless the State accepts it. The Committee note that Central Acts are the model for the State Governments on which they draft their policies and laws. State Governments are waiting for the amendments in Land Acquisition Act. The old and outdated Act has been a hindrance for implementation of various projects where

acquisition of land is required. In view of this, the Committee strongly recommend to the Department to finalise the proposals for amendment to the aforesaid Act and bring the same before the Parliament at the earliest.

Reply of the Government

Some proposals for amendment in the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 are under consideration. The need for amendment of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 has been felt to meet the ever-growing demand for land because of industrialisation and urbanisation specially after adoption of New Economic Policy and for ensuring both higher compensation to landowners as well as for time bound and effective acquisition of land. Accordingly, a draft of the Land Acquisition (Amendment) Bill, 2004 was circulated to State Governments in 2004 for obtaining their views on some proposed amendments of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 to make the acquisition process time bound and effective. However, responses of all States have not been received. Hence, the proposals have not been finalized so far.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development),
O.M. No.Z-11014/2/2006-GC, Dated: 31 August, 2006]

Comments of the Committee

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

Recommendation Serial No. 25 (Para No. 4.33)

The Technology Development, Extension and Training (TDET) Scheme is an important scheme, the foremost objective of which is operationalisation of cost effective and proven technologies and dissemination of research findings and appropriate technologies for the development of various categories of wastelands. From the data furnished by the Department with regard to financial achievement the Committee find that even the meager outlay *i.e.* Rs. 15 crore during 2004-05 and Rs. 17 crore during 2005-06 could not be utilized fully. Various reasons like beneficiaries contribution, delay in the release of State share, delay in submission of progress reports and non-receipt of fresh proposals have been cited as the reasons for shortfall in utilisation of funds. The Committee also note that even the few number of projects undertaken are not being successfully implemented. Out of 161 projects, as many as 22 projects were foreclosed. The Committee feel that there is an urgent need for detailed interaction with the various research institutes like ICAR, State Agricultural Universities which are basically

involved with the research in this field. Besides there is an urgent need to motivate these institutions to initiate more and more projects. There is an urgent need to study the international experience with regard to wastelands development. The Committee desire some concrete action in this regard to be taken by Government.

Reply of the Government

TDET Scheme is being implemented in a project mode on the basis of proposals received from implementing agencies and sanctioned by the Project Sanctioning Committee (PSC). The lower utilisation than the budgetary allocation was only during 2002-03 and 2003-04 due to non-receipt of appropriate fresh proposals, timely progress report, utilisation certificate beneficiary contribution and Audited Statement of Accounts under ongoing projects from various implementing agencies. Nevertheless, efforts were made during 2004-05 and 2005-06 to monitor progress of the projects. As a result, funds allocated to the programme during 2004-05 (Rs. 15.00 crores) and 2005-06 (Rs. 17.00 crores) were fully utilised.

The ICAR, State Agricultural Universities, IITs and other research organizations are fully involved in implementation of TDET Schemes. A senior officer of ICAR (Head Quarters) is a member of PSC of the Scheme.

However, to further strengthen interactions with various research institutes, Department proposed to organize regional level workshops involving various research organizations working on development and dissemination of wastelands development technologies.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development),
O.M. No.Z-11014/2/2006-GC, Dated: 31 August, 2006]

Comments of the Committee

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

Recommendation Serial No. 27 (Para No.5.14)

Maintenance and updation of land records is an important area which needs to be addressed urgently. Land records are the basic document of the property owned by an individual as well as by the group of people and Government at various levels. The importance of land records is immense not only for an individual but also for Government for the future planning. Once the land records are properly

maintained, it will bring transparency and a mechanism to have an idea of Benami landholdings. The Committee find that a laudable scheme Computerisation of Land Records has been initiated by the Union Government with 100 per cent Central assistance since 1988-89. The outlay provided so far *i.e.* Rs. 416.06 crore could not be utilized fully by the State Governments. The utilisation upto 31 January, 2006 is Rs. 256.71 crore. The Committee feel that under-spending of around 40 per cent of the outlay is a major area of concern. Further the Committee note that the allocation during the year 2005-06 was double as compared to previous year. The Committee also find from the replies that sincere efforts have not been made to find out the reasons for huge under-spending. It has simply been stated that the scheme is demand driven. The Committee while expressing their concern over the under-utilisation of funds would like the Department to find out specific reasons for under-spending State-wise and inform the Committee accordingly.

