

THIRD REPORT
STANDING COMMITTEE ON
RURAL DEVELOPMENT
(2004-2005)
(FOURTEENTH LOK SABHA)
MINISTRY OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT
(DEPARTMENT OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT)
DEMANDS FOR GRANTS
(2004-2005)

Presented to Lok Sabha on 19.8.2004

Laid in Rajya Sabha on 19.8.2004



LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI

August, 2004/Sravana, 1926 (Saka)

CONTENTS

	PAGE
COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE	(iii)
ABBREVIATIONS	(v)
INTRODUCTION	(ix)

REPORT

CHAPTER I	Introductory	1
CHAPTER II	Overall Assessment of Demands for Grants (2004-2005) of the Department of Rural Development	3
	Actual Expenditure of funds	3
	Plan Expenditure of Demand No. 80	5
	Unspent/Opening Balance	8
	Contribution to International Bodies	10
	Allocation and expenditure of funds for North-Eastern Area	11
	Below Poverty Line (BPL) Census, 2002	13
CHAPTER III	Scheme-wise assessment of Demands for Grants (2004-2005) of the Department of Rural Development.....	16
	Swarnjayanti Gram Swarozgar Yojana (SGSY) ...	16
	Sampoorna Grameen Rozgar Yojana (SGRY) ...	31
	Rural Housing (RH) Schemes	40
	Pradhan Mantri Gram Sadak Yojana (PMGSY)	49
	DRDA Administration Scheme	55
	New Scheme—Provision for Urban Amenities in Rural Areas (PURA)	56
	Training Schemes : National Institute of Rural Development.....	59

(ii)

	PAGE
Strengthening and establishment of State Institute of Rural Development (SIRDs) and Extension Training Centres (ETCs)	63
Organisation of Training Courses, Seminars, Workshops etc. (OTC)	64
Assistance to Council for Advancement of People's Action and Rural Technology (CAPART)	65
Information, Education and Communication (IEC)	69
Monitoring of the Schemes of Department of Rural Development.....	70

APPENDICES

I. Statement showing Budget Estimate, Revised Estimate and Actual Expenditure, Plan outlay of Department of Rural Development during 9th Five Year Plan	73
II. Statement showing Budget Estimate, Revised Estimate and Actual Expenditure, Plan outlay, Outlay agreed to by the Planning Commission total releases during tenth Five Year Plan and the outlay proposed for 2004-05 by the Department of Rural Development	75
III. Actual Expenditure made by the Department of Rural Development with regard to the Plan Schemes during 2003-2004	77
IV. Actual Expenditure made by the Department of Rural Development with regard to the Non-Plan Schemes during 2003-2004	78
V. Allocation and release to North Eastern Area under various programmes of Department of Rural Development	79
VI. Financial progress under SGSY during 2003-2004	80
VII. Extracts of the Minutes of the Sitting of the Committee held on 11 August, 2004	86
VIII. Extracts of the Minutes of the Sitting of the Committee held on 16 August, 2004	89
IX Statement of observations/recommendations	91

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

PRESENT

Shri Kalyan Singh—*Chairman*

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

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

Rajya Sabha

22. Kumari Nirmala Deshpande
23. Shri Ghanshyam Chandra Kharwar
24. Prof. Alka Balram Kshatriya
25. Shri Penumalli Madhu
26. Shri Stephen Marandi

(iv)

27. Shri Kalraj Mishra
28. Dr. Chandan Mitra
29. Shri Keshubhai S. Patel
30. Dr. Faguni Ram
31. Prof. R.B.S. Varma

SECRETARIAT

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

ABBREVIATIONS

AARDO	—	Afro-Asian Rural Reconstruction Organisation
ADB	—	Asian Development Bank
APL	—	Above Poverty Line
ARTS	—	Advancement of Rural Technology Scheme
BE	—	Budget Estimates
BLCC	—	Block Level Coordination Committee for SGSY
BPL	—	Below Poverty Line
CAPART	—	Council for Advancement of People's Action and Rural Technology
CCSS	—	Credit-cum-subsidy Scheme
CIRDAP	—	Center on Integrated Rural Development in Asia and Pacific
CLCC	—	Central Level Coordination Committee for SGSY
CLGF	—	Commonwealth Local Government Forum
DAVP	—	Directorate of Advertising and Visual Publicity
DLCC	—	District Level Coordination Committee
DLM	—	District Level Monitoring
DRDA	—	District Rural Development Agency
DWCRA	—	Development of Women and Children in Rural Areas
EAS	—	Employment Assurance Scheme
ETC	—	Extension Training Centre
FAQ	—	Fair Average Quality
FCI	—	Food Corporation of India
GJRHFS	—	Golden Jubilee Rural Housing Finance Scheme
GKY	—	Ganga Kalyan Yojana
HUDCO	—	Housing and Urban Development Corporation Limited
HLC	—	High Level Committee
HSD	—	High Speed Diesel
IAY	—	Indira Awaas Yojana
IBRD	—	International Bank for Reconstruction and Development

ICAR	—	Indian Council for Agricultural Research
IEC	—	Information, Education and Communication
IRD	—	Integrated Rural Development Programme
IRMA	—	Indian Institute of Rural Management, Anand
ITEC	—	Indian Technical and Economic Cooperation Programme
IWDP	—	Integrated Wastelands Development Programme
JGSY	—	Jawahar Gram Samridhi Yojana
JRY	—	Jawahar Rozgar Yojana
LIBOR	—	London Inter Bank Exchange Rate
MPR	—	Monthly Progress Report
MNP	—	Minimum Needs Programme
MWS	—	Million Wells Scheme
NABARD	—	National Bank for Agriculture and Rural Development
NC	—	Not Covered
NCT	—	National Capital Territory
NGO	—	Non-Governmental Organization
NIRD	—	National Institute of Rural Development
NLM	—	National Level Monitors
NRRDA	—	National Rural Roads Development Agency
NSAP	—	National Social Assistance Programme
NSSO	—	National Sample Survey Organisation
NYK	—	Nehru Yuvak Kendra
OB	—	Organization of Beneficiaries
OTC	—	Organisation of Training Courses/Seminars/Workshops
PC	—	Public Cooperation regarding promotion of Voluntary Action in Rural Development
PDS	—	Public Distribution System
PMGY	—	Prime Minister's Gramodaya Yojana
PMGSY	—	Pradhan Mantri Gram Sadak Yojana
PURA	—	Provision of Urban Amenities in Rural Areas
PRIs	—	Panchayati Raj Institutions
RBI	—	Reserve Bank of India
RBC	—	Rural Building Centres
RC	—	Regional Committees of CAPART

(vii)

RD	—	Rural Development
RE	—	Revised Estimates
RH	—	Rural Housing Schemes
Rs.	—	Rupees
SAY	—	Samagra Awaas Yojana
SC	—	Scheduled Caste
SHG	—	Self Help Group
SGRY	—	Sampoorna Grameen Rozgar Yojana
SGSY	—	Swarnjayanti Gram Swarozgar Yojana
SIDBI	—	Small Industries Development Bank of India
SIRD	—	State Institute of Rural Development
SITRA	—	Supply of Improved Tool Kits to Rural Artisans
SLCC	—	State Level Coordination Committee for SGSY
SLSC	—	State Level Sanctioning Committee
ST	—	Scheduled Tribe
SVO	—	Support Voluntary Organisations
TRC	—	Technology Resource Centre
TRYSEM	—	Training of Rural Youth for Self-Employment
UB/OB	—	Unspent Balance/ Opening Balance
UC	—	Utilisation Certificate
UT	—	Union territory
ZP	—	Zilla Parishad

INTRODUCTION

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

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

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

4. The Report was considered and adopted by the Committee at their sitting held on 16 August, 2004.

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

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

NEW DELHI;
18 August, 2004
27 Shrawana, 1926 (Saka)

KALYAN SINGH,
Chairman,
Standing Committee on Rural Development.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTORY

The basic function of the Ministry of Rural Development is to realise the objectives of alleviating rural poverty, ensuring improved quality of life for the rural population, especially of those living below the poverty line through formulating and implementing different Yojanas/Programmes relating to various spheres of rural life and activities. The Ministry consists of the following three Departments:

- (i) Department of Rural Development;
- (ii) Department of Land Resources; and
- (iii) Department of Drinking Water Supply.

(i) Department of Rural Development

1.2 The Department of Rural Development formulates and implements Schemes for generation of self-employment and wage employment, provision of housing to rural poor, rural roads and provides support services and other quality inputs such as assistance for strengthening of District Rural Development Agency Administration, training and research, human resource development, development of voluntary action etc. for proper implementation of the Programme.

1.3 As per the amended allocation of Business Rules, all the matters relating to Panchayati Raj Institutions have been taken away from the Ministry of Rural Development and a new Ministry to deal with the said item has been created *w.e.f.* 27 May, 2004.

1.4 The Ministry implements various Central Sector and Centrally Sponsored Schemes. The main Schemes being implemented by the Department are:

- (a) Swarnjayanti Gram Swarozgar Yojana (SGSY);
- (b) Sampoorna Grameen Rozgar Yojana (SGRY);
- (c) Pradhan Mantri Gram Sadak Yojana (PMGSY);
- (d) Rural Housing (RH)

- (i) Indira Awaas Yojana;
- (ii) Innovative Stream for Rural Housing and Habitat Development;
- (iii) Rural Building Centres (RBCs).

1.5 The Department of Rural Development has three autonomous bodies under its administrative control; viz. (i) Council for Advancement of People's Action and Rural Technology (CAPART); (ii) National Institute of Rural Development (NIRD); and (iii) National Rural Roads Development Agency (NRRDA).

1.6 The overall Demands for Grants of the Department for 2004-05 are for Rs. 13603.96 crore. However, after deducting the recoveries expected during the year, the net Budget of the Department during 2004-05 BE is Rs. 11455.96 crore both for Plan and Non-Plan.

1.7 The Demands for Grants of the Department have been presented to Parliament under Demand No. 80. The detailed Demands for Grants of the Department was laid in Lok Sabha on 22 July, 2004.

1.8 Implementation of different Rural Development Programmes in Delhi and Chandigarh was discontinued on specific requests of the respective administrations. Because the Rural Development Schemes are not being implemented in Delhi and Chandigarh, the BPL census which is primarily made to identify the BPL households for the aforesaid Programmes has not been conducted.

1.9 In the present Report, the Committee have restricted their examination only to the major issues concerning the Department and the Programmes/Schemes that are being implemented by them in the context of Demands for Grants 2004-2005.

CHAPTER II

OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF THE DEMANDS FOR GRANTS 2004-2005 OF THE DEPARTMENT OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT

Actual expenditure of funds

The Budget Estimate, Revised Estimate, Actual Expenditure, 9th and 10th Plan proposal by the Department and allocations by the Planning Commission so far during the current Plan is given at *Appendix-I* and *Appendix-II*. The actual expenditure made by the Department of Rural Development with regard to the Plan Schemes and the Non-Plan Schemes during 2003-2004 under Demand No. 80 has been given at *Appendix-III* and *Appendix-IV* respectively.

2.2 The analysis of the comparative data of 9th and 10th Plan indicate the following :

- (i) The Department had proposed allocation for Rs. 1,29,464.27 crore for 10th Plan out of which Rs. 56,748.00 crore is the agreed to allocation by the Planning Commission. Thus it could be seen that Planning Commission has agreed to less than one half of what was proposed to them;
- (ii) Against the outlay of Rs. 32,869.87 crore during 9th Plan, the actual expenditure indicated is Rs. 40,435.22 crore which indicate that Rs. 7565.35 crore were allocated more to the Department during the 9th Plan;
- (iii) As regards comparative position of outlay during 9th and 10th Plan, it is found that during 10th Plan, the Department has been allocated Rs. 16,312.78 crore more than what was the actual expenditure during 9th Plan. Further analysis of the data indicate that under the major schemes *i.e.*, SGSY which continued throughout 9th Plan and is being implemented in 10th Plan, the allocation has been decreased by Rs. 735 crore.
- (iv) During 9th Plan, some of the major Schemes like NSAP (Rs. 3,280 crore allocation) were allocated during 9th Plan, Food for Work Programme (Rs. 800 crore actually released) and Annapoorna (Rs. 596 crore as allocated during 9th Plan) have been transferred to State Governments/other Ministries of the Government of India.

- (v) The Schemes for which the Department has got substantial hike are CAPART, for which during 9th Plan Rs. 60 crore were allocated. The allocation has been enhanced to Rs. 200 crore. Similarly for monitoring, although the Department got very less amount *i.e.* less than 1/3rd of what was proposed during 10th Plan, the allocation has been enhanced considerably as compared to the 9th Plan. During 9th Plan, only Rs. 5 crore were allocated which has been enhanced to Rs.100 crore during 10th Plan.
- (vi) The analysis further indicate that under SGSY during the 10th Plan, there is reduction of Rs.735 crore as compared to the previous plan allocation. Under IAY, *i.e.*, one of the important housing schemes of the Department, Rs.1,318 crore have been earmarked more during 10th Plan as compared to previous plan.
- (vii) During 10th Plan, allocation has been indicated for new Scheme like Provision for Urban Amenities in Rural Areas.
- (viii) It is seen from *Appendix-III* that for Plan Schemes, by the end of first six months *i.e.* upto 30 September, 2003, the Department had spent nearly Rs. 4,107crore out of Rs. 15,500 crore released at RE stage *i.e.* 26.49 per cent of the allocated funds. Whereas, by the end of nine months *i.e.* up to 30 December, 2003, the Department had spent Rs.10,438 crore *i.e.* nearly 67.34 per cent of the allocated funds. As compared to this, expenditure of Non-Plan funds by the end of first six and nine months was 53.94 and 68.55 per cent respectively.

2.3 The Committee note that the Department has got less than half of what was proposed to Planning Commission during 10th Plan. Besides the Department was allocated Rs. 56,748 crore against the expenditure of Rs. 40,435.22 crore during 9th Plan. Therefore the Department has got Rs. 16312.78 crore more than what was the actual expenditure during 9th Plan. They also find that during 9th Plan the Department got Rs. 40,435.22 crore against the outlay of Rs. 32,869.87 crore *i.e.* Rs. 7566.35 crore more than the outlay. The Committee note that although the Department has got Rs. 16,312.78 crore more during the 10th Plan as against the previous Plan, it is difficult to analyse the hike or decrease in view of the fact that some of the Schemes being implemented during 9th Plan like NSAP and Annapoorna have been transferred to State Governments. Further the Scheme-wise analysis of the data indicate that under one of the major Schemes of the Department *i.e.* SGSY, there is drastic reduction of Rs. 735 crore in 10th Plan as compared to previous Plan. The

Committee also note that under IAY Rs. 1,318 crore have been allocated more whereas for CAPART the allocation has been enhanced from Rs. 60 crore to Rs. 200 crore. On monitoring, although the Department has got 1/3rd of what was provided during 10th Plan, the allocation has been considerably enhanced *i.e.* from Rs. 5 crore in 9th Plan to Rs. 100 crore. The details of Scheme-wise analysis has been made in the subsequent chapters of the Report. However the Committee would like to highlight here that there is no planning on the part of the Government. The Schemes, like NSAP and Annapoorna started with the laudable objectives of providing social security, after investment of several crore, were hurriedly transferred from one Ministry/Department to other, or to State Governments. Further there is drastic reduction in the outlay of SGSY, one of the important Schemes of self employment in rural areas. In this scenario, the Committee fail to understand how the objectives of providing employment, housing and infrastructure in rural areas would be achieved. In view of the above, the Committee strongly recommend that adequate outlay under the different Schemes to meet the set objectives should be made. Not only that, the enhanced allocation should be meaningfully utilised by improving the delivery mechanism and taking all the corrective desired steps.

2.4 The Committee further find that under Schemes like IAY, CAPART the allocation has been increased. Similarly, for monitoring, the allocation has been enhanced considerably. The Committee hope that the increased allocation for monitoring would ensure effective implementation of the Programme. They further hope that the enhanced allocation under the respective Schemes of the Department would result in better implementation and fulfilment of the desired objectives.

Plan expenditure of Demand No. 80

2.5 As per the Detailed Demands for Grants (2004-2005) the following data has been indicated:

(Rs. in crore)

	Revenue Section		Net Plan Budget (Revenue Section)	Per cent change
	Plan Budget	Recoveries		
2002-2003 Actuals	17552.46	2500	14992.46	—
2003-04 BE	12595	2325	10260	(-) 31.57%
2003-04 RE	17825	2325	15490	+50.97%
2004-05 BE	13585.40	2148	11432.40	(-) 26.19%

2.6 The above data indicate that BE 2004-05 (Net plan budget) has been reduced by Rs. 4057.60 crore *i.e.* 26.19 per cent if compared to RE of previous year.

2.7 The position regarding BE and RE for 2003-2004 and B.E. 2004-2005 in respect of various Plan Schemes of the Department of Rural Development is indicated below:

(Rs. in crore)				
S.No.	Scheme	B.E. 2003-04	R.E. 2003-04	B.E. 2004-05
1.	Sampoorna Grameen Rozgar Yojana			
	(i) Cash Component	4125.00	4125.00	4500.00
	(ii) Foodgrains Component	775.00	6005.00	600.00
2.	Swarnjayanti Gram Swarozgar Yojana	800.00	800.00	1000.00
3.	Indira Awaas Yojana	1900.00	1900.00	2500.00
4.	Pradhan Mantri Gram Sadak Yojana	2325.00	2325.00	2468.00
5.	Others	345.00	345.00	369.40
	Total	10270.00	15500.00	11437.40

2.8 When asked about the extent to which the cut/reduction of Rs. 4057.60 crore will affect the physical performance of different Plan Programmes/Schemes during 2004-05, the Department has stated that here is an overall increase in the Budget Estimates under all the programmes of the Department of Rural Development. There is decrease in the budget allocation for Foodgrain Component of SGRY only. Only Rs. 775 crore has been earmarked in BE 2003-04 for Foodgrain Component as against RE 2003-2004 of Rs. 6005 crore which has been reduced to Rs. 600 crore in BE 2004-05. The Department has further stated that it had requested Ministry of Finance to allocate additional funds of Rs. 12000 crore for meeting the liability of foodgrains already supplied under SGRY. However, as stated by the Finance Minister in his budget speech 2004-2005 (Para 11), the Planning Commission is in the process of re-allocating the Plan funds. Going by the trend established during the last two years, it is most likely that the additional funds for foodgrain component of SGRY will be provided

through Supplementary Demands for Grants during the course of the financial year. However, since supply of foodgrain under SGRY is being made regularly by the Food Corporation of India in accordance with the request made by this Department, the reduced provision for foodgrains in B.E. 2004-2005 will, in any case, not affect the physical performance of SGRY during 2004-2005 and during the Tenth Plan Period.

2.9 When the attention of the representatives of the Ministry was invited to the huge shortfall in BE during 2004-2005 as against RE of previous year and the need for making huge provision at Supplementary Grants stage, the reply of the Department was that this is under the book adjustment from the Ministry of Rural Development to the Ministry of Food, Civil Supplies and Public Distribution. There will not be any effect on the implementation of the Programme.

2.10 Regarding the date and the amount of release of Central share of funds under different Schemes of the Department during 2003-2004 and 2004-2005, the following information was furnished.

Date and amount of release of Central share under SGSY

2.11 As per SGSY guidelines, the funds are released to the DRDAs in two instalments. 1st instalment is automatically released to DRDAs soon after receiving the consent of the President on Demands for Grants provided the DRDAs have taken 2nd instalment of funds during previous year. However, funds to those DRDAs who had not taken 2nd instalment during previous year are released only after receipt of complete proposals from them.

2.12 Second instalment of funds are released to the DRDAs only when 60 per cent of total available funds is utilized by them and accordingly proposal along with utilization certificate and audited statement of expenditure is submitted by them.

2.13 Therefore, process of release of Central share continues throughout the year. During 2003-2004 and 2004-2005 process of release of funds was started from 16th June, 2003 and 15th April, 2004 respectively.

Date and amount of release of Central share under SGRY

2.14 The funds are released directly to the District Panchayats/ DRDA in two instalments in a particular year. The Districts, which obtained the second instalment of funds in the preceding financial

year without any condition, shall automatically receive the first instalment at the beginning of the financial year. Others shall have to submit the proposal for the 1st instalment with necessary documents. The second instalment is released on receipt of proposal from the districts after fulfilling the prescribed conditions. As such, instalments are released to districts on different dates and it would be unwieldy to submit the dates of release of Central grants under the scheme.

The Date and amount of release of funds under IAY

2.15 The funds under the Indira Awaas Yojana (IAY) are released directly to the DRDAs in two instalments. First instalment is released automatically, if the DRDAs received the second instalment in the previous year without any condition. Otherwise, DRDA is to fulfil the conditions before the first instalment is released. The second instalment is released on receipt of proposal from each DRDA. Since the Central funds are released to DRDAs on different dates depending upon the proposal received from them, it is not possible to provide the dates of release of funds State-wise/Union territory-wise.

2.16 As per the information provided, wherever the State's share is reduced, the State Government is required to release its share equivalent to one-third of the Central Grants (i.e. 25 per cent of total allocation) as State share within 15 days of release of Central Grants. In the event of shortfall of the State share during the previous year, three times of shortfall amount is deducted from the Central share at the time of the release of the second instalment during the next financial year. Accordingly, the release of State share is invariably monitored by this Ministry.