Reply of the Government

Under the scheme of Computerisation of Land Records, different activities *viz.* development of suitable software as per the State's requirement, undertaking basic data entry work, verification/validation and backlog of data entry work, site preparation and setting up of computer centres at tehsil/sub-division level and porting of data from foxbase to window platform and operationalisation of the scheme are time consuming. Accordingly, States are taking time in utilization of funds released for implementation of the scheme. However, in the mean time, the utilization position has improved from the earlier 60 per cent to 64 per cent.

The implementation of the Scheme was reviewed in the Conference of Revenue Secretaries held on 7th June, 2006. The State Governments were requested for expeditious utilization of funds and for effective implementation of the Scheme so that it is completed at the earliest and the benefits reached the grass root level. Minister (RD) has also written to the Chief Ministers for giving priority to the implementation of the Scheme so that it is completed at the earliest.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development),
O.M. No.Z-11014/2/2006-GC, Dated: 31 August, 2006]

Comments of the Committee

(Please see Paragraph No. 37 of Chapter I of the Report)

Recommendation Serial No. 32 (Para No. 5.19)

The Committee find that 15 States have been provided funds for imparting computer awareness training to revenue officials. The Committee would like to be apprised of the details of the funds earmarked for training to these States. The Committee would also like to be informed about the module of training and the agencies involved for imparting training. They would like to suggest that similar initiatives should be taken in other States also.

Reply of the Government

Funds are being provided to State Governments under the CLR Scheme as per demands received for imparting training to revenue officials. However, earmarking of funds for this purpose is not made. The training is being organized by the State Units of the National Informatics Centre (NIC) as per the requirement of the States.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development),
O.M. No.Z-11014/2/2006-GC, Dated: 31 August, 2006]

Comments of the Committee

(Please *see* Paragraph No. 40 of Chapter-I of the Report)

CHAPTER V

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

Recommendation Serial No. 4 (Para No. 2.19)

The Committee observe that Parthasarathy Committee has analysed the watershed programmes in detail and given detailed valuable recommendations. The recommendations of the said Committee should be carefully examined while holding wide-ranging consultations with all concerned and the Department should take the desired action to implement the accepted recommendations of the Committee. The Standing Committee should also be kept apprised of the status of the implementation of the major recommendations of the Parthasarathy Committee.

Reply of the Government

The Parthasarathy Committee report has been circulated, to all State Governments and various concerned Ministries of Government of India, for their views/comments. The report of the Committee has also been put on the web site of the Department (www.dolr.nic.in) for wide consultations. The Ministry is examining the recommendations of Parthasarathy Committee in depth. The observations/suggestions made by the Standing Committee will be duly taken into account and the outcome will be apprised to the Standing Committee.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development),
O.M. No.Z-11014/2/2006-GC, Dated: 31 August, 2006]

Comments of the Committee

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

Recommendation Serial No. 6 (Para No. 2.21)

The Committee note that the Planning Commission has constituted two working groups on Land Relations and Rainfed Areas for Eleventh Five Year Plan to finalise the strategy for the development of wastelands. The expected role of private sector in the task of development of wastelands is also being discussed while chalking out the strategy for Eleventh Plan. The Committee note that the major

apprehension in involving private sector is that the interests of the local people may not be harmed. They feel that the Government should carefully consider the issue of involvement of private sector in consultation with the State Governments and local bodies. The Committee further recommend that strategy for the Eleventh Plan should be finalized expeditiously.

Reply of the Government

Planning Commission has constituted a working group of National Development Council (NDC) on Agriculture and related issues including Wastelands and watershed development programmes. The terms of reference of this working group, *inter alia*, include the feasibility of public-private partnership and scope for the investment by private sector in watershed development programmes. The Department of Land Resources has submitted its comments to the working group which, *inter alia*, include:

- (i) The landless community which mostly belongs to BPL and SC/ST has to be provided with sustainable alternative income generating activities.
- (ii) In addition to land resource development the activities related to rain water conservation, water-harvesting and afforestation be implemented through people's participation.
- (iii) The concern of the Government for food security, rural employment and need to protect the environment should not be neglected in a market oriented approach.
- (iv) All corporate interventions should be faithful to the overall architecture of the Government and principles of people's participation, equity and sustainability are adhered to by all participants.