Unspent/Opening Balance

2.17 The Government has given the following information with regard to the unspent/opening balance during 2002-2003, as reported by the States and Union territories:—

		(Rs. in crore)
Scheme	Opening Balance (OB) as on 1 April, 2003	
SGRY		1363.07
SGSY		415.77
IAY		444.91
DRDA Administration		71.63
Total OB (for four Schemes)	—	Rs. 2295.38 crore
B.E. 2002-2003 of the Department	—	Rs. 12270 crore
Opening Balance of four Schemes	—	18.71 per cent of BE 2002-2003

In this context, The Department of Rural Development had furnished the following formula as per Paragraph Number 8 of 43rd Report—13th Lok Sabha of the Committee on Urban and Rural Development:

Proposal received in December—50 per cent of allocated funds;
 Proposal received in January—40 per cent of allocated funds;
 Proposal received in February—30 per cent of allocated funds; and
 Proposal received in March —20 per cent of allocated funds.

2.18 The Committee note that during 2003-2004 in the first six months, the Department of Rural Development could spend 26.49 per cent of the Plan funds, whereas in the first nine months 67.34 per cent of the allocated funds were spent. On the other hand during the same period, 53.94 and 68.55 per cent respectively of Non-Plan funds were spent. The Committee feel that this uneven spending especially of Plan funds during the year adversely affects the implementation of the Schemes. The Committee, therefore, urge that adequate steps in the coming years should be taken so that the expenditure of Plan as well as Non-Plan funds is conveniently and uniformly spread throughout the year. The Government should therefore, plan ahead to ensure uniform spending throughout the year and in a phased manner.

2.19 The Committee find from the data indicated above that there are huge opening balances with the State Governments under the major Schemes of the Department, viz. SGRY, SGSY, IAY and DRDA Administration. The Committee are distressed to note that Rs. 2295.38 crore i.e. 18.71 per cent of BE 2002-03 remained unspent with the States and the Union territories administration. Not only that under-spending is a recurrent feature during each of the financial year as is evident from the information furnished by the Department. While appreciating the fact that utilisation certificates have to be furnished by the State Government before seeking the second instalment under different schemes, the Committee find that even the first instalment is released very late. When the Department was asked about the date of release of first instalment under different schemes, they have indicated the position only with regard to SGSY. It can be seen that under SGSY, the first instalment could be released on 16th June in 2003 and on 15th April in 2004. Thus, during 2003, there was delay of 46 days and during 2004, there was a delay of 15 days. The Committee would like to know the information on date

of release of funds for all the Central sector and Centrally Sponsored Schemes of the Department. The Committee find that late release of outlay is the main reason of underspending and thereby resulting in unspent balances with the State Governments. The Department consider the releases as the position of expenditure and reflect a very bright picture before the Committee but there are serious problems in the implementation of several schemes which have been analyzed in the subsequent chapters of the report. Here, the Committee would like to highlight that the outlay during a particular year should be released in a phased manner as per the formula evolved by the Department and there should not be rush of releases at the fag end of the financial year, *i.e.* March. The Committee, however, desire that only 10 per cent of funds be released during the month of March, if proposal to this effect is received.

2.20 The Committee further find that late release of funds by the Union Government further encourages the State Government to delay their share of outlay, thereby hampering the implementation of the programme. To motivate the State Governments, the Union Government has to set good precedents. In view of this, the Committee would like that the Union Government should ensure that the first instalment is released in the very first week of the financial year.

2.21 The Committee have examined the scheme 'monitoring' in the subsequent chapter of the report but here the Committee would like to strongly recommend to the Department to gear up the implementing agencies and strengthen the monitoring mechanism so as to ensure cent per cent utilisation of scarce resources.

Contribution to International Bodies

2.22 The Committee are informed that the Department of Rural Development is making contribution to the international organizations as follows:—

S.No.	Name of organization	Since which year contribution made	Current amount of contribution per annum
1.	AARDO*	1962	US \$ 106,000
2.	CIRDAP	1979	US \$ 94,147
3.	CLGF**	1997-98	UK pound 3655

* Earlier known as Afro-Asian Rural Reconstruction Organization (AARRO)

**Commonwealth Local Government Forum—headquarter at London, UK

2.23 The Afro-Asian Rural Reconstruction Organization (earlier known as AARRO but now, AARDO) contributes to the Human Resource Development by organizing training under Indian Technical and Economic Cooperation Programme (ITEC) of Ministry of External Affairs for member countries. AARDO has made adequate use of Indian training Institutions and facilities like NIRD and NISIET at Hyderabad. Centre on Integrated Rural Development in Asia and Pacific (CIRDAP) operates through designated contact Ministries and Link Institutions in member countries. National Institute of Rural Development (NIRD), Hyderabad is the Link Institution in India for CIRDAP.

2.24 CLGF promotes democratic values and good governance and mobilizes Local Government skills and resources through Good Practice Schemes among Commonwealth Organizations by organizing Conferences, Symposia, Workshops etc. Membership contributions to these International organizations have helped the Department of Rural Development in developing understanding among member countries for promoting welfare, eradication of thirst, hunger and poverty among rural people and in assisting member countries in obtaining financial and technical assistance for rural development programmes.

2.25 The Committee find that the Department has been making contribution to various International organisations such as AARDO since 1962 and CIRDAP since 1979. Since the Department of Rural Development has been contributing to AARDO, a Programme of the Ministry of External Affairs for the last 42 years, the Committee feel that there is a need to review the matter in order to examine the need for continuing this contribution.

The Committee would like to be apprised how far the aforesaid contribution could help the Department of Rural Development in developing understanding among member countries by way of promoting welfare, eradication of thirst, hunger and poverty among rural people and in assisting member countries in obtaining financial and technical assistance for rural development programme to comprehend the need for continuing said assistance.

Allocation and Expenditure of Funds for North-Eastern Area (Major Head 2552 and 14.00.42)

2.26 As informed by the Department, lump sum (non-lapsable) provision for North-Eastern States and Sikkim is being earmarked since 2000-2001.

2.27 The State-wise details of allocation and actual release of funds to North-Eastern States and Sikkim from the year 2000-2001 under the major rural development programmes are given in *Appendix-V*.

2.28 As per the information given in Detailed Demands for Grants (2004-2005), the utilization of lump sum provision of funds in the North-Eastern Area has been indicated as below:—

	(Rs. in crore)		
	Allocation (Centre)	Expenditure (Centre+State)	Amount surrendered for transfer to non-lapsable pool (Centre)
2000-2001 BE	676.00	—	324.03
2001-2002 BE	670.50	—	29.64
2002-2003 BE	967.00	Nil	17.35
2003-2004 BE	949.50	NA	—
2003-2004 RE	1027.10	NA	—
2004-2005 BE	1143.74	NA	—

2.29 As regards the reasons for under-utilisation of the said lump sum provisions, the Committee have been informed that the North-Eastern States in general and the State of Assam (which accounts for around 75 percent of the allocation) in particular are unable to provide the State matching share due to financial crunch. The Central share, therefore, gets reduced substantially due to deductions on account of shortfall in State share, as per provisions of the guidelines. In order to overcome this problem, release of funds to Assam under various programmes has been allowed without deductions for short State share, as a special case, during the last two years.

2.30 The Department has further stated that the problems in timely supply of foodgrains by Food Corporation of India under SGRY, inadequate presence of banks for credit delivery under SGSY, limited working season due to weather conditions etc. are other limiting factors hampering the progress of implementation of Schemes and utilization of funds in the North-Eastern States.

2.31 The Committee note that in North-Eastern Area, 10 per cent allocation of the total outlay of the Department is earmarked since

2000-01. They are constrained to note the expenditure position since 2002-03. In 2002-03, the expenditure position is stated to be nil and from 2003-04 to 2004-05, the position has been stated to be not available. Further the Committee find that there are certain problems in implementation of different schemes of the Department in North-Eastern Area as is evident from the information given above. They have some problems in allocating the States share besides inadequate presence of banks for credit delivery under SGSY and limited working season due to weather conditions, etc., have been stated to be major reasons which hamper the progress of implementation of the schemes and thereby result in under-utilization of outlay in North Eastern Area. In view of this scenario, the Committee recommend to the Government to find out the position of utilization of resources in each of the North-Eastern Area under each of the schemes since 2000-01 and submit the same before the Committee so as to enable the Committee to come to the right conclusions. Besides they would like that State-wise reasons for the problems of various States in implementation of the schemes should be analyzed and corrective action taken so that the scarce resources in the starved economy of the country do not remain unutilized thereby affecting the other schemes of the Government.

Below Poverty Line (BPL) Census, 2002

2.32 The Committee have been informed that BPL Census is conducted by State Governments/Union territory Administrations and the Ministry of Rural Development supports them by providing financial and technical assistance. The State/Union territory Governments have been given the flexibility to review the BPL lists with the approval of the Gram Sabha keeping in view the change in the BPL status of the families. The Government of India does not insist the State Governments to remove any person from the existing BPL list.

2.33 As per the information, BPL Census was conducted by the Ministry of Rural Development in 1992, 1997 and 2002. The methodology adopted for BPL Census 2002 *inter-alia* includes 13 score based on socio-economic indicators for identifying the poor households, as against the income or expenditure approach adopted in the earlier censuses. It has been mentioned that the current methodology has been adopted on the recommendation of an expert body constituted for the purpose.

2.34 The Planning Commission has last estimated the persons living below the poverty line during 1999-2000 based on the survey by NSSO. The BPL Census 2002 is independent of the survey conducted by the NSSO and estimate made by Planning Commission during 1999-2000 the BPL census 2002 aims at identifying the BPL families who can be assisted under rural development programmes.

2.35 The Committee desired to know during oral evidence as to whether according to BPL Census, 2002, the number of BPL families had decreased or increased. The representatives of the Department replied that according to the figures available with them it was difficult to state the number of persons in each village, number of BPL families and the number who have been deleted from the BPL list. The representative of the Department stated that they only had to assume these figures.

2.36 As per the information given in the Performance Budget 2004-2005, following the ruling of the Supreme Court in People's Union for Civil Liberties (PUCL) Writ Petition No.196 of 2001 in the Hon'ble Supreme Court for effective implementation of the Central and Centrally Sponsored Schemes to prevent starvation death and malnutrition in the calamity affected rural areas and other backward rural areas on 5th May, 2003, that Government of India will not insist that the State Governments remove any person from the existing BPL List till the next date of hearing. The State Governments were advised not to finalise the BPL List until the next hearing. In view of the advice of Additional Solicitor General of India, all States and Union territories have been requested to complete the spade work and prepare BPL lists immediately. Further, all States and Union territories have also been advised to prepare separate tabulation Plans for several indicators so that valuable inputs for policy intervention can be prepared.

2.37 When asked about the number of States and Union territories which have completed the said spade work and the tabulation Plan for BPL Census 2002 by the end of June, 2004, the Ministry in their reply have stated that almost all the States/Union territories have reported to have completed the entire field survey work. The latest reports regarding completion of spade work and tabulation plans are yet to be received from the States/Union territories. The Ministry is seized of the issue and it has already been planned to hold regional meetings with all the States/Union territories to review the whole exercise and to ensure that the pending action, if any, is completed immediately.

2.38 The Ministry of Rural Development has informed that a total amount of Rs. 7,595.53 lakh to the State Governments and Union territories for conducting BPL Census-2002 has been released.

2.39 The Committee find that the Department has released Rs. 75.96 crore to the States and Union territories for conducting BPL census, 2002. The Committee would like to know the expenditure made by different States and Union territories out of the releases made so far. The Committee have been informed that the latest Reports regarding completion of spade work and tabulation plans are yet to be received from the States and Union territories. They presume that in the absence of the results of BPL Census, 2002, different State Governments must have been relying on the results of the previous BPL Census, which is too old. Therefore, they recommend that while awaiting the judgement of Supreme Court, the Department of Rural Development should impress upon the States/Union territories that the tentative BPL Census 2002 should be ready without any further delay so that no further time is wasted in identifying the BPL families who are in real need of the anti-poverty Programmes of the Department.

CHAPTER III

SCHEME-WISE ASSESSMENT OF DEMANDS FOR GRANTS (2004-2005) OF THE DEPARTMENT OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT

Different Central Sector and Centrally Sponsored Schemes being implemented by the Department of Rural Development are as follows:

- (i) Swarnjayanti Gram Swarozgar Yojana (SGSY);
- (ii) Sampoorna Grameen Rozgar Yojana (SGRY);
- (iii) Rural Housing (RH) Schemes;
- (iv) Pradhan Mantri Gram Sadak Yojana (PMGSY);
- (v) District Rural Development Agency (DRDA) Administration Scheme;
- (vi) Provision of Urban amenities in Rural Areas;
- (vii) Training Schemes;
- (viii) Assistance to Council for Advancement of People's Action and Rural Technology (CAPART);
- (ix) Information, Education and Communication (IEC); and
- (x) Monitoring and Evaluation.

3.2 The allocation and the performance of these Schemes are given as below:—

(i) Swarnjayanti Gram Swarozgar Yojana (SGSY):

3.3 The Swarnjayanti Gram Swarozgar Yojana (SGSY), a holistic programme of self-employment, was launched *w.e.f.* 01 April, 1999 following restructuring of the erstwhile Integrated Rural Development Programme (IRDP), Training of Rural Youth for Self Employment (TRYSEM), Development of Women and Children in Rural Areas (DWCRA), Supply of Tool Kits to Rural Artisans (SITRA) and Ganga Kalyan Yojana (GKY), Million Wells Scheme (MWS) etc.

Funding Pattern

3.4 As provided in the Scheme, the funding pattern is:

Central Allocation—75 per cent

State Allocation—25 per cent

Union territory Allocation—100 per cent by Centre

Objective

3.5 The objective of the SGSY is to bring the assisted poor families (Swarozgaries) above the poverty line by organizing them into Self Help Groups (SHGs) through the process of social mobilisation, training, capacity building and provision of income-generating assets through a mix of bank credit and Government subsidy.

Subsidy to individuals and Self Help Groups (SHGs)

3.6 Assistance under SGSY, to individual Swarozgaries or Self Help Groups (SHGs), is given in the form of subsidy by the Government and credit by the banks. There is no monetary limit on subsidy for irrigation projects. The subsidy is back ended. Cooperative, Regional-Rural and Commercial banks disburse the loan and subsidy.

Subsidy for Individuals

3.7 An individual is provided a subsidy @ 30 per cent of the project cost subject to a maximum of Rs. 7,500. In respect of SCs/STs/disabled persons, the subsidy is 50 per cent of the project cost upto a maximum of Rs. 10,000.

Subsidy for Self Help Groups (SHGs)

3.8 Under the Scheme, 50 per cent of the project cost can be given as a Subsidy to SHGs subject to a ceiling of Rs. 1.25 lakh or Rs. 10000 per member of SHG whichever is less.

Implementation

3.9 The Scheme is implemented through District Rural Development Agencies (DRDAs) in various States with active involvement of Panchayati Raj Institutions, banks, line departments and the Non-Governmental Organisations.

3.10 As per the detailed Demands for Grants (2004-2005) under SGSY (Central Share), Rs. 900 crore have been allocated and Rs.100 crore have been kept in the North-eastern pool. Therefore, the BE 2004-2005 of SGSY is Rs. 1000 crore.

3.11 The tentative credit mobilisation target under SGSY during 2004-2005 has been fixed at Rs. 2507.67 crore for the States and Union territories.

3.12 As per information given in the Annual Report (2003-2004) of the Ministry of Rural Development, performance of SGSY since inception upto 2003-2004 is as follows:—

(i) Number of SHGs formed	—	17.35 lakh
(ii) Number of Swarozgaries assisted	—	45.97 lakh
(a) Individual Swarozgaries	—	25.75 lakh
(b) SHG Swarozgaries	—	20.22 lakh

3.13 One of the basic aims of SGSY over the previous Programme IRDP is that the IRDP envisaged the benefit to the individual beneficiaries, while SGSY stresses on formation of Self Help Groups (SHGs). It has been provided in the SGSY guidelines that the SHGs may consist of 10-20 persons belonging to families Below Poverty Line (BPL). In case of minor irrigation Schemes, disabled persons and in difficult areas, *i.e.* hills, deserts and sparsely populated areas, the number of persons in a group may range from 5 to 20. Even if it is assumed that each of the 17.35 lakh Self Help Groups were formed with a minimum number of persons prescribed in the guidelines *i.e.* 5, the total number of Swarozgaries in these groups would have been more than 85 lakhs upto 2003-2004.

3.14 The Committee find that SGSY was launched in the place of IRDP and its allied Programmes which lays stress on formation of Self Help Groups. However, the Committee note that upto 2003-2004, number of individual Swarozgaries assisted under SGSY was significantly more than the Swarozgaries who were assisted in Groups. Since each Self Help Group should assist at least 10 persons belonging to families Below Poverty Line which might be reduced to 5 persons in hilly and difficult areas, the Committee are unable to understand as to how 17.35 lakh Self Help Groups reportedly formed during this period could assist only 20.21 lakh Swarozgaries which should have been about 85 to 170 lakh. Keeping in view the

information on the number of SHGs and the number of Swarozgaries, the Committee have come to a conclusion that the performance of SGSY in this regard is not satisfactory. They would like the Department to explain the reasons to the Committee.

Per Family investment and subsidy credit ratio

3.15 When asked about the physical target under SGSY, since 1995-96, it has been stated that no physical targets are being fixed. However, the Department is monitoring the following target and achievement:

Year	Per family investment (Rs.)		Subsidy Credit Ratio	
	Target	Achievement	Target	Achievement
2002-03	25000	21666	1:3	1:1.195
2003-04 (Provisional)	25000	22533	1:3	1:1.83
2004-05 (upto June, 2004)	25000	24058	1:3	1:1.85

3.16 When the Committee desired to know the reasons for which the targets set for per family investment and subsidy-credit ratio have so far, not been achieved, the Department have replied that the targets for per family investment and credit subsidy ratio are actually indicative targets. The guidelines of SGSY do not provide for fixing of any target for per family investment and credit subsidy ratio. SGSY is a subsidy cum-credit scheme with subsidy as only an enabling component and credit is critical component. Therefore achievement of these indicative targets for per family investment and credit subsidy ratio largely depends upon credit flow from banking institutions. Up till now credit flow to the beneficiaries has not reached the desired level. Because of this reason the indicative targets related to per family investment and subsidy credit ratio could not be achieved.

3.17 At the launch of the Scheme in 1999, it was envisaged that every family assisted under SGSY will be brought above the poverty line in a period of three years. As per information furnished to the Committee, 3,47,912 members of SHGs and 5,85,956 individual Swarozgaries were assisted during 1999-2000. When the Committee desired to know the number of members of SHGs and individual

Swarozgaries assisted since 1999-2000 and how many of them have come above the poverty line, after receiving 4 years of assistance, the Department has stated that Concurrent Evaluation of SGSY, sponsored by this Ministry was conducted by Centre for Management Development, Thiruvanthapuram during 2002-03, for evaluating the performance of SGSY from year 1999-2000 to 2001-2002. As per this evaluation, out of total swarozgaries (individual and SHGs) who had reported income generation from their SGSY activities, 37.24 per cent individuals and 15.09 per cent SHGs have crossed poverty line due to SGSY activities.

Findings of the Concurrent Evaluation

3.18 As per the information furnished to the Committee, the main objective of SGSY is to bring the assisted poor families above the Poverty Line (at least 30 per cent in each block during the course of five years) by providing them income generating assets. The lagging in the implementation of SGSY as pointed out in the Concurrent Evaluation for the period of 1 April 1999 and 2001-2002 is as follows:

- (i) State Level SGSY Committee meetings were not at all held in Bihar and Meghalaya;
- (ii) Exclusive mechanisms for providing help to Swarozgaries in product design and development were seen in only 7 States;
- (iii) For 19 per cent SHGs, SGSY activities have created no impact;
- (iv) 27 per cent of SHGs could purchase the assets in the first month after the release of loan amount;
- (v) 42 per cent of SHGs market their products/services on their own. Only 5.12 per cent of SHGs found to have participated in trade fairs/exhibitions organized by Governments/non-Governmental agencies regularly and only 12 per cent of SHGs have participated in Gram Shree melas/Saras;
- (vi) People who are not eligible for the benefits under SGSY have become beneficiaries including people belonging to non-BPL category and those who are influential;
- (vii) Only 15.9 per cent of SHGs have crossed poverty line due to SGSY activities;
- (viii) Formation and evolution of SHGs are slow in most districts;

- (ix) In some SHGs each member of group is individually engaged in a micro enterprise of his/her choice, and one/two dominated zamindars, influential members pocketed all benefits of SHG activities;
- (x) Zamindars, their servants and labourers constituted SHGs and benefits were taken by the Zamindars only; and
- (xi) All defaulting SHGs are poorly managed and lack of proper guidance is the main problem faced by SHGs.

Involvement of Banks

3.19 The following lacunae regarding involvement of banks were found by the concurrent evaluation:

- (i) The representatives of banks did not participate in SLSCs in Goa, Kerala, Orissa and Pondicherry;
- (ii) Major complaint of District authorities was non-cooperation from banks (58 per cent) delay in bank procedures (54 per cent), delay in disbursement of assistance (51 per cent), problem of coordination with banks (61 per cent);
- (iii) 72 per cent of individual beneficiaries and 58 per cent of group Swarozgaries have not undergone training for skill development;
- (iv) 51 per cent of individual beneficiaries and 40 per cent of group Swarozgaries were provided the loan in a single dose and the remaining received the loan in multiple doses;
- (v) Grading of SHGs found to be very time consuming;
- (vi) Bank officials are worried about non-performing assets and they sanction loan only to those people who have either not availed the loan before or have repaid the past loan;
- (vii) Banks prefer sanctioning loans to individuals only and release loans individually to members of SHGs for greater accountability;
- (viii) Banks release only the subsidy part of the loan holding back credit portion;

- (ix) Lack of coordination between bank official and officials of blocks; and
- (x) Gram Panchayats have no role to play for recovery of loan.