The report of the Planning Commission's Working Groups is awaited.

On Private Sector participation, the Parthasarathy Committee has suggested the following:—

- (i) Corporate should be encouraged to contribute generously to the National/State NASDORA fund and to WDF at the micro-watershed level. These donations may be provided 100% tax exemption.
- (ii) There is scope for corporate involvement in technical assistance, capacity building and training besides implementation of benchmark initiatives in collaboration with science and technology institutions.

- (iii) The strength of corporate sector as we perceive it would lie in developing marketing systems, providing agricultural extension and other value-added services through IT-enabled activities, energy resource development and management, and some commercial initiatives in terms of developing agricultural plantations which would also return some benefits to the agricultural community in terms of buy back guarantees, information enriched services, etc. However, it needs to be emphasized that all corporate interventions must be faithful to the overall architecture of the watershed programme as enunciated in this report. They must adhere to the principles of people's participation, equity and sustainability emphasized by and mandatory for all practitioners.

The policy for private sector would be finalized expeditiously keeping in view the above and after wide-ranging consultations with the States.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development),
O.M. No.Z-11014/2/2006-GC, Dated: 31 August, 2006]

Comments of the Committee

(Please see Paragraph No. 3 of Chapter I of the Report)

Recommendation Serial No. 9 (Para No. 3.13)

The Committee in their earlier reports have repeatedly been expressing their concern over the multiplicity of programmes/schemes to tackle the problem of wastelands in the country and have been emphasizing on the need for convergence of the programme. While examining the Demands for Grants, it has repeatedly been brought to the notice of Government but the issue although agreed to in principle lacks unanimity among the various Ministries involved in handling the issue of wastelands development. The Technical Committee in Chapter three of the report has expressed similar concerns. It has been stated that serious differences persist among different Ministries regarding the ownership of the unified programme.

The Committee also note that in the Mid-Term Appraisal document of the Planning Commission, the formula for bringing the watershed activities under one umbrella has been suggested which seems to be not agreeable to the concerned Ministries due to their reluctance to leave the area of activities related to watershed management being

undertaken by them. The Committee also note that the proposal has been mooted by the Ministry of Agriculture for a nodal centralized agency *i.e.* Rainfed Area Authority. Again the issue of conflict is the ownership of the aforesaid authority. Further the Committee also find that finally it has been agreed that the said authority would be best located under the umbrella of the PMO. The Committee feels that sufficient time has been lost over the issue of taking decision on the issue of convergence. It is high time to resolve the issue of convergence at the earliest.

Reply of the Government

The Cabinet at its meeting held on 10.8.2006 has approved the proposal of the Ministry of Agriculture for setting up of the National Rainfed Areas Authority (NRAA).

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development),
O.M. No.Z-11014/2/2006-GC, Dated: 31 August, 2006]

Comments of the Committee

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

Recommendation Serial No. 13 (Para No. 3.27)

The Committee have repeatedly been expressing the concern over lack of mechanism to analyse the performance of projects being undertaken under different schemes in their respective reports. The Committee in their 10th Report had even suggested a mechanism to evaluate the performance of different projects. While noting that there is a long gestation period the Committee had suggested to evaluate the projects at various stages like first stage, second stage and third stage etc. and benchmarking the projects by indicating poor, satisfactory or very good. The Committee further find that Hon'ble Prime Minister has expressed similar concerns over the lack of focus on outcomes. He in his address to the nation on 15 August, 2005 has expressed the view that merely utilizing outlays has been the norms under different schemes. Not only that the Technical Committee has also expressed similar views and suggested a similar mechanism as suggested by this Standing Committee to evaluate the performance of projects. Even when the Standing Committee, Hon'ble Prime Minister and the Technical Committee of the Department of Rural development have been expressing their concerns over the sorry state of affairs of monitoring of projects, it seems from the various Budget documents that least attention is paid towards the serious concerns expressed from various

quarters. From the replies at various places it appears the number of instalments released has been deemed to be the mechanism to know that the project has been completed.

The Committee deplore the way the monitoring of the projects is being undertaken by the Department under the various schemes of wastelands development. The Committee would like the Department to pay serious attention to the observations of the Committee as reported above and furnish a detailed note for the information of the Committee indicating thereby the steps proposed to be initiated by the Department to address the concerns as expressed by this Committee and from various other quarters.

Reply of the Government

The Department monitors physical and financial performance of IWDP projects on the basis of quarterly progress reports of individual projects. Mid-Term evaluation of the project by an independent evaluator is compulsory after release of 45% of project fund. Evaluation of watershed projects gives the details of physical performance of the project. The evaluator has to point out shortcomings and suggestions for improvement of the performance of the project. In case, the performance of the project is satisfactory, next instalment is released for the project with directions for mid-course corrections as suggested by the evaluator. Next instalment of project fund is considered on the basis of the action taken to comply the suggestions of the evaluator. After release of all instalments to the project, impact assessment studies are to be conducted by an independent evaluator before the project is formally closed.

The Department is putting in place online monitoring of the projects under area development programmes. The Department has launched a web-based application for direct entry of the watershed projects related data at three levels *i.e.* DoLR, State and Districts. The Quarterly physical and financial progress reports will be entered by the districts and entry for release of central share and State share will be done by the DoLR and State Government. The application will generate periodically updated data base on the following items.

1. Project details : District, block, villages, watersheds with codes, area, ownership details, lands of marginal people.
2. Physical Targets and Achievements : No. of mandays, employment days for SC/ST/women, SHG, UG, trainings, soil and moisture conservation works (contour bunding,

gully plugging, bench terracing etc.), water harvesting structures (check dams, farm ponds etc.), afforestation, horticulture etc.

3. Financial targets and achievement on the above items.

Reports shall be generated for individual project, district, State and country level.

As suggested by the Committee, the Department of Land Resources has initiated action for grading of projects on the basis of performance. The suggested mechanism for evaluating the projects at three stages and benchmarking the projects as poor, satisfactory, good, very good and excellent was discussed with the State Secretaries during the review meeting and it was suggested that a minimal measurable and quantifiable criteria may be fixed for the various activities to be taken up in three phases by the Government of India and the State Governments may supplement these with more criteria if found desirable or prescribe higher performance standards. The suggestion is under active consideration of the Ministry of Rural Development. The Parthasarthy Committee has also suggested monitoring of the project performance after one year, before the release of every new instalment and at the end of the project.

The observations/suggestions made by the Standing Committee will be duly taken into account and the outcome will be appraised to the Standing Committee.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development),
O.M. No.Z-11014/2/2006-GC, Dated: 31 August, 2006]

Comments of the Committee

(Please see Paragraph No. 3 of Chapter I of the Report)

Recommendation Serial No. 16 (Para No.3.42)

The Committee further note that as indicated by Technical Committee Rs. 1,50,000 crore would be required to treat the estimated land of 125 million hectares. The Technical Committee has suggested to double the current programme outlay. Further it has also been stated that the allocation made under National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme would supplement the outlay provided by different Government schemes for the development of wastelands. The Committee find that the outlay for National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme has been separately allocated by the Department of

Rural Development. Rs. 11,300 crore during 2006-2007 have been earmarked for 200 districts which have been covered by the Guarantee Scheme. Till the scheme is not made applicable nationwide, it is difficult to know how far the outlay provided for NREGS could supplement the Government initiatives taken under different wastelands programmes. Besides there is an urgent need to have some sort of coordinating mechanism for the schemes being undertaken under NREGS related to watershed activities and the schemes taken under the Department of Rural Development or some other Ministries of Union Government or State Governments. The Committee feel that Gram Sabha is the best mechanism to coordinate the activities related to wastelands development. The Committee would like to be apprised of the action taken by the Department in this regard.