Second Dose Assistance

3.20 When asked about the number of beneficiaries who have received the second dose assistance, under SGSY, the Department has stated that as per the SGSY Guidelines, multiple doses mean assisting a swarozgari over a period of time with second and subsequent dose(s) enabling him/her to access higher amount of credit. Bank can provide him/her additional credit whether or not this is backed by subsidy depending upon the willingness of swarozgari to access additional credit and his credit worthiness.

3.21 The Department has further stated that the cases of second dose of assistance are not being monitored through monthly progress report.

3.22 The Finance Minister in his Budget speech has indicated that the Self Help Groups (SHGs) bank linkage programme initiated in 1992 has come a long way. He has further stated that while the SHG concept will be promoted vigorously, mature SHGs may be in a position to graduate from consumption or production credit, to starting micro enterprises. The indicative target of credit linking of 5.85 per cent SHGs during the period up to March 31st, 2007 has been set for NABARD, SIDBI, Banks and other agencies. When the Department was asked to provide information with regard to number of SHGs which could be mature enough to enable them to start micro enterprises under SGSY, and the targets fixed in this regard, they have informed that no physical targets are fixed in this regard. However, they have further assured that efforts will be made to credit link maximum number of SHGs under SGSY depending upon availability of resources.

State-wise Performance of SGSY during the year 2003-04

3.23 The position regarding financial progress under SGSY during 2003-04 has been in *Appendix-VI*. It could be seen therefrom that in 9 States/Union territories, the percentage utilization is less than 50 per cent. Besides, in Daman and Diu and Dadra and Nagar Haveli, the

position of expenditure has been indicated as nil. The physical achievement of SGSY is as below :

Year	Physical achievement Swarozgaries assisted during the year	Physical achievement Group formed since inception
2002-03	8.26 lakh	13.44 lakh
2003-04	6.47 lakh	19.78 lakh
2004-05	Not available	Not available

3.24 The position of Swarozgaries assistance has been indicated as below :

Year	Achievement (Lakh Swarozgaries)
1997-1998	17.07
1998-1999	16.77
1999-2000	9.34
2000-2001	10.06
2001-2002	9.38
Total 9th Plan	72.52
2002-2003	8.26
2003-2004*	8.76

*Provisional

3.25 During the first year of 10th Five Year Plan (2002-2003), States of Andhra Pradesh, Arunachal Pradesh, Assam, Bihar, Jharkhand, Karnataka, Kerala, Meghalaya, Mizoram, Nagaland, Orissa, Uttaranchal, West Bengal and during the second year of 10th Five Year Plan (2003-2004), States of Andhra Pradesh, Arunachal Pradesh, Assam, Bihar, Karnataka, Manipur, Meghalaya, Orissa, Punjab, Uttaranchal, and West Bengal have not released their full matching share.

3.26 The Committee are disturbed to note that serious lacunae in the implementation of SGSY has been found in the Concurrent Evaluation. They are further disturbed to find that the Zamindars,

their servants and labourers constitute Self Help Groups and the benefits were taken away by the Zamindars who are above the Poverty Line and who are otherwise not eligible for it. Equally disturbing is the fact that Bank officials are worried about the non-performing assets and they sanction loans only to those people who have either not availed the loan before or have repaid the first loan. Despite the existing guidelines, finding of a number of serious flaws in the implementation of the Scheme is nothing but regrettable. The Committee hope that the Government will give a serious thought to this and take necessary steps during the current financial year to bring about significant changes in the guidelines of the Scheme, so that the flaws noticed in the Concurrent Evaluation are eradicated and the avowed objectives of the Scheme are achieved.

3.27 While analysing the position of involvement of banks in the implementation of SGSY, the Committee note that there are serious problems regarding involvement of banks. As pointed out by concurrent evaluation there is complaint of non-cooperation from banks by district authorities. Further there is delay in banking procedure, delay in disbursement of assistance and problem of cooperation with and co-ordination among banks. Another serious lacuna pointed out by the evaluation is that banks prefer sanctioning loans to individuals only and release loans individually to members of SHGs for greater accountability. Another problem being faced is banks release only the subsidy portion and thus withholding the credit portion. The Committee feel that in the absence of providing credit, the money given as subsidy would have been used by the beneficiary for their consumption needs and thereby resulting in failure of the achievement of the objectives of the scheme that is to bring the beneficiaries above the poverty line. Not only that, there is lack of cooperation between bank officials and officials of blocks.

3.28 Another lacuna noticed by the data furnished by the Department is that there is serious shortfall in credit targets, achievements and credit disbursements. In view of this scenario, the Committee fail to understand how the objective of bringing BPL persons above the poverty line could be achieved. The Committee feel that the Department should take up this matter with Reserve Bank of India so that the necessary instructions would be issued to banks for their cooperation in implementation of the programme. Not only that, there should be regular meeting with the representatives of banks as well as RBI and monitoring of the programmes should be regularly done. Further the Committee also

like to ensure that only the eligible beneficiaries are assisted in the programme and the selection of beneficiaries should be done in Gram Sabhas only. The bank officials should be directed to be present in Gram Sabha meetings so that the process of selection of beneficiaries and completion of formalities, etc., is completed at one go.

3.29 Another corrective step to be taken by the Department is to ensure proper coordination between bank officials and block level government representatives and the Panchayats. The Committee would like the Department to take the corrective steps on the various aspects as raised by the Committee in the aforesaid para and intimate the Committee accordingly.

3.30 The Committee are constrained to note that efforts made by the Department under SGSY have not culminated into the desired results even after 5 years of implementation of SGSY Scheme, credit flow to the beneficiaries has not reached the desired level. The Committee would like the Government to go deeply into the methodology and find out the reasons which preclude in obtaining the desired result. The Committee are informed that the Scheme was launched with great optimism with an end to having every assisted family above poverty line within three years. However, this appears to have remained a distant dream. The Government should take all ground realities and possibilities into account. The Committee feel that the Department should not merely be a silent spectator in this regard but should seriously introspect on the lacunae detected and come out with ameliorative measures. While setting up the target, hyperboles do not help and lead to confusion. The Government should point out serious flaws noticed in the implementation of the Scheme to the Reserve Bank of India (RBI) and Ministry of Finance. They urge the Government to take suitable measures in this regard and apprise them accordingly.

3.31 The Committee find from the information provided by the Department that there are certain problems being faced in the implementation of SGSY as pointed out in the concurrent evaluation for the period of 1st April, 1999 to 2001. It has been stated in the findings of said evaluation that only 27 per cent of SHGs could purchase the assets in the first month after the release of loan amount. Another problem indicated in the evaluation seems to be lack of forward and backward linkages. It has been indicated that 42 per cent of SHGs market their products/services on their own. Another disturbing feature noticed by the evaluation is that people

who are not eligible for the benefits under SGSY have become beneficiaries including people belonging to non BPL category and those who are influential. The Committee further note that the objective of SGSY is to provide self employment to BPL persons so as to enable them to cross poverty line even by giving the multiple doses of assistance. They are disturbed to know as pointed out by the concurrent evaluation that only 15.9 per cent of SHGs could cross poverty line. By analysing all these factors, the Committee have come to the conclusion that there are serious problems in the implementation of the programme. The issues related to involvement of banks have been analyzed separately in the succeeding paras of the Report.

3.32 From the data provided by the Department, regarding financial achievement during the year 2003-04, the Committee find that in as many as 8 States, the performance was less than 50 per cent. These States are Arunachal Pradesh, Assam, Goa, Jharkhand, Manipur, Meghalaya, Nagaland and Rajasthan. Further in 3 Union territories the performance was stated to be nil. As regards, the physical achievement, the Committee find that there was declining trend from 1997-98 to 1999-2000. The number of Swarozgaris increased in the year 2000-2001 which further decreased in the following years i.e., 2001-2002, 2002-2003. In 2003-2004 although the data has been provided provisional, there is slight increase in the number of Swarozgaris assisted as compared to that of 2002-2003.

In view of the aforesaid scenario, the Committee feel that the Government has to analyse critically the performance of SGSY which is one of the oldest and important schemes of the Department after interacting with the respective State Governments, PRIs. Besides the steps to provide forward and backward to the self help groups, should be undertaken so that the viability of the self help groups could be ensured.

3.33 The Committee further find that most of the Swarozgaris have to sell their products in the market on their own because there is lack of institutional arrangements being made for the aforesaid schemes. The Committee feel that the profits of Swarozgaris are considerably reduced if they resort to self marketing. Another area of concern is the competitiveness in the market. The Government has to think of all these aspects seriously and provide the protection to the self help groups. Besides, to enable the self help groups to face the competition in the market the stress need to be given to

training aspect so that the products produced by the beneficiaries are competitive in the market. More and more Gramshree Melas, like SARAS, organised during the India International Trade Fair in Delhi and Delhi Haat, should be organized in other States of the country so as to enable Swarozgaris to sell their products in such Melas. More and more NGOs should also be involved in the programme.

3.34 The Committee further find that Finance Minister has indicated that mature SHGs may be in a position to graduate from consumption or production credit to starting micro enterprises. The Committee find that Finance Minister has indicated that an indicative target of credit linking 5.85 lakh SHGs during the period up to March 2007 has been set for NABARD, SIDBI and other agencies. The Committee find from the information furnished by the Department that they have not set any target in this regard. The Committee fail to understand how the Government would achieve the aforesaid targets in the absence of any planning being made in one of the biggest programmes of Self Help Groups *i.e.*, SGSY.

3.35 The Committee would like to know from the Department, the number of SHGs who could graduate from consumption or production credit to starting micro enterprises since the inception of the scheme so as to enable the Committee to know about the real impact of the programme. They would also like to be apprised about the number of SHGs who could be credit linked by different agencies like NABARD, SIDBI and Banks.

3.36 Keeping in view the aforesaid, the Committee conclude that there are some serious problems in implementation of the programme. They would like that there are some serious problems in the implementation of SGSY. They would like the Department to take corrective steps immediately, after consultation with State Governments, Panchayats, Banks and all concerned with the implementation of the Programme and apprise the Committee accordingly.

Defunct Self Help Groups

3.37 When the Committee wanted to know whether all SHGs formed so far under SGSY are existing and receiving assistance from the financial institutions, the Department stated that as per SGSY guidelines, the financial assistance to the matured SHGs is given in the form of Government subsidy and credit from banks. Government subsidy is an enabling component and is given only once.

3.38 It has further been stated that as far as information of existing/defunct groups is concerned, till 2003-04 this information was not being monitored by the Ministry. However, State Governments have now been requested to furnish information in this regard.

3.39 Asked further as to whether any of the SHGs formed so far were found to be defunct by the Ministry, the Department has stated that the information is yet to be received from the State Governments/Union territories.

3.40 The Committee are unhappy to note that the Department is yet to receive the information regarding existing or defunct Self Help Groups from the States/Union territories. They also note that all the States and Union territories have been requested to furnish the information in this regard from 2003-2004. The Committee in their earlier Report (48th Report—13th Lok Sabha, Para No. 3.25 refers) had desired to maintain the information on the number of defunct Self Help Groups which the Government had agreed to provide. It appears that the Government has not given any serious thought as to why SHGs become defunct after a certain period. They also do not maintain information regarding existing/defunct SHGs. This is a glaring lapse and needs to be addressed seriously. The success of the Scheme depends on proper review of its functioning and the lacunae detected in its functioning which is required to be done by the Government and expected. The Committee, therefore, desire that Ministry of Rural Development should expedite the requisite information from the States and Union territories without any further delay. The Committee should be kept informed about the steps taken.

Implementation of SGSY in Union territories

3.41 As regards the release of Central share of funds to the States/Union territories during 2003-2004 and 2004-2005 under SGSY, the Committee have been informed that during 2004-2005, no funds have been released to the State of Manipur. Further, during 2003-2004 (upto June, 2004) and upto the same period in 2004-2005, no funds have been released to Union territories of Andaman & Nicobar Islands, Daman & Diu, Dadra & Nagar Haveli and Lakshadweep. The Committee are also informed that SGSY is not implemented in Delhi and Chandigarh as these places do not have rural areas.

3.42 The Committee are dismayed to note that performance of SGSY in several Union territories and in the State of Manipur is close to nil, as no Central funds have been released to them during

2003-2004 and 2004-2005. They feel that as the Union territories get cent percent Central assistance, the performance of SGSY should have been better as there is no States share involved. The Committee desire to know the specific reasons as to why these Union territories and the State of Manipur have been deprived of the assistance under SGSY. The Committee, therefore, recommend that monitoring of all the Schemes shall further be strengthened in the current financial year and suitable corrective measures be initiated so that funds under the Scheme are released to these Union territories and Manipur without any further delay.

Performance of Commercial, Cooperative and Regional Rural Banks

3.43 As per the information furnished to the Committee, the State-wise credit mobilisation target *vis-a-vis* the achievement since 2001-2002 is as follows:—

(Rs. in crore)

Year	Credit target	Credit disbursed
2001-2002	3200.87	1329.68
2002-2003	2525.21	1184.30
2003-2004	2129.33	1275.24

3.44 When the Committee wanted to know as to whether the Department of Rural Development monitored the performance of Banks under SGSY separately for Commercial Banks, Cooperative Banks, Regional Rural Banks, they were informed that credit mobilisation is monitored by this Ministry regularly with reference to the targets fixed for each State. The monitoring is not done separately for Commercial, Cooperative and Regional Rural Banks with reference to their individual targets as the same is being done by RBI/NABARD. The subsidy under SGSY is released to DRDAs. The DRDAs in turn keep the subsidy in the service areas of Banks of particular Blocks, Districts etc. The information of subsidy released by DRDAs to the Banks is not being monitored by this Ministry.

3.45 The Committee are shocked to note that credit mobilisation target has never been achieved by the Commercial, Cooperative and Regional Rural Banks since 2001-2002. Further, the Ministry of Rural Development does not monitor the performance of Commercial, Cooperative and Regional Rural Banks as is being done by RBI/NABARD. They also note that the same information is available

with the DRDAs, but the subsidy released by DRDAs to Banks is also not being monitored by the Ministry. With the absence of the requisite information in this regard, the Committee feel that no effective assessment of performance of different Banks can be made so far as the implementation of the SGSY is concerned. They, therefore, urge the Department to monitor credit mobilisation targets *vis-a-vis* achievement separately by Commercial, Cooperative and Regional Rural Banks. It should also be seen that the information in this regard is collected from the DRDAs.

SGSY Infrastructure

3.46 The Committee have been informed that as per mandated guidelines of SGSY, the DRDAs may prioritise the expenditure on different components *i.e.* training and capacity building, revolving funds, subsidy for economic activity based on the local requirements at different stages of group formulation. The DRDAs may ensure that there is a balance between the expenditure proposed for different items. The expenditure on infrastructure should not exceed 20 percent of the total SGSY allocation, (25 percent in case of North-Eastern States). Under Special Project Component of SGSY, Projects are approved by the Ministry by an Inter-Ministerial Committee, headed by the Secretary (Rural Development) and the funds are released to the concerned DRDAs/Implementing Agencies. As per the information furnished by the Department, the State of Sikkim has not been provided any funds for infrastructure Projects. In addition to 27 other States, Nehru Yuvak Kendras (NYKs) have been involved for implementation of Special Projects.

3.47 The Committee are unable to find the reasons as to why Sikkim is excluded from implementing Special Projects Component of SGSY. They find that in addition to other States, Nehru Yuvak Kendras (NYKs) have also been given the task of implementing Special SGSY Projects. The Committee, would like to know the reasons for exclusion of Sikkim, the justification of involving the NYKs as well as the success of SGSY Special Projects.

Monitoring of SGSY

3.48 As per the SGSY guidelines, the following number of sittings are recommended:—

- | | | |
|---|---|-----------------------------------|
| (i) Central Level Coordination Committee | — | once in six months |
| (ii) State Level Coordination Committee | — | once in every quarter of the Year |
| (iii) District Level Coordination Committee | — | every month |
| (iv) Block Level Coordination Committee | — | twice a month |

3.49 The Department has informed that the prescribed frequency of CLCC is generally maintained to the extent possible. The meetings of SLCC, DLCC and BLCC are required to be monitored by the respective State Governments. It has however, been pointed out in the Concurrent Evaluation Study that between 1 April 1999 to 2001-2002, State Level Coordination Committee meetings were not held in Bihar and Meghalaya.

3.50 While noting that the prescribed frequency of CLCC is generally maintained, the Committee find that as has been pointed out by Concurrent Evaluation, many State Governments like Bihar and Meghalaya do not hold SLCC meetings regularly. Further, the Department of Rural Development also do not monitor the meetings of SLCC, DLCC and BLCC which according to the Department are required to be monitored by the respective State Governments. The Committee desire that the Government should obtain quarterly and six monthly Reports from the State Governments on the information of meetings held by SLCC, DLCC and BLCC and pressurise all the States to adhere to the prescribed frequency to the extent possible.

(ii) Sampoorna Grameen Rozgar Yojana (SGRY)

3.51 The Sampoorna Grameen Rozgar Yojana (SGRY) was launched by merging the erstwhile Employment Assurance Scheme (EAS) and Jawahar Gram Samridhi Yojana (JGSY) w.e.f. 25 September, 2001.

Objective

3.52 The objective of the Scheme is to provide additional wage employment in all rural areas and thereby provide food security and improve nutritional levels with the creation of durable community, social and economic assets and infrastructural development of rural areas.

Funding pattern

3.53 The Scheme was implemented in two streams until 31 March 2004.

The First Stream: It was implemented at the District (Zilla Parishad) and Intermediate Panchayat levels. 50 percent of the funds and foodgrains under SGRY was distributed between the Zilla Parishad and the Intermediate Panchayats in 40 : 60 ratio.

The Second Stream: It was implemented at the Village Panchayat level. 50 per cent of the funds and foodgrains under SGRY was earmarked for Village Panchayats and distributed among them through DRDAs and Zilla Parishad.

3.54 From 2004-2005, it has been decided to merge both the streams of SGRY together for administrative convenience. The cash component of the programme is shared between Centre and States in the ratio of 75:25. For Union territories, the Centre provides 100 per cent funds under the Scheme. Foodgrains are provided free of cost to States and Union territories but the cost of transportation of foodgrains from Food Corporation of India (FCI) godown to worksite/PDS and its distribution is the responsibility of the State/Union territory Governments. Under the scheme foodgrains are distributed @ minimum of 5 kg per manday to the workers.

Implementing Authority

3.55 First stream was implemented at the District and Intermediate Panchayat level. The second stream was implemented at the Village Panchayat level until 31 March 2004.

3.56 As per the detailed Demands for Grants, the BE 2004-2005 under SGRY is Rs. 4590 crore and in addition, Rs. 510 crore are provided in the lumpsum provision for the North-Eastern States. Thus, the total BE 2004-2005 of SGRY is Rs. 5100 crore. The Cash Component of SGRY during 2004-2005 has been increased from Rs. 4125 crore in 2003-2004 to Rs. 4500 crore.

3.57 The Committee are informed that the physical target of generating 100 crores manday annually under SGRY, was set during 10th Plan. To achieve these targets, the Ministry has proposed an outlay of Rs. 48538 crore during the 10th Five Year Plan against which an outlay of Rs. 30000 crore has been kept by the Planning Commission. However, additional requirement of funds are being granted from time to time through Supplementary Grants. During 2002-2003, 74.83 crore mandays and during 2003-2004, 80.10 crore mandays have been generated under SGRY. When the Committee wanted to know the unspent/opening balance of SGRY as on 1 April 2004, the Department has replied that the State and Union territories had not furnished information relating to closing balance in their Monthly Progress Reports. The closing balance as on 31 March 2004 has been derived by deducting expenditure as reported by the States against the total availability of funds during 2003-2004. The information on unspent

balance against the States of Bihar, Chhattisgarh, Gujarat, Jharkhand, Manipur, Nagaland, Sikkim, Uttaranchal, Uttar Pradesh and West Bengal have been stated as not available. For the Union territories of Andaman & Nicobar Islands, Dadra & Nagar Haveli, Daman & Diu also, the information is stated to be not available. Therefore, it can be stated that the aforesaid 13 States and 3 Union territories are yet to furnish the information on total expenditure met under SGRY during 2003-2004 so far.

3.58 The Committee note that although the Cash Component of SGRY during 2004-2005 has been increased from Rs. 4,125 crore to Rs. 4,500 crore, the physical target of generating 100 crore mandays annually during the 10th Five Year Plan has not been achieved so far. The Committee feel that besides increasing the funds, additional steps need to be taken by the Department to achieve the set target. The Committee hope that suitable measures to meet the physical performance of SGRY will be put in place to achieve the targets.

3.59 The non availability of information on the total expenditure from 13 States and 3 Union territories speaks a lot about the inadequate monitoring of the Scheme by the Government. Despite having the existing monitoring mechanism, the Department has failed to obtain the information from all the States/Union territories. The Committee, therefore, desire that the existing monitoring of the Scheme should further be strengthened and these States and Union territories to be persuaded to submit the total expenditure incurred during 2003-2004 without any further delay.

Demand of funds in Supplementary Grants

3.60 The Committee are informed that under the SGRY, 50 lakh tonnes foodgrains have been provided for release annually. To meet the economic cost (at the rate of Rs. 12 taking together the average economic cost of rice and wheat) of this quantity, a minimum amount of Rs. 6000 crore will be required annually. Keeping this in view, the Ministry has requested to make provision including the cost of the foodgrains at the BE stage itself. But due to the financial constraints, the entire cost of foodgrains are not provided at the BE stage by the Planning Commission. Only a token amount is provided at the BE stage and the requirement is met to the extent possible in the supplementary grants. During the current year, Rs. 600 crore under the SGRY, including the Special Component (Rs. 300 crore for each) have been provided in BE 2004-05 towards the payments to the Food Corporation of India. This amount has already been exhausted and

this Ministry has committed liabilities of Rs. 5111 crore under the SGRY and Rs. 6900 crore under the Special Component for which a formal request has already been made. Further, Rs. 5230 crore was obtained through Supplementary Grants during 2003-2004 over and above the Budget estimate of Rs. 4900 crore.