Reply of the Government

The Area Development Programmes under DDP, DPAP and IWDP are implemented by the Panchayati Raj Institutions under the Hariyali Guidelines. The NREGS is also implemented by the PRIs. There is a provision in both to dovetail in order to achieve greater impact at the implementation level. The mechanism to coordinate the activities related to wastelands development is therefore inbuilt in these schemes. However, NREGA is not applicable countrywide and the NREGS depends on demand for work, which may be seasonal. As far as the recommendation of Parthasarathy Committee on this issue is concerned, the same is being examined by the Ministry in depth. The observations/suggestions made by the Standing Committee will, however, be duly taken into account and the outcome will be apprised to the Standing Committee.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development),
O.M. No.Z-11014/2/2006-GC, Dated: 31 August, 2006]

Comments of the Committee

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

Recommendation Serial No. 19 (Para No. 3.45)

The Committee further note that some initiatives are being taken to amend the Land Revenue Act. Consultations are being held with the interested Ministries. The Committee stress that the proposals for amendment of the Land Revenue Act should be finalized at the earliest.

Reply of the Government

A new scheme *viz.* Comprehensive Modernization of Land Records (CMLR) with 100 per cent Central assistance is being formulated. The Scheme envisages integration of computerization of land records with survey & settlement, digitization of cadastral maps and registration. CMLR will deliver outcomes in terms of updated land records to establish clear land titles. It is proposed to have a model law for giving legal back up to various features of CMLR. However, it is likely to take time.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development),
O.M. No.Z-11014/2/2006-GC, Dated: 31 August, 2006]

Comments of the Committee

(Please *see* Paragraph No. 3 of Chapter I of the Report)

Recommendation Serial No. 22 (Para No. 4.15)

As regards the monitoring of the physical status of the projects the Committee in the preceding paras of the report have noted that the common problems with regard to the projects undertaken for wastelands under different schemes of the Department are foreclosure of projects, stopping payment to projects etc. The issue has been dealt with the detail and suggestions made in the preceding part of the report. As regards the issue of time overrun of the projects being undertaken under IWDP, the Committee find that the gestation period of projects is five years whereas almost half of the projects taken up during 9th Plan are still to be completed. The Committee also note that the Technical Committee has suggested to increase the gestation period of projects from five years to eight years. The Committee also observe that in case the gestation period is increased the average cost of the projects may also increase. The Committee would further like the Department to examine the suggestion of the Technical Committee and furnish their comments so as to enable the Committee to review the position further.

Reply of the Government

The Ministry is examining the recommendations of Parthasarathy Committee in depth. The observations/suggestions made by the Standing Committee will be duly taken into account and the outcome will be apprised to the Standing Committee.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development),
O.M. No.Z-11014/2/2006-GC, Dated: 31 August, 2006]

Comments of the Committee

(Please *see* Paragraph No. 3 of Chapter I of the Report)

Recommendation Serial No. 24 (Para No. 4.25)

The Committee further find that DDP and DPAP blocks were identified more than a decade back. The situation in these blocks may have changed. Many blocks would have turned greener and need no assistance under these programmes whereas some other additional blocks may need assistance. Further, requests from some of the States are being received by the Department for coverage of additional blocks. The Committee also note that the Parthasarthy Committee was supposed to look into the issue of exclusion/inclusion of DDP and DPAP blocks. Since the said Committee has already submitted the report, the Committee would like to be informed whether the said issue has been addressed in the report and if so, the details thereof.

Reply of the Government

It is submitted that the exercise of re-identification of blocks under DPAP and DDP is quite extensive, time consuming and requiring a huge data for technical and professional analysis. Thus this aspect could not be covered in the report. However, Ministry has taken up this matter with the Chairman, Parthasarathy Committee and the expert institution that is CRIDA, Hyderabad.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development),
O.M. No.Z-11014/2/2006-GC, Dated: 31 August, 2006]

Comments of the Committee

(Please *see* Paragraph No. 3 of Chapter I of the Report)

Recommendation Serial No. 33 (Para No.5.20)

The Committee further find that Lal Bahadur Shastri National Academy of Administration (LBSNAA) has conducted an evaluation study on Computerisation of Land Records in the States of Karnataka, West Bengal and Rajasthan. The evaluation study of Tamil Nadu is under progress. Further NIRD was also requested to undertake evaluation study in the States of Andhra Pradesh, Orissa, Gujarat, Maharashtra and Kerala. The Committee express their unhappiness that no progress report has been received from NIRD which is a premier institution for research and is under the administrative control of the Ministry of Rural Development. The Committee would like to be apprised about the details of the studies completed by LBSNAA.