3.61 The Committee find that Rs. 5230 crore was obtained through Supplementary Grants during 2003-2004 over and above the Budget estimate of Rs. 4,900 crore. The Committee are disturbed to find that only a token amount is provided at the BE 2004-2005 stage, which has already been exhausted and the Ministry has committed liabilities of Rs. 5,111 crore under SGRY and Rs. 6,900 crore for the Special Component of SGRY. Thus the practice of demanding more funds in the Supplementary Grants is likely to continue in this year also. Persistent demands of Supplementary Grants is not a healthy sign as it does not give the implementing agencies in different districts the idea about the amount of allocations earmarked for effective implementation of the Scheme. The Implementing Agencies should be well aware of the provisions well ahead of time *i.e.* at the beginning of the financial year. Therefore, the Committee recommend that the Government should find out ways and means to overcome this impasse and take suitable steps, so that Planning Commission/ Ministry of Finance are persuaded to provide adequate necessary funds for SGRY at the beginning of the financial year.

Minimum wages paid to the beneficiaries of SGRY

3.62 When the Committee wanted to know the amount of minimum wages paid to the beneficiaries of SGRY during 2002-2003 from all the States/Union territories, the Government could provide the said information from 19 major States only which is as follows:

3.63 Minimum wages being paid under the SGRY by the major States are given as under:

(In Rs.)		
S.N.	States	Minimum Wages under SGRY
1	2	3
1.	Andhra Pradesh*	80.00
2.	Assam	48.00

1	2	3
3.	Bihar	58.64
4.	Chhattisgarh	52.66
5.	Gujarat	61.00
6.	Haryana	80.00
7.	Himachal Pradesh	60.00
8.	Jharkhand	63.00
9.	Karnataka	46.25
10.	Kerala	91.00
11.	Madhya Pradesh	52.85
12.	Maharashtra	45.00
13.	Orissa	50.00
14.	Punjab	81.70
15.	Rajasthan	60.00
16.	Tamil Nadu	54.00
17.	Uttar Pradesh	58.00
18.	Uttaranchal	58.00
19.	West Bengal	62.00

*Minimum wage rate varies from district to district. Rs. 80.00 is average wage rate for the State as a whole.

3.64 Regarding the said information from the remaining 9 States and 5 Union territories, the Government have replied that the information is awaited from the concerned States and Union territories. These States and Union territories are being constantly reminded to send the information. The Ministry has no plan to impress upon the States and Union territories have a uniform wage rate as this rate is fixed by each State/Union territory, keeping in view the local conditions.

3.65 It is highly disappointing to note that the Government could provide the information on minimum wages paid to the beneficiaries

of the SGRY only in respect of 19 States. While glancing through the limited information available, the Committee find that there is wide variation in the minimum wages paid to the beneficiaries, for example the highest minimum wage was paid in the State of Kerala, which was Rs. 91, whereas its adjoining State Karnataka paid minimum wage of Rs. 46.25p per day. Similar variations are found in many major States including Andhra Pradesh, Orissa, Chhattisgarh etc. Even in some States like Andhra Pradesh, the minimum wage rate varies from District to District. The Committee are of the view that widespread variation in minimum wages leads to rapid migration, which hampers better implementation of SGRY. They, therefore, recommend that the Ministry of Rural Development should impress upon all the States/Union territories to have to the extent possible a uniform wage rate in all the Districts of a particular State and also there should not be much difference in the minimum wages in different States so that the SGRY Scheme can be implemented effectively. Further, the Committee desire that relevant information from the remaining States and Union territories should be obtained expeditiously and they be apprised accordingly.

Quality and supply of foodgrains under SGRY

3.66 The Committee during their Study tour to Chennai-Madurai, Coimbatore and Kodaikanal had found that foodgrains from Punjab were supplied in Tamil Nadu under SGRY even though foodgrains from Andhra Pradesh, a State close to Tamil Nadu were available. Also, the quality of rice as obtained from sample packets was not of eatable quality.

3.67 The Department has furnished the following information on the aforesaid observation of the Committee:

“The FCI has been given the mandate to procure foodgrains from the States having surplus foodgrains and to distribute it throughout the country as per demand under the different Centrally Sponsored Schemes. It is for the FCI to supply the foodgrains under the SGRY from their existing stocks available in other States. This Ministry have issued instructions and discussed this issue with the FCI from time to time to provide ‘Fair Average Quality (FAQ)’ foodgrains to Implementing Agencies under the SGRY. The concerned officers of District Panchayats/DRDAs are required to conduct inspection of the stocks before taking delivery of the same to ensure that foodgrains below the FAQ are not lifted. The SGRY

Guidelines also provide for the normal practice of Joint Sampling, as is done for the Public Distribution System (PDS) to ensure lifting of good quality foodgrains.”

3.68 In response to a query regarding system for receiving back the payment made for foodgrains of bad quality, the Committee are informed that at present, there is no provision in the Guidelines for receiving back the payment made to FCI for foodgrains of bad quality. The instructions provide that district authorities should not accept stocks below fair average quality.

3.69 Regarding the action taken by the Department for fixation of responsibility on officials for supplying foodgrains of bad quality under SGRY, it has been stated that the implementation of the SGRY is the responsibility of the State Government/Union territory Administration. However, no such report has been received in the Ministry so far regarding Departmental Action initiated/being initiated against the official concerned for distributing bad quality of foodgrains under the Scheme.

3.70 The Committee find that Food Corporation of India (FCI) has been given mandate to procure foodgrains from the States having surplus foodgrains for distributing throughout the country as per the demand. The Committee desire that FCI should be impressed upon to provide as far as possible the surplus foodgrains procured from the adjoining States or the same State so as to reduce the transportation cost as well as the time taken for delivering the foodgrains to the barest minimum.

3.71 The Committee also find that there is no provision in the guidelines for receiving back the payment made to FCI for foodgrains of bad quality. The Committee desire the Ministry to look into these aspects and make the necessary provisions in the guidelines to ensure that in case of supply of foodgrains of bad quality, payment made to FCI is received back. The Committee also desire that the Department of Rural Development should take necessary steps, so that for supply of bad quality foodgrains under SGRY, the responsibility should be fixed on the officials involved and action initiated accordingly.

New Food for Work Programme in 150 most backward districts

3.72 Hon'ble Finance Minister in his Budget Speech has proposed to launch a new Food for Work Programme in 150 districts classified

as most backward and identified as areas in immediate need of such a programme. Allocations under different schemes will be pooled together to support the Food for Work Programme. There are substantial funds totalling over Rs. 6,000 crore under SGRY, SGSY, SJSRY, REGF & PMRY. Depending on the demand for such work, more funds will be allocated in the current year.

3.73 Regarding the details of the aforesaid new Programme, the Committee have been informed during oral evidence, that a National Employment Guarantee Act to provide a legal guarantee for at least 100 days of employment in every year per family to every rural/urban poor household is to be enacted. A suitable legislation in this regard will be enacted by the Ministry of Labour and Employment. The enactment will take care of the details. In the meantime, it is being considered to launch "Food for Work Programme" in 150 most backward districts of the country, which will be in addition to the existing resources to these districts under the SGRY.

3.74 The Committee find that the Finance Minister has indicated in the budget speech that the work has begun on the National Employment Guarantee Act which aims to guarantee 100 days of employment in a year to one able bodied person in every poor household. The Committee hope that the said legislation would be finalised expeditiously in consultation with the Ministries of Rural Development, and Labour and Employment. They also hope that provisions of the said legislation, when enacted would also be applicable to the SGRY and other related Schemes of the Department.

Evaluation Study of SGRY

3.75 The Department has informed that Evaluation Study of SGRY has been awarded to reputed institutions/organisations in September 2003 and the draft Report has been received in the Ministry and is under examination. The Department has also furnished the list of 44 reputed institutions/organisations involved in the evaluation of SGRY out of which 21 institutions are based either in Delhi or New Delhi.

3.76 The Committee note that the Evaluation Study of SGRY has been commissioned in September 2003 in which 44 reputed institutions have been involved of which 21 are based in Delhi or New Delhi. They also note that neither National Institute of Rural Development (NIRD) nor any of the State Institute of Rural Development (SIRD) are involved in the said study. The Committee desire that as far as possible, the Ministry of Rural Development

should try to involve one reputed institution of each State in the Evaluation Study of the Schemes. The possibility of involving NIRD and some of the SIRDs should be explored in this regard.

Special Component of SGRY

3.77 As per the Preliminary Material replies allocation of foodgrains to the States, under Special Component of SGRY, is made on the basis of requirement to deal with calamities such as drought, earthquake, cyclone, flood etc. As per the Performance Budget 2004-05, the foodgrains can be utilised in any Scheme of Central or State Government in the District affected by a natural calamity and duly notified as such. The subject of notification of calamity is dealt with by the Ministry of Agriculture and the Ministry of Home Affairs.

3.78 For drought, the nodal Ministry is Ministry of Agriculture. For other calamities like flood, earthquake etc., the Ministry of Home Affairs is the nodal Ministry. When a calamity takes place in any State, the State Government, after making an assessment, notifies the affected areas. After notification, depending on the nature of the calamity, the magnitude of the problem is assessed by one of these Ministries. It is only when a High Level Committee (HLC) set up for the purpose, decides *inter-alia*, how much of foodgrains under the Special Component shall be released to which of the affected districts of the State, that the Ministry of Rural Development comes into the picture for release of foodgrains accordingly.

3.79 As per the information furnished, during 2002-2003 and 2003-2004, 367 and 276 districts out of 595 districts of the country were covered under the Special Component of SGRY. The unlifted quantities of foodgrains as on 31 March, 2003 and 31 March, 2004 was 5.90 lakh and 16.18 lakh metric tonnes respectively.

3.80 The Committee note with concern that the possibility of considerable delay in meeting the formalities for release of foodgrains under Special Component of SGRY to deal with calamities such as drought, earthquake, cyclone, flood etc. cannot be ruled out due to the existing long procedural formalities. The Committee presume that this has resulted in accumulation of unlifted (authorised quantity of) foodgrains with the State Governments which has been reported to be as high as 16.18 lakh metric tonnes as on 31 March 2004. They, therefore, desire that the Ministry of Rural Development should in consultation with the Ministry of Agriculture and Ministry of Home Affairs, who are the nodal Ministries for drought and other calamities

like flood, earthquake etc. respectively, initiate suitable measures, so that considerable time is not wasted between the occurrence of a calamity and release of foodgrains under Special Component of SGRY.

(iii) Rural Housing (RH) Schemes

3.81 The following four schemes are being implemented by the Department under Rural Housing:

(a) **Indira Awaas Yojana (IAY)** is being implemented since 1985-86 to provide assistance to Below Poverty Line (BPL) households belonging to the Scheduled Castes/Scheduled Tribes, freed bonded labourers and also to non-Scheduled Castes/Scheduled Tribes, households of rural BPL, families of ex-servicemen of the armed forces and para military forces killed in action. The ceiling on construction assistance under IAY is Rs.25,000 per unit for plain areas and Rs.27,500 for hilly/difficult areas and conversion of *kutcha* house into *pucca* house (upgradation) is Rs.12,500 w.e.f. 1.4.2004. The funds under the Scheme are shared between the Centre and the States in the ratio of 75:25. The Union territories are provided 100 per cent Central assistance.

(b) **Credit-cum-Subsidy Scheme for Rural Housing:** The Scheme was launched w.e.f. 01 April 1999. The Scheme targets rural families having annual income upto Rs. 32,000 while the subsidy is restricted to Rs.10,000 per household. The upper limit of construction, i.e. loan admissible under the scheme is Rs. 40,000 per household. The subsidy component is shared between the Centre and the States in the ratio of 75:25. The Union territories are provided 100 per cent assistance. The scheme has been merged with Indira Awaas Yojana w.e.f. 1.4.2004.

(c) **Innovative Stream for Rural Housing and Habitat Development:** The Scheme is being implemented on project basis since 1999-2000. Recognised educational/technical institutions, corporate bodies, autonomous societies, State Governments, development institutions and credible NGOs in the field of Rural Housing can apply for assistance under the Scheme. The maximum permissible assistance for Government agencies is Rs. 50 lakh.

(d) **Rural Building Centres (RBCs):** The Scheme of Rural Building Centres was launched w.e.f. 1.4.1999. The objective is to achieve technology transfer, information dissemination, skill upgradation through training of rural masons, plumbers etc., production of cost effective and environment friendly material. For setting up a RBC, a

total Central grant of Rs.15 lakh is provided in three instalments. The Scheme is being implemented and monitored by the Ministry of Rural Development with the assistance of Housing and Urban Development Corporation Limited (HUDCO).

Overall Analysis

3.82 The overall Budget allocation for the Rural Housing (RH) during 2004-2005 is Rs. 2500 crore, out of which Rs. 2242 crore and Rs. 5 crore are kept under the Major Heads 2216 and 4216 respectively and the balance (Rs. 253 crore) is kept under the Major Head 2552 where the lump sum provision is kept for North-Eastern States.

3.83 As per the campaign of Housing for all, between 1999-2000 and 2002-2003, an additional 13 lakh houses annually were targeted to be constructed in rural areas. This has not been achieved.

3.84 When the Committee wanted to know the information/figures for houseless persons in the rural areas as on 1.4.2002, and separately for BPL and APL persons, they were informed that the Ministry of Rural Development does not maintain the figures for houseless persons either for BPL or APL. However, for planning purpose regarding construction of rural houses for the poor, housing shortage estimated as per Census is taken into account. As per 2001 Census estimates, the housing shortage in the rural areas is estimated at 14.9 million. In addition, about 10 lakh houses are added to the existing housing shortage every year.

3.85 As per the Performance Budget 2004-2005, more than 1.106 crore houses have been built under IAY between 1985-86 and 2003-2004 period. When the Committee enquired about the existence of 1.106 crore houses, reported to have been built under IAY, the reply was, so far no attempt has been made to verify all the houses built under IAY since inception. However, periodical verification by way of conducting concurrent evaluations, impact studies, studies conducted by District Level Monitors (DLMs) and periodical visits by Area Officers and National Level Monitors (NLMs) is being done.

3.86 Several parts of the country are prone to various natural calamities such as flood, cyclone, earthquake, etc. When the Committee asked about how many houses constructed under Rural Housing have been damaged (partially and totally) because of the natural calamities, since 1985-86, they were replied that the Ministry of Rural Development does not monitor the status of damaged houses (partially or totally) due to natural calamities.

3.87 Asked further as to how the Department ensures construction of durable houses in the natural calamity prone areas, they were informed that the Indira Awaas Yojana (IAY) houses are constructed

by the beneficiaries themselves by using locally available materials. They are expected to use available low cost and disaster resistant and environment friendly technologies. To promote such technologies Rural Building Centres have been set up.

3.88 The physical target and achievement under IAY since 1999-2000 is as below:

Year	Target	Achievement
1999-2000	1271619	925679
2000-2001	1244320	1170926
2001-2002	1293753	1171081
2002-2003	1314431	1548641
2003-2004	1484554	1269267 + 543175 under construction
2004-2005	1562365	10620 + 71488 under construction

3.89 The Committee have been informed that under Indira Awaas Yojana (IAY), 728 lakh additional houses are being constructed over and above the targets of 1999-2000. The Committee, however, find that the target for 1999-2000 was 1271619 and the Department has constructed only 543175 additional number of houses during the year 2003-2004, over and above the targets under the Scheme.

3.90 The following information has been furnished on the Performance of IAY in the 9th Plan *vis-a-vis* 10th Plan :

(Rs. in crore)											
Plan	Plan Proposal By Deptt.	Approved Plan outlay	OB at beginning of the Plan	Central Share allocation	Central Share release	State Share allocation	State Share release	Total allocation (C+S)	Total Release (C+S)	Total available funds	Total Expenditure
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
9th Plan (1997 to 2002)	28042.00	8035.75	372.23	7468.69	7425.12	2265.99	2256.46	9734.68	9681.58	10053.81	9638.36
10th Plan (2002 to 2007)	13040.00	8603.00	821.42	5987.57	4740.23	1991.86	1578.40	7979.43	6318.63	7140.06	5492.88

3.91 The Committee note that the Government has been setting targets for providing houses to the needy in the rural areas time and again without achieving them. For example in the 'Campaign for Housing for All', it was decided to construct additional 2 million houses, out of which 13 lakh houses were required to be constructed in the rural areas through various Schemes, such as IAY, Credit-cum-Subsidy Scheme, Housing and Urban Development Corporation Limited (HUDCO) Scheme, State Governments' Schemes and National Housing Bank/Commercial Banks etc. The Committee, however, note that though 7 to 8 lakh additional houses were admitted to have been constructed over and above the targets of 1999-2000, the actual figure is only about 5.43 lakhs. The Department proposed to construct additional houses for the poor under the Credit-cum-Subsidy Scheme also which remained a non-starter which according to Department was due to the reasons that neither any BPL family came forward nor the Banks were committal. The Committee are dismayed to conclude that the targets of number of houses set under IAY during the years 1999-2000 to 2003-2004 except during the year 2002-2003, were not achieved.

3.92 The Committee further note that as per the estimates of Census 2001, there is a shortage of about 149 lakh houses in the country. At the present level of resources available, only about 15 lakh houses can be constructed every year, whereas about 10 lakh additional houses are added annually to existing shelterlessness which aspect also needs to be looked into. Keeping in view the pace at which the houses are constructed, the Committee are apprehensive about how the Government will achieve the aim to end shelterlessness in rural India. The Committee regret that while there is acute shortage of houses, the funds correspondingly have not been increased to meet the huge gap between demand and supply. They, therefore, recommend that the Ministry should take appropriate steps to achieve the targets set and also request the Planning Commission to re-allocate additional funds to meet the acute shortage of rural housing.

3.93 The Committee note that so far no attempt has been made to verify all the 1.16 crore houses reportedly built under IAY since inception. They also note that periodical verification is being done

by the Ministry by way of taking Concurrent Evaluation and periodical visits by Area Officers. In this scenario, the Committee fail to understand as to what can be the use of taking Concurrent Evaluation if the Department has not monitored the status of the existence of houses. They, therefore, recommend that the Ministry of Rural Development should initiate a study to verify all the houses constructed under IAY without further wastage of time.

3.94 The Committee note that several parts of the country are prone to various natural calamities such as flood, cyclone, earthquake etc. They further note that the houses constructed under IAY are being constructed by the beneficiaries themselves who are expected to use available local materials and low cost disaster resistant and environment friendly technologies. However, no separate provision for retrofitting the existing houses against natural calamities has been provided under the guidelines. Therefore, the Committee desire that in order to achieve construction of durable houses, some provision in the guidelines are made for retrofitting of IAY houses in the natural calamity prone areas.

Role of HUDCO in Rural Housing

3.95 HUDCO is an autonomous organization under the aegis of Ministry of Urban Development/Urban Employment and Poverty Alleviation and engaged in the activities of providing loans for construction of houses in urban and rural areas. The Ministry of Rural Development only provides equity support to the HUDCO to garner and generate additional resources for construction of houses in rural areas. Since, HUDCO, which is an organization under the Ministry of Urban Development, and provides financial assistance for construction of houses in rural areas in the form of loan only, details about the financial achievements year-wise and state-wise are not available with the Ministry of Rural Development and thus Department of Rural Development does not monitor the performance of HUDCO in construction of houses in rural areas.

3.96 Equity support is provided to the HUDCO to garner and mobilize additional resources (*approx. eight times, the size of equity contribution*) from the market. The funds so leveraged are to be utilized exclusively for financing the construction of additional Rural Housing units over and above the HUDCO normally financed through their existing resources.

3.97 Details of equity support provided to the HUDCO since 1998-1999 and return thereon is given as under:

(Rupees in crore)		
Year	Equity Support	Return/ Dividends
1998-1999	50	—
1999-2000	150	4.23
2000-2001	100	5.40
2001-2002	50	5.75
2002-2003	50	11.72
2003-2004	10	Not yet received

3.98 The Committee have been informed that Equity to HUDCO was reduced from Rs. 50 crore in 2002-2003 to Rs. 10 crore in 2003-2004 BE and from Rs. 10 crore in 2003-2004 to Rs. 5 crore in 2004-2005 BE. The Committee were further informed that it is not known how many rural families have actually benefited through HUDCO under rural housing. The real needy rural families may not have access to HUDCO funds, as it is 100 per cent loan. Also because of higher prudential norms etc. HUDCO is finding it difficult to leverage funds for rural housing. So it was thought to provide more funds for construction of IAY houses for BPL families, by reducing capital outlay (*equity support to HUDCO*). First it was reduced from Rs. 50 crore during 2002-2003 to Rs. 10 crore during 2003-2004 and further reduced to Rs. 5 crore as per the budget estimates for the year 2004-2005. The equity support to the HUDCO will continue, but the amount will be decided on year-to-year basis.

3.99 As per the information furnished to the Committee, the HUDCO has released the following funds and have helped in constructing the following units since 1998-1999:

Year	Total release (Rs. in crore)	Total unit sanctioned
1	2	3
1998-99	323.89	634638
1999-2000	374.15	654050

1	2	3
2000-2001	599.39	732131
2001-2002	209.80	333113
2002-2003	323.48	413078
2003-2004	327.71	542438
Total	2158.42	3309448

3.100 The Committee note that equity support is provided to HUDCO by Department of Rural Development who garner and provide additional resources *i.e.* approximately 8 times the size of equity contribution from the market. The Committee are disturbed to note that as HUDCO is under the aegis of the Ministry of Urban Development and Urban Employment and Poverty Alleviation, the Ministry of Rural Development does not monitor the performance of HUDCO in rural housing. The Department of Rural Development does not maintain and thus could not provide information relating to the actual houses constructed out of the dwelling units sanctioned under the Two Million Housing Programme of the Department of Rural Development. The Committee, therefore, recommend that the Ministry should obtain the performance of HUDCO on an yearly basis so that they could have a clear cut picture of the role of HUDCO in the field of Rural Housing. In case the performance of HUDCO is found unsatisfactory, the Ministry should take suitable corrective and ameliorative measures so that rural families do not suffer.