Reply of the Government

The reports of the evaluation studies in respect of the States of Karnataka, West Bengal and Rajasthan have been received and the findings have already been sent to the Committee Secretariat. The report in respect of Tamil Nadu is still awaited from LBSNAA. They have been requested for submission of the Report expeditiously. During February, 2005, NIRD was requested for undertaking evaluation of the scheme of CLR in few States *viz.* Andhra Pradesh, Gujarat and Orissa. As per information received from NIRD, they have already completed studies on the scheme of CLR in 8 States, including Andhra Pradesh and Gujarat. Formal study report is awaited from NIRD.

[Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development),
O.M. No.Z-11014/2/2006-GC, Dated: 31 August, 2006]

Comments of the Committee

(Please *see* Paragraph No. 3 of Chapter I of the Report)

NEW DELHI;
15 March, 2007
24 Phalguna, 1928 (*Saka*)

KALYAN SINGH,
Chairman,
Standing Committee on
Rural Development.

APPENDIX I

(Reference reply to the para no. 3.25 & 4.24)

STATE-WISE NUMBER OF DPAP/DDP PROJECTS FOR WHICH FUNDING HAS BEEN STOPPED

Sl.No.	Name of State	Total No. of Projects where funding is stopped	Total cost (Rs. in lakhs)	Number of installments released				Total funds released		
				Ist	IIInd	IIIrd	IVth	Vth	VIth	(Rs. in lakhs)
Drought Prone Areas Programme (DPAP)										
1.	Andhra Pradesh	60	1200.00				60			390.00
2.	Bihar	101	2020.00		22	14	65			540.50
3.	Chhatisgarh	112	1680.00					112		896.00
4.	Gujarat	27	540.00				20	7		186.00
5.	Himachal Pradesh	00	00.00							
6.	J & K	32	640.00				22		10	233.00
7.	Jharkhand	244	4270.00	51		108	69	16		1139.00
8.	Karnataka	114	2280.00				21		93	973.50
9.	Madhya Pradesh	00	00.00							
10.	Maharashtra	657	13140.00		8		235	227	187	5046.50
11.	Orissa	162	3510.00			12	132		18	1074.00
12.	Rajasthan	19	380.00					8	11	151.00
13.	Tamil Nadu	40	800.00		8			12	20	296.00
14.	Uttaranchal	00	00.00							
15.	Uttar Pradesh	61	1160.00						61	549.00
16.	West Bengal	135	2700.00			8	127			861.50
Total		1764	34320.00	51	38	142	751	382	400	12336.0
Desert Development Programme (DDP)										
1.	Haryana	50	1235.00	-	-	-	-	14	36	1033.11
2.	J & K	85	2125.00	-	-	-	-	61	24	1735.35
3.	Karnataka	165	3712.50	-	9	82	-	24	50	1760.01
Total		300	7072.50	-	9	82	-	99	110	4528.47

APPENDIX II

(Reference reply to the para no. 3.25 & 4.24)

NUMBER OF PROJECTS SANCTIONED, COMPLETED, FUNDING STOPPED AND PROJECTS IN PROGRESS FROM 1995-96 TO 2005-06.

Drought Prone Areas Programme (DPAP)

State	No. of Projects sanctioned from 1995-96 to 2005-06	Total cost (Rs. in crores)	No. of project Completed	No. of projects for which funding stopped			No. of ongoing projects
				Since 1.4.03	Since 1.10.03	Since 1.4.05	
Andhra Pradesh	3882	940.05	1904	00	00	60	1918
Bihar	453	125.80	00	101	00	00	352
Chhattisgarh	1020	277.00	122	112	00	00	786
Gujarat	2149	576.80	495	00	22	05	1627
Himachal Pradesh	365	102.40	60	00	00	00	305
Jammu & Kashmir	483	141.70	00	00	10	22	451
Jharkhand	1453	399.70	19	244	00	00	1190
Karnataka	2105	566.10	343	114	00	00	1648
Madhya Pradesh	2934	765.90	1141	00	00	00	1793
Maharashtra	3180	850.30	161	657	00	00	2362
Orissa	1146	328.80	30	162	00	00	954
Rajasthan	987	276.10	210	19	00	00	758
Tamil Nadu	1414	354.30	549	00	00	40	825
Uttar Pradesh	1576	392.50	566	61	00	00	949
Uttranchal	737	200.40	117	00	00	00	620
West Bengal	479	130.20	00	135	00	00	344
Total	24363	6428.05	5717	1605	32	127	16882