3.101 As per the Preliminary Material replies, Monthly Progress Reports (MPRs) from some of the States and Union territories are still pending for 2003-2004. When the Committee wanted to know the defaulting Districts/States for submitting MPRs for 2003-2004, they were informed that District-wise Monthly Progress Reports (MPRs) are consolidated by the State Government concerned and sent to this Ministry. The following States/UTs have not submitted their MPRs for the year 2003-2004. The month/year when last MPR was received from these States has been indicated against each:

(i) Jharkhand	February 2004
(ii) Manipur	January 2004
(iii) Nagaland	October 2003
(iv) Dadra & Nagar Haveli	November 2002

3.102 While noting that the States of Jharkhand, Manipur and Nagaland have not submitted their Monthly Progress Reports regularly for the year 2003-2004, the Committee find that the Union territory of Dadra & Nagar Haveli has not submitted the same since November 2002. As a long time has elapsed since the Monthly Progress Reports were obtained from the above mentioned States and Union territory, the Committee would like the Department to state the reasons as to why the Reports were not obtained from these States and the Union territories, despite having Area Officers Scheme in operation.

Availability and disbursement of credit for rural housing

3.103 It has been stated in the Budget Speech delivered by the Finance Minister that a major impediment to credit for rural housing is absence of proper title to the land. The Government of West Bengal has made a law to simplify the creation of security, which deserve to be emulated by other States.

3.104 When the Committee wanted to have the details of the West Bengal law, they have been replied that the Ministry of Rural Development deals with the Scheme of the Indira Awaas Yojana (IAY), which is the flagship Scheme of Rural Housing (RH), under which assistance is provided to the BPL shelterless families for construction of their dwelling unit. Usually, the IAY houses are constructed by the beneficiaries on their own land. If land is not available with the selected beneficiary, the same is to be provided by the State Government concerned. The West Bengal Law has not been studied by this Ministry at this point of time. Therefore, it is not possible to provide details in this regard. However, the State Government has been asked to provide a copy of the West Bengal Law.

3.105 The Finance Minister in his Budget speech has stated that a major impediment to credit for rural housing is absence of proper title for the land. He also stated that West Bengal has made a law to simplify the creation of security, which deserve to be emulated by other States. The Ministry have informed that West Bengal State Government has been asked to provide a copy of West Bengal law. The Committee hope that the Government after studying the said law extensively and expeditiously, would issue the guidelines to other State Governments to enact similar laws so that the benefit of different rural development schemes could be extended to rural poor.

Rural Building Centres (RBCs)

3.106 Rural Building Centres (RBCs) are established under the supervision and technical guidance of HUDCO and funds are released in three instalments after verification by HUDCO and receipt of Utilization Certificate and Audit Reports etc. As per the Preliminary Material replies, the Centre has released more than Rs. 1.8 crore for RBCs. 85 RBCs have so far been approved against which only 35 RBCs have become functional.

3.107 Rural Building Centres (RBCs) are expected to be completed within a period of two years. However, no such deadline has been fixed for construction and functioning of all the RBCs approved so far. However, efforts are being made to get these RBCs completed and to make them functional at the earliest.

3.108 When the Committee wanted to know what steps would be taken by Department of Rural Development during 2004-2005 to construct and functionalise all 85 RBCs approved so far, HUDCO is being asked to get the pending works of approved Rural Building Centres (RBCs) completed at the earliest.

3.109 As per information furnished to the Committee, out of 85 RBCs approved so far in various States and Union territories, only 25 RBCs have received a second instalment of funds out of which only 6 RBCs have received the funds for three instalments.

3.110 The Committee are disturbed to find that out of 85 Rural Building Centres(RBCs) approved, only 35 have become functional so far. On the one hand, the Department has stated that RBCs are expected to be completed within a period of two years by utilising the funds released in three instalments, on the other hand, it has been stated that no such deadline has been fixed for construction and functioning of all RBCs approved so far. The Committee also note that out of all the 85 approved RBCs, which were to get assistance through HUDCO, only 25 were released the second instalment, whereas the third instalment had been released only to 6 of them. The Committee, therefore, doubt as to how all the RBCs will become functional without receiving the second and the third instalments. Being critical of the poor functioning of RBCs, the Committee hope that the Department will impress upon HUDCO to get the pending work of approval of RBCs completed expeditiously, so that all the approved RBCs become functional at the earliest.

(iv) Pradhan Mantri Gram Sadak Yojana (PMGSY)

3.111 PMGSY was launched on 25 December 2000. The objective of the Yojana is to provide road connectivity, through good all-weather roads, to all unconnected rural habitations with a population of more than 500 persons by the year 2007 (terminal year of Tenth Plan Period). Upgradation (to prescribed standards) of existing roads is permitted to be taken up under the Programme so as to achieve connectivity through good all-weather roads. This is a cent per cent Centrally Sponsored Scheme.

Implementing Authority

3.112 Each State Government/Union territory administration identify one or two suitable agencies (having a presence in all Districts and with competence in executing time-bound road construction works) designated as Executing Agencies (such as the Public Works Department/ Rural Engineering Service/Rural Works Department/Zilla Parishad/ Panchayati Raj Engineering Department).

3.113 The Outlay/Budget Estimate (*i.e.* Central Share) for PMGSY 2004-2005 is Rs.2148 crore. In addition, Rs.320 crore is being obtained as borrowing from Asian Development Bank and International Bank for Reconstruction and Development *i.e.* World Bank.

The year-wise allocation and expenditure under PMGSY are as follows:

Year/Phase	Allocation (Rs. in crore)	Expenditure (Amount released to States) (Rs. in crore)	No. of roads cleared	No. of roads completed (upto March, 2004)
2001-02 (Phase-II)	2500	2489.73	—	—
2002-03 (Phase-II)	2500	2469	11103*	7268*
2003-04 (Phase-III)	2325	2314.33	8419	992
2004-05 (Phase-IV)	2148 + 320 (EAP)***	48.47	1939**	—
Total	9793	7321.53	21461	8260

* Road works for 2001-02 and 2002-03 were cleared together in one phase (Phase-II).

** Proposals of six States have so far been cleared.

*** EAP—Externally Aided Projects funded by World Bank and ADB.

3.114 As per PMGSY Guidelines (Para 3.5) a habitation is a cluster of population, living in an area, the location of which does not change over time. The unit for PMGSY is habitation and not village. There were 6,34,321 villages as per the 2001 census. Generally a village consists of several habitations separated by short distances. The following is the number of habitations of various sizes as reported by the States:—

1000 and above	500—1000	250—500	Below 250	Total
231331	205276	187591	285044	909242

3.115 As per the Performance Budget 2004-05, after the PMGSY was launched, all the State Governments were asked to do a survey to establish a core network of rural roads which also provided data on the length of roads required.

3.116 The Core Network survey has been completed by all States except Manipur. It is under scrutiny/verification in respect of many of the States.

3.117 At the time of launch of PMGSY as a Centrally Sponsored Scheme, it was estimated that there would be about 50,600 unconnected habitations of 1000 or more. It was also estimated that the average cost per km. for providing fresh connectivity per km. would be Rs. 14.7 lakh per km. and that the average distance per habitation is 1.26 km. As such the total requirement of funds for providing connectivity to the 50,600 unconnected habitations of 1000+ was estimated at about Rs. 9372 crore. As per the Core Network estimates, the number of such habitations is about 54,800, the cost of fresh connectivity is nearer Rs. 19 lakh/km. and the average distance per habitation is about 2.1 km. As such funds required for connecting the unconnected habitations of 1000+ is about Rs. 21,865 crore. The funds provided during the period 2000-03 has been Rs. 7500 crore only.

3.118 At the time of launching of PMGSY on 24 December 2000, it was envisaged that all habitations with a population of 1000 or more will be connected by 2003. When the Committee wanted to know as to whether each of these villages have been connected by end 2003 as envisaged, they were replied that States which do not have any remaining unconnected habitations of 1000+ now are Andhra Pradesh, Goa, Gujarat, Haryana, Kerala, Karnataka, Maharashtra, Nagaland and Tamil Nadu.

3.119 As per the Preliminary Material replies the allocation under PMGSY, is dependant upon cess on High Speed Diesel (HSD) which was Rupee 1 per ltr. earlier but has been hiked by Rupee 0.50 since 2003-2004. The 2003-2004 BE has been reduced to Rs. 2325 crore from Rs. 2500 crore and the 2004-2005 BE is further reduced to Rs. 2148 crore.

3.120 About the reasons for which the return from the cess on HSD was reduced despite increase in number of vehicles, which resulted in reduction of outlay for PMGSY since 2003-04, the Committee were informed that the cess amount is collected into the Central Road Fund and provided in the Budget by the Ministry of Finance. As such this Ministry is only aware of the budget provision actually made. When the Committee wanted to know that with the present amount of allocation for PMGSY how many years it will take to connect all rural habitations having a population of more than 250, it was replied that based on the latest data from the Core Network, the total road length required to be newly constructed under PMGSY is about 3.69 lakh km. The total requirement of funds for the purpose is about Rs. 76,000 crore. At an average annual allocation rate of Rs. 2200 crore per annum it will take over 30 years to complete the new connectivity.

3.121 As per the Preliminary Material replies the gap in availability of funds for PMGSY is being met partially from borrowing from ADB, IBRD, etc. (During 2004-2005 these institutions have given/expected to give Rs.320 crore). About the terms and conditions of the said borrowing and repayment, the Committee were informed that the borrowing from ADB and IBRD is a loan. However the borrowing from IDA is a credit carrying zero rate of interest. The terms and conditions of the ADB loan is that it is a loan of USD 400 million with a 5-year moratorium and a 10-year repayment thereafter. The rate of interest is calculated on the basis of LIBOR plus. It is understood that this currently works out to about 1.3 to 1.5 per cent per annum. The substantial part of the World Bank loan for USD 400 million is likely to be an IDA credit with zero rate of interest and a service charge of 0.75 per cent. Repayment is over 35 years including a grace period of 10 years. IBRD loan has a front-end fee of 1 per cent and interest of about 2 per cent per annum. The loan period is 15-20 years with a grace period of 3-5 years.

3.122 At the time of launching, it was advertised that road works under PMGSY will be constructed within 9 months. As per the Preliminary Material replies execution of road works take 9 to

12 months from actual award. However, the task of completion of roads under PMGSY is as below:—

Year	% completion by end March'04	% of roads not completed by end of March 2004	Number of road cleared	Number of roads completed within 9 to 12 month
2000-01	94.20%	5.8%	13290	NA
2001-02	72.25%	27.75%	11103	NA
2002-03	72.25%	27.75%	8419	NA
2003-04	16.02%	83.98%	1939	NA

3.123 Rural Roads is a State subject and contracts are awarded by the various State Governments. The total number of roads involved are 13,217 road works in 2000-01, 11,167 road works in 2001-03 and 8344 road works in 2003-04. The management of the contracts is the function of the State Governments. The Ministry of Rural Development and its agency NRRDA periodically review the performance of the State Governments in Regional Reviews.

3.124 It has also been replied that appreciable improvement in the quality of Road construction has been noticed over time with the cumulative percentage of unsatisfactory works going down from 40 per cent upto March 2002 to 14.55 per cent upto March 2004.

3.125 The Committee note that out of Rs. 9793 crore allocation, Rs.7321.53 crore have been released under the PMGSY to the States upto March 2004. Further out of 21461 number of roads cleared, only 8260 roads have reportedly been completed. The Committee feel that performance of a number of States is dismal so far as completion of road work is concerned. Keeping in view the variation in the estimates of construction cost in different States, the Committee feel that almost double the length of roads can be constructed with the available funds.

3.126 The Committee note with concern that Rs.76000 crore would be needed to cover road connectivity to all habitations of 500 plus population and with current allocation rate, it will take over 30 years to complete the new connectivity. They also note that allocation of PMGSY is dependent upon the cess amount collected through the Central Road Fund. They are astonished to find that even though the cess on High Speed Diesel has been increased from Rupee 1 to

Rs. 1.50, the Department is not getting the additional funds. Rather the allocation is being reduced in the last couple of years. As the road connectivity is a pre-requisite for rural development and thereby the reduction of rural poverty, the Department should have started the projects only after reassuring themselves about the availability of funds. They are equally surprised to find that between launching of the Scheme and results of core net work, the number of unconnected habitations, increased from 50,600 to 54,800, cost per kilometer increased from Rs. 4.7 lakh to Rs. 19 lakh and average distance per habitation enhanced from 1.26 km. to 2.1 km. The Committee therefore, are inclined to conclude that most of the calculations at the launch of the programme on 24.12.2000 were unrealistic. While recommending for the demand of more allocation under the Scheme, they desire that the Department of Rural Development should ensure that these parameters like the number of unconnected habitations, cost per kilometer, average distance between habitations, etc. do not enhance further.

3.127 The Committee note with concern that even though the Budget allocation for PMGSY remained same during 2000-2001 and 2001-2002, the number of roads cleared came down from 11103 to 1939 in 2004-2005. They are equally surprised to find that even though execution of road works should take 9 to 12 months from actual award, nearly 6 per cent of the road work started in 2000-2001 and 28 per cent of the road works started in 2001-2002, are yet to be completed. Being critical of the way the Government have spent the scarce resources provided under PMGSY, they recommend that Department of Rural Development in consultation with NRRDA should ensure that all the works taken up does not take more than 12 months from actual award as envisaged.

Implementation of PMGSY in Delhi

3.128 As per the Annual Report 2002-2003 of the Ministry a proposal for PMGSY road in Delhi was received in 2000-2001 and Rs. 5 crore was released to Delhi during 2001-2002.

3.129 When asked about the position of unconnected habitations in rural areas in Delhi, the Committee were informed that there are no unconnected habitations in rural areas of Delhi as per definition given in the PMGSY Guidelines since the habitations are within 500 meters of an all-weather roads.

3.130 Asked further as to whether the release of PMGSY funds to Delhi in 2001-2002 was as per the guidelines of the Scheme, the reply was the release of funds to Delhi in 2001-02 was in accordance with the PMGSY allocation. Delhi Government has not reported any expenditure out of the released amount so far.

3.131 Some of the major Central Sector Schemes like SGSY, IAY are not being implemented in NCT Delhi as there is no rural area.

3.132 As per the information furnished to the Committee, all the Centrally Sponsored Schemes of Department of Rural Development are not implemented in the Union territories of Delhi and Chandigarh.

3.133 The Committee find that as per the information provided by the Ministry the implementation of rural development programmes in Delhi was discontinued on the specific request of the Administration because the rural development schemes are not being implemented in Delhi. Further it has been stated that there are no unconnected habitations in Delhi. The Committee are surprised to find that during 2001-02 Rs. 5 crore was released to Delhi Government under PMGSY. The Committee would like to be apprised about the clear position of Centrally Sponsored Schemes of the Ministry of Rural Development in Delhi. They would also like to be apprised of the physical and financial achievement with regard to the money released to Delhi during 2001-2002.

Implementation of PMGSY in all Union territories

3.134 The position regarding financial and physical performance of PMGSY in all six Union territories is as follows:

UT	Total amount released (Rs. in crore)	Total expenditure reported (Rs. in crore)	Total number of road works cleared	Total number of road works completed
A&N Islands	10.59	0.26	18	0
D&N Haveli	5.00	0.0	37	0
Daman & Diu	5.00	0.35	—	—
Delhi	5.00	0.00	1	0
Lakshadweep	4.89	0.00	—	—
Pondicherry	5.00	8.73	86	66

3.135 The Committee are surprised to find that both the physical and financial performance of PMGSY in Union territories, except in case of Pondicherry, is either nil or close to nil. The Committee would like to know as to why less importance is given for the performance of the Scheme in the Union territories, despite having a multi-faceted monitoring. They hope that the reasons for poor performance of the Scheme in the Union territories will be looked into without delay so that these places do not remain unconnected in the years to come.

(v) DRDA Administration Scheme

3.136 As per the information furnished to the Committee, there were 576 DRDAs in 595 districts as on 31st March, 2004. Only 571 DRDAs are covered under the DRDA Administration Scheme. All the DRDAs have not been merged with the Zilla Parishads.

3.137 Under the existing guidelines of the “DRDA Administration” Scheme, the opening balance of the DRDAs should not exceed 15 per cent of the allocation of the year in which funds are released. In case the opening balance exceeds this limit, the Central share of the amount by which it exceeds this limit will be deducted at the time of release of second instalment. Accumulation of unspent balances is thus prevented by the above mentioned provisions in the guidelines. The State/Union territory-wise details of opening balance of DRDA Administration Scheme as on 1.4.2001, 1.4.2002 and 1.4.2003 was Rs. 47.76 crore, Rs. 57.24 crore and Rs. 71.63 crore respectively.

3.138 As per the Preliminary Material Replies there are four different types of districts (Category A to Category D) as per the number of blocks. The State Governments are advised to ensure staffing pattern of DRDAs and personnel policies laid down in the guidelines. Although the guidelines have prescribed a model staffing structure for DRDAs, the actual staffing is decided by the State Governments according to their local conditions. In view of this, there is no uniformity in the actual staff position in the DRDAs.

3.139 The following are the broad personnel policies for DRDAs laid down in the Guidelines:

- (a) The DRDAs should take employees on deputation for specific period and should not have any permanent staff.

- (b) The posts of Project Director, Project Officers, APOs and all the technical posts should be manned by officers of proven capability and motivation and should be selected in an objective manner by a Selection Committee. Emphasis should be on selecting officers of young age and in any case not older than 50 years.
- (c) Project Directors, APOs and other technical staff must have a minimum tenure of 2-3 years.
- (d) The Officials and staff of DRDAs should be trained regularly for proper orientation.

3.140 As per the Preliminary Material replies the governing body of DRDA also reviews and monitor the implementation of annual plans of DRDAs. The Annual Plans are prepared by the DRDAs to set their own priorities. These are for use at district level and are not required to be forwarded to the Ministry.

3.141 The Committee are surprised to find that all the districts of the country do not have a District Rural Development Agency (DRDA) as on 31.3.2004. They are equally surprised to find that all the 576 established DRDAs do not receive the funds under the DRDA administration Scheme. Even though guidelines have been prescribed for a model staffing structure and broad personnel policies for four different types of DRDAs, there is no uniformity in this regard. They feel that the Ministry of Rural Development has minimised its role only to release the funds under the scheme and be a silent spectator in this regard. Further the Government is not aware of the priorities set by DRDAs as if these are not required to be forwarded to the Ministry. They have their own doubts as to how the Government can ensure efficient implementation of Rural Development Programmes without obtaining the annual reports. They, therefore, recommend that model staffing structure, broad personnel policies and furnishing of annual Reports of all DRDAs be done without any further delay.

(vi) New Scheme 'Provision for Urban Amenities in Rural Areas (PURA)'

3.142 As per the information given in Preliminary Material and Performance Budget 2004-2005, a new Scheme 'Provision for Urban Amenities in Rural Areas' (PURA) has been started w.e.f. 2003-2004.

3.143 A new Centrally Sponsored Scheme namely, Provision of Urban Amenities in Rural Areas (PURA), was prepared by the Planning

Commission based on the thoughts placed before the Nation by the Hon'ble President of India for bridging the rural urban divide and achieving balanced socio-economic development. The Planning Commission prepared a Cabinet Note for the Scheme. As per the Cabinet Note the Scheme would be implemented in 3130 rural clusters across the country in the next five years. The scheme aims to provide physical and social infrastructure in the identified rural clusters to further their growth potential, which are:

1. Road transportation and power connectivity;
2. Electronic connectivity in the form of reliable Telecom, Internet and IT services;
3. Knowledge connectivity in the form of good educational and training institutions; and
4. Market connectivity that would enable farmers to get the best price for their produce.

3.144 In addition to the above, the Scheme would also include provisions of drinking water supply and upgradation of existing health facilities. A list of towns for PURA was also selected by the Planning Commission as per the criteria suggested in the Cabinet Note. The Cabinet considered the note in its meeting on 20.1.2004 approved in principle the 'Provision of Urban Services in Rural Areas' Scheme with the direction that the outlay for the scheme will be within the Gross Budgetary Support. The Cabinet also decided that the list of towns would have to be reworked in consultation with the State Governments and brought back to the Cabinet. The consultation with the State Governments is under progress.

Allocation and Expenditure of PURA Scheme

	(Rs. in crore)	
	Allocation	Expenditure
2002-2003 (BE)	0	—
2003-2004 (BE)	0	5.78 (upto March 2004)
2004-2005 (BE)	1	NA

3.145 Although no allocation for PURA Scheme was made in 2003-2004 BE, an amount of Rs.5.78 crore was spent by reappropriation of savings under different Schemes of the Ministry. Regarding diversion of funds, it was replied that the reappropriation of funds for PURA, out of savings under different Schemes of the Ministry was approved by the Ministry of Finance and the Parliament. When asked as to whether the allocation of Rs.1 crore in 2004-2005 BE for the Scheme would be sufficient to meet the targets, the Committee were informed that the allocation of Rs.1 crore is not sufficient to meet the targets under PURA. The Finance Minister in his Budget Speech has talked about providing additional funds to PURA.