Desert Development Programme (DDP)

				Since 1.4.03	Since 1.3.04	Since 1.4.05	No. of ongoing projects
Andhra Pradesh	906	249.15	206	00	00	00	700
Gujarat	2642	748.50	560	00	00	00	2082
Haryana	1030	292.40	188	00	00	50	792
Himachal Pradesh	504	144.80	80	00	00	00	424
Jammu & Kashmir	667	186.35	94	00	85	00	488
Karnataka	1362	387.525	120	65	00	100	1077
Rajasthan	6365	1810.425	1335	00	00	00	5030
Total	13476	3819.150	2583	65	85	150	10593

APPENDIX III

COMMITTEE ON RURAL DEVELOPMENT (2006-2007)

EXTRACTS OF MINUTES OF THE FIFTH SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE HELD ON TUESDAY THE 27 FEBRUARY, 2007

The Committee sat from 1500 hrs. to 1630 hrs. in Room No. '139',
Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi.

PRESENT

Shri Hannan Mollah—*In the Chair*

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

2. Shri Mani Charenamei
3. Shri Zora Singh Mann
4. Shri Krishna Murari Moghe
5. Shri D. Narbula
6. Shri A. F. G. Osmani
7. Adv. Renge Patil Tukaram Ganpatrao
8. Shrimati Jyotirmoyee Sikdar
9. Shri Sita Ram Singh
10. Shri Bagun Sumbrui
11. Shri Beni Prasad Verma

Rajya Sabha

12. Shri Balihari
13. Shri Jayantilal Barot
14. Dr. Chandan Mitra
15. Shri P.R. Rajan
16. Shri Bhagwati Singh

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri P.K. Grover — *Joint Secretary*
2. Shrimati Sudesh Luthra — *Deputy Secretary Grade I*
3. Shri A. K. Shah — *Deputy Secretary Grade II*

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

3. At the outset, the Chairman welcomed the members to the sitting of the Committee and solicited their cooperation in examination and finalisation of draft action taken reports on Demands for Grants (2006-2007) and reports on Demands for Grants (2007-2008) of various Departments/Ministries under the jurisdiction of the Committee.

4. The Committee then took up for consideration Memorandum No. 3 regarding draft action taken report on Nineteenth Report of the Committee on Demands for Grants (2006-2007) of the Department of Land Resources (Ministry of Rural Development). The Committee after deliberations adopted the draft report with a slight modification.

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

6. The Committee then adjourned to meet again at 1500 hrs. onwards on 1 March, 2007 for consideration and adoption of two draft action taken reports on Demands for Grants (2006-07) in respect of Department of Rural Development (Ministry of Rural Development) and Ministry of Panchayati Raj.

***Relevant portions of the minutes not related to the subject have been kept separately.

APPENDIX IV

[Vide Para 4 of the Introduction]

ANALYSIS OF THE ACTION TAKEN BY THE GOVERNMENT ON THE RECOMMENDATIONS CONTAINED IN THE NINETEENTH REPORT OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON RURAL DEVELOPMENT (14th LOK SABHA)

I. Total number of recommendations	36
II. Recommendations that have been accepted by the Government	17
Para Nos. 2.5, 2.17, 2.18, 2.20, 3.40, 3.43, 3.46, 4.14, 4.24, 4.34, 5.15, 5.16, 5.17, 5.18, 5.25, 5.26 and 5.27	
Percentage to the total recommendations	(47.22%)
III. Recommendations which the Committee do not desire to pursue in view of the Government's replies	Nil
Percentage to total recommendations	(Nil)
IV. Recommendations in respect of which replies of the Government have not been accepted by the Committee	10
Para Nos. 2.26, 2.27, 3.14, 3.25, 3.26, 3.41, 3.44, 4.33, 5.14 and 5.19	
Percentage to total recommendations	(27.78%)
V. Recommendations in respect of which final replies of the Government are still awaited	9
Para Nos. 2.19, 2.21, 3.13, 3.27, 3.42, 3.45, 4.15, 4.25 and 5.20	
Percentage to total recommendations	(25%)