3.146 As per the Preliminary Material Replies, Credit-cum-Subsidy Scheme (CCSS) launched since 1.4.1999 and Samagra Awaas Yojana (SAY) have been merged with IAY w.e.f. 1.4.2004 because these new Schemes did not pick up. About the reasons due to which CCSS and SAY could not pick up, it has been replied that the credit-cum-subsidy scheme was merged with the Indira Awaas Yojana (IAY) as the Scheme could not pick up during the five years of this operation due to involvement of credit from the financial institutions.

3.147 The Samagra Awaas Yojana (SAY) was a habitat development scheme. Per district availability of funds under the scheme was very small. The objective of the scheme was to create civic infrastructure through convergence of the other schemes at grass root level. But the desired convergence could not be done.

3.148 The Committee note that a new scheme 'Provision for Urban Amenities in Rural Areas' (PURA) with the objective of providing physical and social infrastructure in the identified 3,130 rural clusters was approved by Cabinet. The Committee have been apprised that during 2003-2004, an amount of Rs. 5.78 crore was spent by reappropriation of different schemes of the Department of Rural Development. The Committee also note that Finance Minister in his Budget speech has indicated that additional funds would be provided for the Scheme. The Committee deplore the way the planning for new schemes is being made without ensuring for the outlay. Besides the Committee fail to understand how Rs. 5.78 crore could be utilised during 2003-2004, when the scheme is still in the process of finalisation. The Committee would like to be apprised of the detailed guidelines alongwith the details of the expenditure made during 2003-2004.

The Committee further note that Credit-cum-subsidy scheme launched since 1999 and Samagara Awaas Yojana have been merged with IAY w.e.f. 1.4.1999 as these schemes did not pick-up. The Committee are constrained to note the way the Department is hurriedly starting new schemes to achieve the objectives for which comprehensive schemes already exist. The schemes are being started without planning and then merged with other schemes when these schemes could not pick-up. The Committee would like that the approach of the Government should be to provide additional funds to the existing schemes and improve the delivery mechanism by proper monitoring so as to have tangible impact on the lives of rural poor.

(vii) Training Schemes

National Institute of Rural Development (NIRD)

3.149 In April 1962, the Central Institute of Study and Research in Community Development, Trainers Training Institute were merged to establish National Institute of Community Development (NICD). The NICD became an autonomous registered Society in November 1965. The name of NICD was changed to National Institute of Rural Development (NIRD) in September 1977 which has since set up a regional Centre at Guwahati in July 1983. The NIRD's policy is determined by a 47 member General Council.

3.150 The NIRD undertakes training programmes for creation and enhancement of capacity of the delivery mechanism for poverty alleviation and rural infrastructure programmes, undertakes research and studies on Panchayati Raj Institutions and Rural Development programmes for continuous policy and programmes upgradations and disseminates information through various publications.

3.151 The activities of NIRD relate to training, research, action research and consultancy in rural development. Action Plan has been drawn up on each of these activities and is being implemented.

3.152 NIRD has planned to conduct 166 Training Programmes in NIRD, Head Quarters and 34 Training Programmes at NERC, Guwahati for the year 2004-2005. NIRD has also drawn up a plan for Research Studies and 32 Research Studies are being conducted and they are still continuing. NIRD planned 4 Action Research Projects for the year 2004-2005 which are still continuing. Three consultancy studies were planned for the year 2004-2005 and they are progressing steadily.

3.153 The extent of assistance by Department of Rural Development to NIRD since 1999-2000 is as follows:

(Rs. in crore)

Year	Plan	Non-Plan
1999-2000	5.00	7.15
2000-2001	5.00	7.60
2001-2002	5.00	7.55
2002-2003	5.45	7.55
2003-2004	6.57	7.50

3.154 As per the detailed Demand for Grants 2003-2004 of the Ministry, the following funds were allocated for NIRD under Plan and Non-Plan:

NIRD	Plan	Rs.6.00 crore
	Non-Plan*	Rs.7.62 crore

*2515: Administrative expenditure and promotion of study of Rural Development and social change.

The actual expenditure by NIRD during 2003-2004 is given below:

Plan	Rs.6.13 crore
Non-Plan	Rs.9.12 crore

The difference between the Non-Plan grant released and the actual expenditure is being met out of internal accruals.

3.155 The information relating to the training imparted by NIRD since 1999-2000 is given below:—

(Rs. in lakh)

Year	Total allocation of training	Total release	Total expenditure	No. of Training Programmes proposed to be organised	No. of Training Programmes held	No. of persons trained
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1999-00	60.00	60.00	54.67	132	152	4268
2000-01	60.00	60.00	65.28	152	155	4329

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2001-02	60.00	60.00	70.92	159	162	4927
2002-03	50.00	50.00	87.37	157	177	5201
2003-04	50.00	50.00	66.12	176	188	5387

The information relating to the research done by NIRD since 1999-2000 is as follows:—

(Rs. in lakh)

Year	Total allocation for research	Total release	Total expenditure	No. of research studies proposed to be organised	No. of research studies completed	Brief findings
1999-00	53.00	53.00	49.48	25	25	The studies are of micro-level and specific in nature and findings vary from study to study.
2000-01	85.00	85.00	51.06	56	56	
2001-02	80.00	80.00	47.76	53	53	
2002-03	50.00	50.00	50.67	55	55	
2003-04	50.00	50.00	49.15	45	45	

3.156 The information relating to the action Research done by NIRD since 1999-2000 is given below:—

(Rs. in lakh)

Year	Total allocation for action research	Total release	Total expenditure	No. of action research studies proposed to be Undertaken	No. of action research studies Completed	Brief findings
1999-00	-	-	-	2	On-going	NA
2000-01	60.00	60.00	51.24	2	-do-	NA
2001-02	60.00	60.00	45.58	2	-do-	NA
2002-03	25.00	25.00	3.94	3	-do-	NA
2003-04	25.00	25.00	2.00	4	-do-	NA

3.157 The NIRD earn revenue by providing consultancy services. The information relating to the consultancy done by NIRD since 1999-2000 is as follows:—

(Rs. in lakh)				
Year	Receipts	Payments	No. of consultancy proposed to be undertaken	No. of consultancy assignments completed*
1999-00	139.12	93.13	20	13
2000-01	186.00	208.94	10	8
2001-02	136.80	115.97	8	6
2002-03	67.45	58.28	8	6
2003-04	127.63	79.51	8	5
2004-05 (upto 9.7.04)	33.44	31.10	3	On going

* The duration of the consultancy are not co-terminus with financial year concerned and are sometimes spread over more than a year.

3.158 When the Committee wanted to know the present status of the study of Rural Development and social change, it was replied that there is at present no separate scheme study captioned “Study of Rural Development and Social Change” underway. However, during the years 1991-96, a study named “Monitoring Rural Change” was conducted and a series of seven reports were prepared.

3.159 The funds allocated to NIRD are utilised for meeting administrative expenditure and for undertaking training programmes, research studies, etc. relating to rural development and Panchayati Raj.

3.160 The Committee find during 2003-2004, Rs. 6.13 crore Plan and Rs. 9.12 crore Non-Plan outlay was spent for the purpose of administrative expenditure and promotion of study of rural development and social change. The Committee are surprised to note that when asked for the status of said study they were informed that no such study is underway. The Committee fail to understand how the expenditure was made for the study which was never made.

By noting the data furnished by the Department the Committee find that major expenditure of NIRD is for imparting training whereas NIRD was established with objectives to undertake research and studies on Panchayati Raj Institutions and rural development programmes for continuous policy and programmes upgradation and dissemination information through publication. The Committee feel that the said objectives are not being fulfilled. While the Committee appreciate conducting training programmes they feel that more stress need to be given to research in policy and programmes so as to bring improvement in implementation of various programmes of rural development.

(viii) Strengthening and Establishment of State Institute of Rural Development (SIRDs) and Extension Training Centres (ETCs)

(A) State Institute of Rural Development (SIRD)

3.161 The Centrally Sponsored Scheme for Strengthening and Establishment of State Institute of Rural Development (SIRDs) and Extension Training Centres (ETCs) is being implemented since 6th Five Year Plan (1980-85).

3.162 As against 28 States in the country, the total number of State Institutes of Rural Development (SIRDs) established and functioning as on 1.4.2004 is 27. All SIRDs are operating from their own buildings or in rented buildings. Three more SIRDs are yet to be established in the States of Bihar, Chhattisgarh and Uttaranchal. Since 1994-1995, 100 per cent Central assistance is provided to SIRDs for non-recurring expenditure while the recurring expenditure is shared on 50:50 basis between the Centre and the States.

(B) Extension Training Centre (ETCs)

3.163 In order to impart training to village and block level functionaries, the Scheme of ETCs was taken up since 7th Plan period (1985-90). In 24 States, 88 different Extension Training Centres (ETCs) have been established and functioning as on 01.04.2004. The States which do not have ETCs are Goa, Sikkim, Tripura and Uttaranchal.

3.164 The following information was furnished regarding allocation, release and expenditure made by SIRDs and ETCs since 1997-98.

The expenditure made by SIRDs and ETCs since 1997-98 is given below:—

(Rs. in crore)

Year	Release	Expenditure
1997-98	7.51*	6.75
1998-99	6.66*	6.02
1999-2000	10.25	10.01
2000-01	13.39*	11.44
2001-02	11.75	10.83
2002-03	11.72	10.27
2003-04	25.60**	2.91@

@ Repots from some SIRDs/ETCs are awaited.

* Additional release was met by reappropriation from other schemes.

** Additional release was met by utilising savings from other Schemes.

(ix) Organisation of Training Courses, Seminars, Workshops etc. (OTC)

3.165 The funds under OTC scheme are used for funding proposals relating to capacity building, organisation of workshops and training courses on the various rural development schemes and career management of departmental staff. However, after making separate provisions for training of elected members and officials of Panchayati Raj Institutions from the year 2001-02 onwards, there has been a reduction in the number of proposals under the OTC scheme, resulting in savings under the scheme, which were utilised for SIRDs/ETCs. Keeping this in view, the allocation for OTC Scheme has been proposed at Rs. 0.50 crore during the year 2004-2005.

3.166 As per the written replies during 1997-98, 2002-03, 2003-04 savings made from OTC Scheme was reappropriated to the Scheme of SIRD. However, during 2000-2001, additional release was met by reappropriation/saving of funds from other Scheme. The reappropriation made during these years from OTC to other Schemes was within the powers delegated to the Ministry and the utilisation of funds of other schemes was done after permissible reappropriation.

3.167 The Committee note that three SIRDs are yet to be established in Bihar, Chhattisgarh and Uttaranchal. They are surprised to note that several States like Goa, Sikkim, Tripura and Uttaranchal do not have a single ETC. They hope that steps will be taken by Government to establish SIRDs and ETCs without further delay. They also observe that reappropriation from savings of other Schemes is being widely practised by the Department. As reappropriation is not a healthy practice, the Committee feel that it should be discouraged and desire that utilisation of savings from the same Scheme be made to meet higher demands of SIRDs, ETCs and OTCs to the extent possible.

(x) Assistance to Council for Advancement of People's Action and Rural Technology (CAPART)

3.168 The Council for Advancement of People's Action and Rural Technology (CAPART) came into existence in September, 1986 following the merger of two erstwhile Societies, namely, People's Action for Development India (PADI) and Council for Advancement of Rural Technology (CAPART). The principal aim of CAPART is to involve the people in the implementation of development programmes and promote need-based, innovative projects through non-governmental voluntary organizations and it works towards creating a peoples movement for development in the rural areas through higher social mobilization, lowering of social barriers and empowerment of the rural poor. The main objectives of CAPART include:

- Promotion of voluntary action through grassroots planning, organization of seminars and workshops;
- Providing a platform for sharing and dissemination of knowledge and experience;
- Providing funding support to innovative need based project;
- Encouraging voluntary organizations to collaborate amongst themselves by developing networks;
- Selection and encouragement of innovative technologies and their dissemination;
- Reduction of rural poverty;
- Generation of awareness for conservation of the environment and natural resources;
- Providing the minimum needs in respect of safe drinking water, sanitation etc.

3.169 From the financial year 2001-2002, the Ministry has made the budget provision for CAPART under a single Head, namely, 'Assistance to CAPART'. This assistance is principally utilized in implementing three Schemes, namely, Promotion of Voluntary Action in Rural Development (PC), Advancement of Rural Technology Scheme (ARTS) and Organization of Beneficiaries (OB). The administrative costs are also met from the Head "Assistance to CAPART".

3.170 The aims and objectives of the projects implemented under these programmes are as under:—

1. **Public Cooperation Scheme:** Projects of innovative and integrated nature only are considered under the scheme which result in harnessing the collective energies and creativity of the rural community and lead to capacity building and enhancement of life.
2. **Organisation of Beneficiaries:** Projects for creating awareness organising the beneficiaries into groups and strengthening their bargaining position etc., are considered under this scheme.
3. **Watershed Development Scheme:** CAPART Watershed Programme is operational in drought prone and water scarcity areas with the active involvement of grass root voluntary organizations and village level beneficiaries. The programme involves experienced voluntary organizations representing all the agro-ecological Zones in the Country. Capacity building stage in the programme is very useful for the voluntary organizations as well as for village level workers so that implementation work is done adhering to the watershed principles, such as top to bottom and ridge to valley approach. The unique model of Support Voluntary Organisations (SVOs) to train and technically assist various voluntary organizations approved for watershed and natural resource management has been developed for better implementation of the programme.
4. **Appropriate Rural Technology Scheme:** Under Rural Technology activity, the mandate of CAPART is to co-ordinate all efforts towards advancement of technology relevant to rural areas except for sectors being dealt with ICAR and its sister organizations. The broad objective of the Council under this is development and dissemination of rural technology. Projects aimed at conducting need based

study, survey and adaptive research and development, administration and dissemination of appropriate technologies amongst the poor are funded under this scheme. A programme of setting up of Technology Resource Centres (TRCs) was initiated by CAPART under this scheme. These are VOs equipped with lab facilities that received annual grants from CAPART for development of appropriate technology and dissemination of the same through network of small VOs within their areas of operation.

5. **Disability Scheme:** Projects relating to the Community based Rehabilitation of the disabled to facilitate and help them for integration with the community as dignified, self-reliant categories so that they can contribute to the development process of the Society.

3.171 No project under any of CAPART's schemes is sanctioned without pre-funding appraisal and the approval of the National Standing Committee/Regional Committees which comprises eminent persons in the field of rural development. The Voluntary Organisation (VO) has to submit progress report in the prescribed proforma within six months of the release of the 1st instalment. Before the second instalment is released, mid term evaluation is done. After completion of the project, the VO has to submit the final progress report and audited statement of accounts alongwith Utilization Certificate and therefore, the entire project is post evaluated.

3.172 The extent of assistance to CAPART by Ministry of Rural Development since 1999-2000 is as below:

1999-2000	Rs.13.00 crore
2000-2001	Rs.13.00 crore
2001-2002	Rs.30.00 crore
2002-2003	Rs.30.00 crore
2003-2004	Rs.71.46 crore

3.173 The Department has stated that CAPART's expenditure for the year 2003-2004 was Rs.67.91 crore against the total actual release of Rs.71.46 crore.

3.174 When the Committee wanted to know as to whether VO furnish Utilisation Certificate to CAPART and to Ministry of Rural

Development and to what extent Ministry of Rural Development has received UCs from VOs during 2003-2004, they were replied that Voluntary Organisations (VOs) furnish utilization certificates to CAPART for the amounts released to them and CAPART furnishes UC to the Ministry for the entire amount received from the Ministry. CAPART has received UCs for Rs.10.03 crore during 2003-2004. This is a continuous process involving UCs relating to releases made in earlier years.

3.175 When asked about the monitoring of activities of CAPART by the Ministry of Rural Development, the Committee were replied that the Ministry monitors the activities of CAPART through a series of meeting at the Secretary (RD) level, which includes monthly staff meeting of Secretary (RD). In addition, CAPART's activities are reviewed by the Chairman, Executive Committee who is also the Minister for Rural Development as well as through Executive Committee and General Body meetings.

3.176 As per the information, 65 different Voluntary Organizations operating in 16 different States have been blacklisted by CAPART since 1999-2000, which include 14 VOs from Uttar Pradesh, followed by Andhra Pradesh (13), Haryana (12), Madhya Pradesh (4).

3.177 The Committee have been informed that the functioning of CAPART has been decentralized by setting up Regional Committees (RCs) and these RCs have been empowered to sanction projects upto Rs.20 lakh each w.e.f. 04 September 2000. In addition to the RCs at Ahmedabad, Bhubaneswar, Chandigarh, Dharwad, Guwahati, Hyderabad, Jaipur, Lucknow and Patna, National Standing Committees have been constituted to sanction projects upto Rupee 1 crore by the Headquarters (at New Delhi).

3.178 The Committee note with concern that although more than Rs.71 crore has been released to CAPART which has further been released to the Voluntary Organisations, the CAPART has received Utilisation Certificate of Rs.10 crore only. The Committee are not satisfied with the monitoring of activities of CAPART. As more and more Voluntary Organisations are being blacklisted by CAPART, the Committee desire that proper scrutiny of Voluntary Organisations be made before releasing the funds. They recommend that the monitoring of the funds so released be done on a monthly basis so that chance of having blacklisted VOs are minimised. They also desire that the existing monitoring of different activities of CAPART

and its regional committees be further strengthened so that the funds released are meaningfully utilised.

3.179 The Committee are not happy with the establishment of Regional Committees of CAPART in the places where the Schemes of Department of Rural Development were not being implemented viz. Chandigarh and Delhi. They also note that Regional Committees have been set up and are functioning in 9 different places. The Committee, would like to know the jurisdiction of States and Union territories under each of these Regional Committees. They feel that the said jurisdiction should not be administered from a distant area. For example, to oversee the performance of NGOs of Jammu and Kashmir at Chandigarh, is neither justifiable nor practical. They, therefore, recommend that CAPART should consider establishment of Committees at the State level.

3.180 The Committee also note that existing Guidelines of submission and approval of project does not categorically mention a fixed percentage for smaller NGOs. They presume bigger and established NGOs are getting more benefits at the cost of smaller NGOs. They, therefore, recommend that it should be ensured that smaller NGOs at least get 50 per cent of assistance in each Scheme being financed by the CAPART. Necessary changes in the guidelines of CAPART be made in this regard and Committee be apprised accordingly.

(xi) Information, Education and Communication (IEC)

3.181 To create awareness about Rural Development Programmes being implemented by the Ministry of Rural Development amongst target groups in rural areas, Information, Education and Communication (IEC) activities through major available modes are undertaken by the Ministry. In Electronic Media, audio/video spots as well as half an hour and fifteen minutes programmes in Hindi and regional languages are produced and broadcast/ telecast over Doordarshan/All India Radio (AIR). In Print Media press advertisements on all India basis in Hindi, English and Regional languages are issued periodically. Booklets, leaflets on the programmes in various languages are also printed for wide distribution amongst the people in rural areas. Guidelines, Manuals, evaluation studies relating to different programmes are also printed as per need. A fortnightly newsletter in Hindi and a monthly newsletter in English and 11 regional languages titled 'Grameen Bharat' is being circulated to all Panchayats in the country free of cost highlighting the

schemes of the Ministry, success stories, rural technologies as well as development schemes of other departments.

3.182 The total expenditure and media-wise expenditure for Print media, Electronic media and for Outdoor Publicity since 2001-2002 is as under:

	(Rs. in Lakh)		
	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04
Print media	1042.65	396.35	350.00
Electronic Media (Radio & TV)	4260.30	991.98	1880.36
Outdoor Publicity	—	—	75.71
Others	158.77	289.67	298.93
Total	5461.71	1678.00	2605.00

3.183 The Committee note with concern that the expenditure on IEC activities has been reduced by more than half in two years starting from 2001-2002. They observe that the rural poor is not yet aware of different activities of the Ministry being implemented for their development. They, therefore, desire that both allocation and utilisation of funds for the IEC activities be substantially stepped up so that different Schemes of the Ministry are given wide publicity. The rural poor need to be enlightened about the activities being taken up under IEC. Awareness campaign should be stepped up to involve the rural poor. The Committee should be kept informed about the steps taken in this regard.

(xii) Monitoring of the Schemes of Ministry of Rural Development

3.184 The Area Officers Scheme monitors the Schemes with reference to quality, adherence to guidelines in the implementation of Schemes, flow of funds, proper utilization of funds and achievements of physical and financial targets etc. The important observations of Area Officers are shared with the State Government concerned, advising them to take appropriate measures, wherever shortcomings are noticed and complaints received by the Ministry are also looked into by the Area Officers during their visits to the State/District/Block etc.

3.185 As per the recommendations made by the Area Officers in 2002-2003 and 2003-2004, it could be implemented by the Union Government, State Government and Union territory Administrations. The observations and major issues brought out by the Area Officers are forwarded to the respective State Governments and Union territory Administration for corrective actions. The State Government is also requested to send action taken report to the Ministry.

3.186 The State Governments generally respond to the observations/recommendations made by the Area Officers and take corrective measures if certain deficiencies are noticed. Proper monitoring of projects is the need of the hour to speed up growth and development of rural India.

3.187 The Ministry of Rural Development places special emphasis on monitoring and evaluation of its programmes being implemented in rural areas all over the country. The Ministry has put in place a comprehensive system of monitoring the implementation of the programmes, including utilization of funds, through the following mechanisms:

- (i) Reviews by Union Minister by visiting the States;
- (ii) Area Officers Scheme;
- (iii) Performance Review Committee (inter-ministerial Committee of the Deptt.);
- (iv) Periodical Progress Reports (Monthly and quarterly);
- (v) District Level Monitoring;
- (vi) Concurrent Evaluation and Village Based Impact Assessment Studies;
- (vii) National Level Monitors;
- (viii) Vigilance and Monitoring Committee;
- (ix) The Gram Sabha are also authorized to conduct Social Audit for ensuring transparency and effective implementation of rural development programmes.

3.188 The Area Officers have visited 16 and 11 States during 2002-2003 and 2003-2004 respectively:

Year	Number of States
2002-2003	16
2003-2004	11

3.189 Under the system, the DLM Agencies are required to submit monthly and quarterly reports on the implementation of various programmes of the Ministry. Besides, collecting the information on flow of funds from the Project Implementation Agencies and implementation aspects, the DLM Agencies also physically verify the assets created under all the programmes of the Ministry. Beneficiaries are also verified. The Ministry has been getting the monthly and quarterly reports from the District Level Monitors regularly till March, 2004.

3.190 The Committee note with concern that Area Officers Scheme in its 10 years of existence has not been very useful in obtaining utilisation of funds Certificates from the States/Union territories. As the coverage of 16 and 11 States in 2002-2003 and 2003-2004 respectively by the Area Officers is too low, they desire that the Government should take adequate steps to ensure that all the States and Union territories are covered under the Scheme during each couple of years.

3.191 The Committee feel that there is a need to expand District Level Monitoring (DLM) to all the districts. They also feel that similar stress should be given to Village based impact assessment studies. The Government should try to cover all the villages from where starvation deaths have been reported in the media recently, under village based impact assessment study, on a priority basis.

NEW DELHI;
18 August, 2004
27 Sravana, 1926 (Saka)

KALYAN SINGH,
Chairman,
Standing Committee on Rural Development.

APPENDIX III

ACTUAL EXPENDITURE MADE BY THE DEPARTMENT OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT WITH REGARD TO THE PLAN SCHEMES DURING 2003-2004

(Rs. in Crore)

Sl. No.	Name of the Scheme	B.E. 2003-2004	R.E. 2003-2004	Actual Exp. upto 30.9.03	Actual Exp. upto 30.12.03	Actual Exp. upto 31.3.04
PLAN						
1.	Sampoorna Gramin Rozgar Yojana	4900.00	1030.00	2515.56	7257.22	10129.93
2.	Swarnajayanti Gram Swarozgar Yojana	800.00	800.00	333.19	582.53	797.55
3.	DRDA Administration	220.00	220.00	101.65	145.98	220.00
4.	Rural Housing	1900.00	1900.00	1001.46	1389.44	1899.50
5.	Grants to National Institute of Rural Dev.	6.00	6.00	3.00	3.00	6.00
6.	Training	39.00	39.00	16.48	29.08	39.84
7.	Information, Education and Communication (IEC)	10.00	10.00	2.59	5.03	10.50
8.	Assistance to C.A.P.A.R.T.	50.00	50.00	50.00	50.00	50.00
9.	Monitoring Mechanism	200.00	20.00	8.87	9.73	15.83
10.	Pradhan Mantri Gram Sadak Yojana	2325.00	2325.00	73.96	866.11	2328.60
11.	Provision for Urban Amenities in Rural Areas	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.78
Total		10270.00	15500.00	4106.76	10438.12	15503.53

APPENDIX IV

ACTUAL EXPENDITURE MADE BY THE DEPARTMENT OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT WITH REGARD TO THE NON-PLAN SCHEMES DURING 2003-2004

(Rs. in crore)

Sl.No.	Name of the Scheme	B.E. 2003-2004	R.E. 2003-2004	Actual exp. upto 30.9.03	Actual exp. upto 30.12.03	Actual exp. upto 31.3.04
NON-PLAN						
1.	Headquarter's Estt. of Deptt. of Rural Development	10.16	9.91	5.61	8.35	9.81
2.	Grants to National Institute of Rural Development	7.62	7.50	3.81	3.81	7.50
3.	Production of Literature for Rural Development	0.33	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25
4.	Contribution to International Bodies	1.17	1.10	0.45	0.45	0.47
	Total	19.28	18.76	10.12	12.86	18.03

APPENDIX VII

EXTRACTS OF THE COMMITTEE ON RURAL DEVELOPMENT (2004-2005)

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

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

PRESENT

Shri Kalyan Singh — *Chairman*

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

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

Rajya Sabha

18. Kumari Nirmala Deshpande
19. Prof. Alka Balram Kshatriya
20. Shri Penumalli Madhu
21. Shri Kalraj Mishra
22. Dr. Faguni Ram
23. Prof. R.B.S. Varma

SECRETARIAT

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

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

1. Shri M. Shankar, Secretary
2. Shri P.P. Mathur, Additional Secretary and Finance Advisor
3. Shrimati Komal Anand, Director-General, CAPART
4. Ms. A.K. Ahuja, Joint Secretary
5. Shri Wilfred Lakra, Joint Secretary
6. Dr. P.V. Thomas, Economic Adviser

2. At the outset, the Chairman welcomed the members to the sitting of the Committee convened to take oral evidence of the representatives of the Department of Rural Development (Ministry of Rural Development) on Demands for Grants (2004-2005).

[The representatives of the Department of Rural Development (Ministry of Rural Development), were then called in]

3. The Chairman thereafter welcomed the representatives of the Department of Rural Development, to the sitting. He drew their attention to Direction 55 (1) of the 'Directions by the Speaker'.

4. The Committee then took oral evidence of the representatives of the Department of Rural Development (Ministry of Rural Development) on Demands for Grants (2004-2005). The Secretary, Rural Development briefly explained to the Committee the overall position with regard to the allocation and expenditure of the Department as well as the projections of the Department during 10th Plan period. He also dealt with the features and enumerated the problems being faced with regard to the implementation of various schemes of the Department. The Committee then discussed in detail the primary issues related to

the examination of the Demands for Grants (2004-2005) of the Department with special emphasis on major Centrally Sponsored Schemes of the Department.

[The Committee then adjourned to meet again at 1430 hrs.]

5. The Committee then resumed discussion on Demands for Grants 2004-2005 of the said Department on the remaining programmes of the Department and members raised various pointed queries and sought clarifications thereon. The representatives of the Department were asked to send written replies to the queries, which could not be answered during the sitting.

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

6. ***

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

7. ***

[The Committee thereafter adjourned to take up the evidence of the Department of Drinking Water Supply (Ministry of Rural Development) on Demands for Grants 2004-2005].

A verbatim record of proceedings has been kept.

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

APPENDIX VIII

COMMITTEE ON RURAL DEVELOPMENT (2004-2005)

EXTRACTS OF THE MINUTES OF THE FOURTH SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE HELD ON MONDAY, THE 16 AUGUST, 2004

The Committee sat from 1500 hrs. to 1830 hrs. in Committee Room 'D',
Ground Floor, Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi.

PRESENT

Shri Kalyan Singh—*Chairman*

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

2. Shri Mohan Jena
3. Shri Shrichand Kriplani
4. Shri Subhash Maharia
5. Shri A.F. Golam Osmani
6. Shri S. Sudhakar Reddy
7. Shri Nikhilananda Sar
8. Shri Bagun Sumbrai

Rajya Sabha

9. Kumari Nirmala Deshpande
10. Shri Penumalli Madu
11. Shri Stephen Marandi
12. Shri Kalraj Mishra
13. Shri Chandan Mitra
14. Dr. Faguni Ram
15. Prof. R.B.S. Varma

SECRETARIAT

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

2. The Chairman, at the outset, welcomed the members to the sitting of the Committee. The Committee then took up for consideration the draft Report on Demands for Grants (2004-2005) of the Department of Rural Development (Ministry of Rural Development). The members of the Committee suggested certain modifications which were included in the Draft Report. The said Draft Report was adopted. *** **

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

The Committee then adjourned.

***Relevant Portions of the Minutes not related to the subject have been kept separately.

APPENDIX IX

STATEMENT OF OBSERVATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Sl. No.	Para No.	Observation/Recommendation
1	2	3
1.	2.3	<p>The Committee note that the Department has got less than half of what was proposed to Planning Commission during 10th Plan. Besides the Department was allocated Rs. 56,748 crore against the expenditure of Rs. 40,435.22 crore during 9th Plan. Therefore the Department has got Rs. 16312.78 crore more than what was the actual expenditure during 9th Plan. They also find that during 9th Plan the Department got Rs. 40,435.22 crore against the outlay of Rs. 32,869.87 crore <i>i.e.</i> Rs. 7566.35 crore more than the outlay. The Committee note that although the Department has got Rs. 16,312.78 crore more during the 10th Plan as against the previous Plan, it is difficult to analyse the hike or decrease in view of the fact that some of the Schemes being implemented during 9th Plan like NSAP and Annapoorna have been transferred to State Governments. Further the Scheme-wise analysis of the data indicate that under one of the major Schemes of the Department <i>i.e.</i> SGSY, there is drastic reduction of Rs. 735 crore in 10th Plan as compared to previous Plan. The Committee also note that under IAY Rs. 1,318 crore have been allocated more whereas for CAPART the allocation has been enhanced from Rs. 60 crore to Rs. 200 crore. On monitoring, although the</p>

1	2	3
		<p>Department has got 1/3rd of what was provided during 10th Plan, the allocation has been considerably enhanced <i>i.e.</i> from Rs. 5 crore in 9th Plan to Rs.100 crore. The details of Scheme-wise analysis has been made in the subsequent chapters of the Report. However the Committee would like to highlight here that there is no planning on the part of the Government. The Schemes, like NSAP and Annapoorna started with the laudable objectives of providing social security, after investment of several crore, were hurriedly transferred from one Ministry/Department to other, or to State Governments. Further there is drastic reduction in the outlay of SGSY, one of the important Schemes of self employment in rural areas. In this scenario, the Committee fail to understand how the objectives of providing employment, housing and infrastructure in rural areas would be achieved. In view of the above, the Committee strongly recommend that adequate outlay under the different Schemes to meet the set objectives should be made. Not only that, the enhanced allocation should be meaningfully utilised by improving the delivery mechanism and taking all the corrective desired steps.</p>
2.	2.4	<p>The Committee further find that under Schemes like IAY, CAPART the allocation has been increased. Similarly, for monitoring, the allocation has been enhanced considerably. The Committee hope that the increased allocation for monitoring would ensure effective implementation of the Programme. They further hope that the enhanced allocation under the respective Schemes of the</p>

1	2	3
		Department would result in better implementation and fulfilment of the desired objectives.
3.	2.18	The Committee note that during 2003-2004 in the first six months, the Department of Rural Development could spend 26.49 per cent of the Plan funds, whereas in the first nine months 67.34 per cent of the allocated funds were spent. On the other hand during the same period, 53.94 and 68.55 per cent respectively of Non-Plan funds were spent. The Committee feel that this uneven spending especially of Plan funds during the year adversely affects the implementation of the Schemes. The Committee, therefore, urge that adequate steps in the coming years should be taken so that the expenditure of Plan as well as Non-Plan funds is conveniently and uniformly spread throughout the year. The Government should therefore, plan ahead to ensure uniform spending throughout the year and in a phased manner.
4.	2.19	The Committee find from the data indicated above that there are huge opening balances with the State Governments under the major Schemes of the Department, viz. SGRY, SGSY, IAY and DRDA Administration. The Committee are distressed to note that Rs.2295.38 crore i.e. 18.71 per cent of BE 2002-03 remained unspent with the States and the Union territories administration. Not only that under-spending is a recurrent feature during each of the financial year as is evident from the information furnished by the Department. While appreciating the fact that utilisation certificates have to be

1	2	3
		<p>furnished by the State Government before seeking the second instalment under different schemes, the Committee find that even the first instalment is released very late. When the Department was asked about the date of release of first instalment under different schemes, they have indicated the position only with regard to SGSY. It can be seen that under SGSY, the first instalment could be released on 16th June in 2003 and on 15th April in 2004. Thus, during 2003, there was delay of 46 days and during 2004, there was a delay of 15 days. The Committee would like to know the information on date of release of funds for all the central sector and Centrally Sponsored Schemes of the Department. The Committee find that late release of outlay is the main reason of underspending and thereby resulting in unspent balances with the State Governments. The Department consider the releases as the position of expenditure and reflect a very bright picture before the Committee but there are serious problems in the implementation of several schemes which have been analyzed in the subsequent chapters of the report. Here, the Committee would like to highlight that the outlay during a particular year should be released in a phased manner as per the formula evolved by the Department and there should not be rush of releases at the fag end of the financial year, <i>i.e.</i> March. The Committee, however, desire that only 10 per cent of funds be released during the month of March, if proposal to this effect is received.</p>
5.	2.20	<p>The Committee further find that late release of funds by the Union Government further</p>

1	2	3
		<p>encourages the State Government to delay their share of outlay, thereby hampering the implementation of the programme. To motivate the State Governments, the Union Government has to set good precedents. In view of this, the Committee would like that the Union Government should ensure that the first instalment is released in the very first week of the financial year.</p>
6.	2.21	<p>The Committee have examined the scheme 'monitoring' in the subsequent chapter of the report but here the Committee would like to strongly recommend to the Department to gear up the implementing agencies and strengthen the monitoring mechanism so as to ensure cent per cent utilisation of scarce resources.</p>
7.	2.25	<p>The Committee find that the Department has been making contribution to various International organisations such as AARDO since 1962 and CIRDAP since 1979. Since the Department of Rural Development has been contributing to AARDO, a Programme of the Ministry of External Affairs for the last 42 years, the Committee feel that there is a need to review the matter in order to examine the need for continuing this contribution.</p> <p>The Committee would like to be apprised how far the aforesaid contribution could help the Department of Rural Development in developing understanding among member countries by way of promoting welfare, eradication of thirst, hunger and poverty among rural people and in assisting member countries in obtaining financial and technical assistance for rural</p>

1	2	3
		development programme to comprehend the need for continuing said assistance.
8.	2.31	<p>The Committee note that in North Eastern Area, 10 per cent allocation of the total outlay of the Department is earmarked since 2000-01. They are constrained to note the expenditure position since 2002-03. In 2002-03, the expenditure position is stated to be nil and from 2003-04 to 2004-05, the position has been stated to be not available. Further the Committee find that there are certain problems in implementation of different schemes of the Department in North Eastern Area as is evident from the information given above. They have some problems in allocating the States share besides inadequate presence of banks for credit delivery under SGSY and limited working season due to weather conditions, etc., have been stated to be major reasons which hamper the progress of implementation of the schemes and thereby result in under utilization of outlay in North Eastern Area. In view of this scenario, the Committee recommend to the Government to find out the position of utilization of resources in each of the North Eastern Area under each of the schemes since 2000-01 and submit the same before the Committee so as to enable the Committee to come to the right conclusions. Besides they would like that State-wise reasons for the problems of various States in implementation of the schemes should be analyzed and corrective action taken so that the scarce resources in the starved economy of the country do not remain unutilized thereby affecting the other schemes of the Government.</p>

1	2	3
9.	2.39	<p>The Committee find that the Department has released Rs. 75.96 crore to the States and Union territories for conducting BPL census, 2002. The Committee would like to know the expenditure made by different States and Union territories out of the releases made so far. The Committee have been informed that the latest Reports regarding completion of spadework and tabulation plans are yet to be received from the States and Union territories. They presume that in the absence of the results of BPL Census, 2002, different State Governments must have been relying on the results of the previous BPL Census, which is too old. Therefore, they recommend that while awaiting the judgement of Supreme Court, the Department of Rural Development should impress upon the States/Union territories that the tentative BPL Census 2002 should be ready without any further delay so that no further time is wasted in identifying the BPL families who are in real need of the anti-poverty Programmes of the Department.</p>
10.	3.14	<p>The Committee find that SGSY was launched in the place of IRDP and its allied Programmes which lays stress on formation of Self Help Groups. However, the Committee note that upto 2003-2004, number of individual Swarozgaries assisted under SGSY was significantly more than the Swarozgaries who were assisted in Groups. Since each Self Help Group should assist at least 10 persons belonging to families Below Poverty Line which might be reduced to 5 persons in hilly and difficult areas, the Committee are unable to</p>

1	2	3
		<p>understand as to how 17.35 lakh Self Help Groups reportedly formed during this period could assist only 20.21 lakh Swarozgaries which should have been about 85 to 170 lakh. Keeping in view the information on the number of SHGs and the number of Swarozgaries, the Committee have come to a conclusion that the performance of SGSY in this regard is not satisfactory. They would like the Department to explain the reasons to the Committee.</p>
11.	3.26	<p>The Committee are disturbed to note that serious lacunae in the implementation of SGSY has been found in the Concurrent Evaluation. They are further disturbed to find that the Zamindars, their servants and labourers constitute Self Help Groups and the benefits were taken away by the Zamindars who are above the Poverty Line and who are otherwise not eligible for it. Equally disturbing is the fact that Bank officials are worried about the non-performing assets and they sanction loans only to those people who have either not availed the loan before or have repaid the first loan. Despite the existing guidelines, finding of a number of serious flaws in the implementation of the Scheme is nothing but regrettable. The Committee hope that the Government will give a serious thought to this and take necessary steps during the current financial year to bring about significant changes in the guidelines of the Scheme, so that the flaws noticed in the Concurrent Evaluation are eradicated and the avowed objectives of the Scheme are achieved.</p>
12.	3.27	<p>While analysing the position of involvement of banks in the implementation of SGSY,</p>

1	2	3
		<p>the Committee note that there are serious problems regarding involvement of banks. As pointed out by concurrent evaluation there is complaint of non-cooperation from banks by district authorities. Further there is delay in banking procedure, delay in disbursement of assistance and problem of cooperation with and coordination among banks. Another serious lacuna pointed out by the evaluation is that banks prefer sanctioning loans to individuals only and release loans individually to members of SHGs for greater accountability. Another problem being faced is banks release only the subsidy portion and thus withholding the credit portion. The Committee feel that in the absence of providing credit the money given as subsidy would have been used by the beneficiary for their consumption needs and thereby resulting in failure of the achievement of the objectives of the scheme that is to bring the beneficiaries above the poverty line. Not only that there is lack of cooperation between bank officials and officials of blocks.</p>
13.	3.28	<p>Another lacuna noticed by the data furnished by the Department is that there is serious shortfall in credit targets, achievements and credit disbursements. In view of this scenario, the Committee fail to understand how the objective of bringing BPL persons above the poverty line could be achieved. The Committee feel that the Department should take up this matter with Reserve Bank of India so that the necessary instructions would be issued to banks for their cooperation in implementation of the programme. Not only that, there should be</p>

1	2	3
		<p>regular meeting with the representatives of banks as well as RBI and monitoring of the programmes should be regularly done. Further the Committee also like that to ensure that only the eligible beneficiaries are assisted in the programme the selection of beneficiaries should be done in Gram Sabhas only. The bank officials should be directed to be present in Gram Sabha meetings so that the process of selection of beneficiaries and completion of formalities, etc., is completed at one go.</p>
14.	3.29	<p>Another corrective step to be taken by the Department is to ensure proper coordination between bank officials and block level government representatives and the Panchayats. The Committee would like the Department to take the corrective steps on the various aspects as raised by the Committee in the aforesaid para and intimate the Committee accordingly.</p>
15.	3.30	<p>The Committee are constrained to note that efforts made by the Department under SGSY have not culminated into the desired results as even after 5 years of implementation of SGSY Scheme, credit flow to the beneficiaries has not reached the desired level. The Committee would like the Government to go deeply into the methodology and find out the reasons which preclude in obtaining the desired result. The Committee are informed that the Scheme was launched with great optimism with an end to having every assisted family above poverty line within three years. However, this appears to have remained a distant dream. The Government should take all ground realities and possibilities into</p>

1	2	3
		<p>account. The Committee feel that the Department should not merely be a silent spectator in this regard but should seriously introspect on the lacunae detected and come out with ameliorative measures. While setting up the target, hyperboles do not help and lead to confusion. The Government should point out serious flaws noticed in the implementation of the Scheme to the Reserve Bank of India (RBI) and Ministry of Finance. They urge the Government to take suitable measures in this regard and apprise them accordingly.</p>
16.	3.31	<p>The Committee find from the information provided by the Department that there are certain problems being faced in the implementation of SGSY as pointed out in the concurrent evaluation for the period of 1st April, 1999 to 2001. It has been stated in the findings of said evaluation that only 27 per cent of SHGs could purchase the assets in the first month after the release of loan amount. Another problem indicated in the evaluation seems to be lack of forward and backward linkages. It has been indicated that 42 per cent of SHGs market their products/services on their own. Another disturbing feature noticed by the evaluation is that people who are not eligible for the benefits under SGSY have become beneficiaries including people belonging to non BPL category and those who are influential. The Committee further note that the objective of SGSY is to provide self employment to BPL persons so as to enable them to cross poverty line even by giving the multiple doses of assistance. They are disturbed to know as pointed out by the concurrent evaluation</p>

1	2	3
		<p>only 15.9 per cent of SHGs could cross poverty line. By analysing all these factors, the Committee have come to the conclusion that there are serious problems in the implementation of the programme. The issues related to involvement of banks have been analyzed separately in the succeeding paras of the Report.</p>
17.	3.32	<p>From the data provided by the Department, regarding financial achievement during the year 2003-04, the Committee find that in as many as 8 States, the performance was less than 50 per cent. These States are Arunachal Pradesh, Assam, Goa, Jharkhand, Manipur, Meghalaya, Nagaland and Rajasthan. Further in 3 Union territories the performance was stated to be nil. As regards, the physical achievement, the Committee find that there was declining trend from 1997-98 to 1999-2000. The number of Swarozgaris increased in the year 2000-2001 which further decreased in the following years <i>i.e.</i>, 2001-2002, 2002-2003. In 2003-2004 although the data has been provided provisional, there is slight increase in the number of Swarozgaris assisted as compared to that of 2002-2003.</p> <p>In view of the aforesaid scenario, the Committee feel that the Government has to analyse critically the performance of SGSY which is one of the oldest and important schemes of the Department after interacting with the respective State Governments, PRIs. Besides the steps to provide forward and backward to the self help groups, should be undertaken so that the viability of the self help groups could</p>

1	2	3
		be ensured.
18.	3.33	<p>The Committee further find that most of the Swarozgaris have to sell their products in the market on their own because there is lack of institutional arrangements being made for the aforesaid schemes. The Committee feel that the profits of Swarozgaris are considerably reduced if they resort to self marketing. Another area of concern is the competitiveness in the market. The Government has to think of all these aspects seriously and provide the protection to the self help groups. Besides, to enable the self help groups to face the competition in the market the stress need to be given to training aspect so that the products produced by the beneficiaries are competitive in the market. More and more Gramshree Melas like SARAS organised during the India International Trade Fair in Delhi and Delhi Haat should be organized in other States of the country so as to enable Swarozgaris to sell their products in such Melas. More and more NGOs should also be involved in the programme.</p>
19.	3.34	<p>The Committee further find that Finance Minister has indicated that mature SHGs may be in a position to graduate from consumption or production credit to starting micro enterprises. The Committee find that Finance Minister has indicated that an indicative target of credit linking 5.85 lakh SHGs during the period up to March 2007 has been set for NABARD, SIDBI and other agencies. The Committee find from the information furnished by the Department that they have not set any</p>

1	2	3
		target in this regard. The Committee fail to understand how the Government would achieve the aforesaid targets in the absence of any planning being made in one of the biggest programmes of Self Help Groups <i>i.e.</i> , SGSY.
20.	3.35	The Committee would like to know from the Department, the number of SHGs who could graduate from consumption or production credit to starting micro enterprises since the inception of the scheme so as to enable the Committee to know about the real impact of the programme. They would also like to be apprised about the number of SHGs who could be credit linked by different agencies like NABARD, SIDBI and banks.
21.	3.36	Keeping in view the aforesaid, the Committee conclude that there are some serious problems in implementation of the Programme. They would like that there are some serious problems in the implementation of SGSY. They would like the Department to take corrective steps immediately, after consultation with State Governments, Panchayats, Banks and all concerned with the implementation of the Programme and apprise the Committee accordingly.
22.	3.40	The Committee are unhappy to note that the Department is yet to receive the information regarding existing or defunct Self Help Groups from the States/Union territories. They also note that all the States and Union territories have been requested to furnish the information in this regard from 2003-2004. The Committee in their earlier Report (48th Report—13th Lok

1	2	3
		<p>Sabha, Para No.3.25 refers) had desired to maintain the information on the number of defunct Self Help Groups which the Government had agreed to provide. It appears that the Government has not given any serious thought as to why SHGs become defunct after a certain period. They also do not maintain information regarding existing/defunct SHGs. This is a glaring lapse and needs to be addressed seriously. The success of the Scheme depends on proper review of its functioning and the lacunae detected in its functioning which is required to be done by the Government and expected. The Committee, therefore, desire that Ministry of Rural Development should expedite the requisite information from the States and Union territories without any further delay. The Committee should be kept informed about the steps taken.</p>
23.	3.42	<p>The Committee are dismayed to note that performance of SGSY in several Union territories and in the State of Manipur is close to nil, as no Central funds have been released to them during 2003-2004 and 2004-2005. They feel that as the Union territories get cent percent Central assistance, the performance of SGSY should have been better as there is no States share involved. The Committee desire to know the specific reasons as to why these Union territories and the State of Manipur have been deprived of the assistance under SGSY. The Committee, therefore, recommend that monitoring of all the Schemes shall further be strengthened in the current financial year and suitable corrective measures be initiated so that funds under the Scheme are released</p>

1	2	3
		to these Union territories and Manipur without any further delay.
24.	3.45	<p>The Committee are shocked to note that credit mobilisation target has never been achieved by the Commercial, Cooperative and Regional Rural Banks since 2001-2002. Further, the Ministry of Rural Development does not monitor the performance of Commercial, Cooperative and Regional Rural Banks as is being done by RBI/NABARD. They also note that the same information is available with the DRDAs, but the subsidy released by DRDAs to Banks is also not being monitored by the Ministry. With the absence of the requisite information in this regard, the Committee feel that no effective assessment of performance of different Banks can be made so far as the implementation of the SGSY is concerned. They, therefore, urge the Department to monitor credit mobilisation targets <i>vis-a-vis</i> achievement separately by Commercial, Cooperative and Regional Rural Banks. It should also be seen that the information in this regard is collected from the DRDAs.</p>
25.	3.47	<p>The Committee are unable to find the reasons as to why Sikkim is excluded from implementing Special Projects Component of SGSY. They find that in addition to other States, Nehru Yuvak Kendras (NYKs) have also been given the task of implementing Special SGSY Projects. The Committee, would like to know the reasons for exclusion of Sikkim, the justification of involving the NYKs as well as the success of SGSY Special Projects.</p>
26.	3.50	<p>While noting that the prescribed frequency of CLCC is generally maintained, the</p>

1	2	3
		<p>Committee find that as has been pointed out by Concurrent Evaluation, many State Governments like Bihar and Meghalaya do not hold SLCC meetings regularly. Further, the Department of Rural Development also do not monitor the meetings of SLCC, DLCC and BLCC which according to the Department are required to be monitored by the respective State Governments. The Committee desire that the Government should obtain quarterly and six monthly Reports from the State Governments on the information of meetings held by SLCC, DLCC and BLCC and pressurise all the States to adhere to the prescribed frequency to the extent possible.</p>
27.	3.58	<p>The Committee note that although the Cash Component of SGRY during 2004-2005 has been increased from Rs.4,125 crore to Rs.4,500 crore, the physical target of generating 100 crore mandays annually during the 10th Five Year Plan has not been achieved so far. The Committee feel that besides increasing the funds, additional steps need to be taken by the Department to achieve the set target. The Committee hope that suitable measures to meet the physical performance of SGRY will be put in place to achieve the targets.</p>
28.	3.59	<p>The non availability of information on the total expenditure from 13 States and 3 Union territories speaks a lot about the inadequate monitoring of the Scheme by the Government. Despite having the existing monitoring mechanism, the Department has failed to obtain the information from all the States/Union territories. The Committee, therefore, desire</p>

1	2	3
		that the existing monitoring of the Scheme should further be strengthened and these States and Union territories to be persuaded to submit the total expenditure incurred during 2003-2004 without any further delay.
29.	3.61	<p>The Committee find that Rs. 5230 crore was obtained through Supplementary Grants during 2003-2004 over and above the Budget estimate of Rs. 4,900 crore. The Committee are disturbed to find that only a token amount is provided at the BE 2004-2005 stage, which has already been exhausted and the Ministry has committed liabilities of Rs. 5,111 crore under SGRY and Rs. 6,900 crore for the Special Component of SGRY. Thus the practice of demanding more funds in the Supplementary Grants is likely to continue in this year also. Persistent demands of Supplementary Grants is not a healthy sign as it does not give the implementing agencies in different districts the idea about the amount of allocations earmarked for effective implementation of the Scheme. The Implementing Agencies should be well aware of the provisions well ahead of time <i>i.e.</i> at the beginning of the financial year. Therefore, the Committee recommend that the Government should find out ways and means to overcome this impasse and take suitable steps, so that Planning Commission/Ministry of Finance are persuaded to provide adequate necessary funds for SGRY at the beginning of the financial year.</p>
30.	3.65	<p>It is highly disappointing to note that the Government could provide the information on minimum wages paid to the</p>

1	2	3
		<p>beneficiaries of the SGRY only in respect of 19 States. While glancing through the limited information available, the Committee find that there is wide variation in the minimum wages paid to the beneficiaries, for example the highest minimum wage was paid in the State of Kerala, which was Rs.91, whereas its adjoining State Karnataka paid minimum wage of Rs.46.25p per day. Similar variations are found in many major States including Andhra Pradesh, Orissa, Chhattisgarh etc. Even in some States like Andhra Pradesh, the minimum wage rate varies from District to District. The Committee are of the view that widespread variation in minimum wages leads to rapid migration, which hampers better implementation of SGRY. They, therefore, recommend that the Ministry of Rural Development should impress upon all the States/Union territories to have to the extent possible a uniform wage rate in all the Districts of a particular State and also there should not be much difference in the minimum wages in different States so that the SGRY Scheme can be implemented effectively. Further, the Committee desire that relevant information from the remaining States and Union territories should be obtained expeditiously and they be apprised accordingly.</p>
31.	3.70	<p>The Committee find that Food Corporation of India (FCI) has been given mandate to procure foodgrains from the States having surplus foodgrains for distributing throughout the country as per the demand. The Committee desire that FCI should be impressed upon to provide as far as</p>

1	2	3
		possible the surplus foodgrains procured from the adjoining States or the same State so as to reduce the transportation cost as well as the time taken for delivering the foodgrains to the barest minimum.
32.	3.71	The Committee also find that there is no provision in the guidelines for receiving back the payment made to FCI for foodgrains of bad quality. The Committee desire the Ministry to look into these aspects and make the necessary provisions in the guidelines to ensure that in case of supply of foodgrains of bad quality, payment made to FCI is received back. The Committee also desire that the Department of Rural Development should take necessary steps, so that for supply of bad quality foodgrains under SGRY, the responsibility should be fixed on the officials involved and action initiated accordingly.
33.	3.74	The Committee find that the Finance Minister has indicated in the budget speech that the work has begun on the National Employment Guarantee Act which aims to guarantee 100 days of employment in a year to one able bodied person in every poor household. The Committee hope that the said legislation would be finalised expeditiously in consultation with the Ministries of Rural Development, and Labour and Employment. They also hope that provisions of the said legislation, when enacted would also be applicable to the SGRY and other related Schemes of the Department.

1	2	3
34.	3.76	<p>The Committee note that the Evaluation Study of SGRY has been commissioned in September 2003 in which 44 reputed institutions have been involved of which 21 are based in Delhi or New Delhi. They also note that neither National Institute of Rural Development (NIRD) nor any of the State Institute of Rural Development (SIRD) are involved in the said study. The Committee desire that as far as possible, the Ministry of Rural Development should try to involve one reputed institution of each State in the Evaluation Study of the Schemes. The possibility of involving NIRD and some of the SIRDs should be explored in this regard.</p>
35.	3.80	<p>The Committee note with concern that the possibility of considerable delay in meeting the formalities for release of foodgrains under Special Component of SGRY to deal with calamities such as drought, earthquake, cyclone, flood etc. cannot be ruled out due to the existing long procedural formalities. The Committee presume that this has resulted in accumulation of unlifted (authorised quantity of) foodgrains with the State Governments which has been reported to be as high as 16.18 lakh metric tonnes as on 31 March 2004. They, therefore, desire that the Ministry of Rural Development should in consultation with the Ministry of Agriculture and Ministry of Home Affairs, who are the nodal Ministries for drought and other calamities like flood, earthquake etc. respectively, initiate suitable measures, so that considerable time is not wasted between the occurrence of a calamity and release of foodgrains under Special Component of SGRY.</p>

1	2	3
36.	3.91	<p>The Committee note that the Government has been setting targets for providing houses to the needy in the rural areas time and again without achieving them. For example in the 'Campaign for Housing for All', it was decided to construct additional 2 million houses, out of which 13 lakh houses were required to be constructed in the rural areas through various Schemes, such as IAY, Credit-cum-Subsidy Scheme, Housing and Urban Development Corporation Limited (HUDCO) Scheme, State Governments' Schemes and National Housing Bank/Commercial Banks etc. The Committee, however, note that though 7 to 8 lakh additional houses were admitted to have been constructed over and above the targets of 1999-2000, the actual figure is only about 5.43 lakhs. The Department proposed to construct additional houses for the poor under the Credit-cum-Subsidy Scheme also which remained a non-starter which according to Department was due to the reasons that neither any BPL family came forward nor the Banks were committal. The Committee are dismayed to conclude that the targets of number of houses set under IAY during the years 1999-2000 to 2003-2004 except during the year 2002-2003, were not achieved.</p>
37.	3.92	<p>The Committee further note that as per the estimates of Census 2001, there is a shortage of about 149 lakh houses in the country. At the present level of resources available, only about 15 lakh houses can be constructed every year, whereas about 10 lakh additional houses are added annually to existing shelterlessness which aspect also needs to be looked in to.</p>

1	2	3
		<p>Keeping in view the pace at which the houses are constructed, the Committee are apprehensive about how the Government will achieve the aim to end shelterlessness in rural India. The Committee regret that while there is acute shortage of houses, the funds correspondingly have not been increased to meet the huge gap between demand and supply. They, therefore, recommend that the Ministry should take appropriate steps to achieve the targets set and also request the Planning Commission to re-allocate additional funds to meet the acute shortage of rural housing.</p>
38.	3.93	<p>The Committee note that so far no attempt has been made to verify all the 1.16 crore houses reportedly built under IAY since inception. They also note that periodical verification is being done by the Ministry by way of taking Concurrent Evaluation and periodical visits by Area Officers. In this scenario, the Committee fail to understand as to what can be the use of taking Concurrent Evaluation if the Department has not monitored the status of the existence of houses. They, therefore, recommend that the Ministry of Rural Development should initiate a study to verify all the houses constructed under IAY without further wastage of time.</p>
39.	3.94	<p>The Committee note that several parts of the country are prone to various natural calamities such as flood, cyclone, earthquake etc. They further note that the houses constructed under IAY are being constructed by the beneficiaries themselves who are expected to use available local materials and low cost disaster resistant and</p>

1	2	3
		<p>environment friendly technologies. However, no separate provision for retrofitting the existing houses against natural calamities has been provided under the guidelines. Therefore, the Committee desire that in order to achieve construction of durable houses, some provision in the guidelines are made for retrofitting of IAY houses in the natural calamity prone areas.</p>
40.	3.100	<p>The Committee note that equity support is provided to HUDCO by Department of Rural Development who garner and provide additional resources <i>i.e.</i> approximately 8 times the size of equity contribution from the market. The Committee are disturbed to note that as HUDCO is under the aegis of the Ministry of Urban Development and Urban Employment and Poverty Alleviation, the Ministry of Rural Development does not monitor the performance of HUDCO in rural housing. The Department of Rural Development does not maintain and thus could not provide information relating to the actual houses constructed out of the dwelling units sanctioned under the Two Million Housing Programme of the Department of Rural Development. The Committee, therefore, recommend that the Ministry should obtain the performance of HUDCO on an yearly basis so that they could have a clear cut picture of the role of HUDCO in the field of Rural Housing. In case the performance of HUDCO is found unsatisfactory, the Ministry should take suitable corrective and ameliorative measures so that rural families do not suffer.</p>

1	2	3
41.	3.102	While noting that the States of Jharkhand, Manipur and Nagaland have not submitted their Monthly Progress Reports regularly for the year 2003-2004, the Committee find that the Union Territory of Dadra & Nagar Haveli has not submitted the same since November 2002. As a long time has elapsed since the Monthly Progress Reports were obtained from the above mentioned States and Union Territory, the Committee would like the Department to state the reasons as to why the Reports were not obtained from these States and the Union Territories, despite having Area Officers Scheme in operation.
42.	3.105	The Finance Minister in his Budget speech has stated that a major impediment to credit for rural housing is absence of proper title for the land. He also stated that West Bengal has made a law to simplify the creation of security, which deserve to be emulated by other States. The Ministry have informed that West Bengal State Government has been asked to provide a copy of West Bengal law. The Committee hope that the Government after studying the said law extensively and expeditiously, would issue the guidelines to other State Governments to enact similar laws so that the benefit of different rural development schemes could be extended to rural poor.
43.	3.110	The Committee are disturbed to find that out of 85 Rural Building Centres(RBCs) approved, only 35 have become functional so far. On the one hand, the Department has stated that RBCs are expected to be completed within a period of two years by utilising the funds released in three instalments, on the other hand, it has been stated that no such deadline has been fixed

1	2	3
		<p>for construction and functioning of all RBCs approved so far. The Committee also note that out of all the 85 approved RBCs, which were to get assistance through HUDCO, only 25 were released the second instalment, whereas the third instalment had been released only to 6 of them. The Committee, therefore, doubt as to how all the RBCs will become functional without receiving the second and the third instalments. Being critical of the poor functioning of RBCs, the Committee hope that the Department will impress upon HUDCO to get the pending work of approval of RBCs completed expeditiously, so that all the approved RBCs become functional at the earliest.</p>
44.	3.125	<p>The Committee note that out of Rs. 9793 crore allocation, Rs. 7321.53 crore have been released under the PMGSY to the States upto March 2004. Further out of 21461 number of roads cleared, only 8260 roads have reportedly been completed. The Committee feel that performance of a number of States is dismal so far as completion of road work is concerned. Keeping in view the variation in the estimates of construction cost in different States, the Committee feel that almost double the length of roads can be constructed with the available funds.</p>
45.	3.126	<p>The Committee note with concern that Rs. 76000 crore would be needed to cover road connectivity to all habitations of 500 plus population and with current allocation rate, it will take over 30 years to complete the new connectivity. They also note that allocation of PMGSY is dependent upon the</p>

1	2	3
		<p>cess amount collected through the Central Road Fund. They are astonished to find that even though the cess on High Speed Diesel has been increased from Rupee 1 to Rs. 1.50, the Department is not getting the additional funds. Rather the allocation is being reduced in the last couple of years. As the road connectivity is a pre-requisite for rural development and thereby the reduction of rural poverty, the Department should have started the projects only after reassuring themselves about the availability of funds. They are equally surprised to find that between launching of the Scheme and results of core net work, the number of unconnected habitations, increased from 50,600 to 54,800 cost per kilometre increased from Rs. 4.7 lakh to Rs. 19 lakh and average distance per habitation enhanced from 1.26 km. to 2.1 km. The Committee therefore, are inclined to conclude that most of the calculations at the launch of the programme on 24.12.2000 were unrealistic. While recommending for the demand of more allocation under the Scheme, they desire that the Department of Rural Development should ensure that these parameters like the number of unconnected habitations, cost per kilometre, average distance between habitations, etc. do not enhance further.</p>
46.	3.127	<p>The Committee note with concern that even though the Budget allocation for PMGSY remained same during 2000-2001 and 2001-2002, the number of roads cleared came down from 11103 to 1939 in 2004-2005. They are equally surprised to find that even though execution of road works should take 9 to 12 months from actual award, nearly</p>

1	2	3
		6 per cent of the road work started in 2000-2001 and 28 per cent of the road works started in 2001-2002, are yet to be completed. Being critical of the way the Government have spent the scarce resources provided under PMGSY, they recommend that Department of Rural Development in consultation with NRRDA should ensure that all the works taken up does not take more than 12 months from actual award as envisaged.
47.	3.133	The Committee find that as per the information provided by the Ministry the implementation of rural development programmes in Delhi was discontinued on the specific request of the Administration because the rural development schemes are not being implemented in Delhi. Further it has been stated that there are no unconnected habitations in Delhi. The Committee are surprised to find that during 2001-02, Rs. 5 crore was released to Delhi Government under PMGSY. The Committee would like to be apprised about the clear position of Centrally Sponsored Schemes of the Ministry of Rural Development in Delhi. They would also like to be apprised of the physical and financial achievement with regard to the money released to Delhi during 2001-2002. Further, The Committee would like that the Department should recover the funds, if the released amount during 2001-02 has not so far been spent.
48.	3.135	The Committee are surprised to find that both the physical and financial performance of PMGSY in Union territories, except in case of Pondicherry, is either nil or close to nil. The Committee would like to know as to why less importance is given for the performance of the Scheme in the Union territories, despite having a multi-faceted

1	2	3
		monitoring. They hope that the reasons for poor performance of the Scheme in the Union territories will be looked into without delay so that these places do not remain unconnected in the years to come.
49.	3.141	The Committee are surprised to find that all the districts of the country do not have a District Rural Development Agency (DRDA) as on 31.3.2004. They are equally surprised to find that all the 576 established DRDAs do not receive the funds under the DRDA administration Scheme. Even though guidelines have been prescribed for a model staffing structure and broad personnel policies for four different types of DRDAs, there is no uniformity in this regard. They feel that the Ministry of Rural Development has minimised its role only to release the funds under the scheme and be a silent spectator in this regard. Further the Government is not aware of the priorities set by DRDAs as if these are not required to be forwarded to the Ministry. They have their own doubts as to how the Government can ensure efficient implementation of Rural Development Programmes without obtaining the annual reports. They, therefore, recommend that model staffing structure, broad personnel policies and furnishing of annual Reports of all DRDAs be done without any further delay.
50.	3.148	The Committee note that a new scheme 'Provision for Urban Amenities in Rural Areas' (PURA) with the objective of providing physical and social infrastructure in the identified 3,130 rural clusters was approved by Cabinet. The Committee have

1	2	3
		<p>been apprised that during 2003-2004, an amount of Rs. 5.78 crore was spent by reappropriation of different schemes of the Department of Rural Development. The Committee also note that Finance Minister in his Budget speech has indicated that additional funds would be provided for the Scheme. The Committee deplore the way the planning for new schemes is being made without ensuring for the outlay. Besides the Committee fail to understand how Rs. 5.78 crore could be utilised during 2003-2004, when the scheme is still in the process of finalisation. The Committee would like to be apprised of the detailed guidelines alongwith the details of the expenditure made during 2003-2004.</p> <p>The Committee further note that Credit-cum-subsidy scheme launched since 1999 and Samagara Awaas Yojana have been merged with IAY <i>w.e.f.</i> 1.4.1999 as these schemes did not pick-up. The Committee are constrained to note the way the Department is hurriedly starting new schemes to achieve the objectives for which comprehensive schemes already exist. The schemes are being started without planning and then merged with other schemes when these schemes could not pick-up. The Committee would like that the approach of the Government should be to provide additional funds to the existing schemes and improve the delivery mechanism by proper monitoring so as to have tangible impact on the lives of rural poor.</p>
51.	3.160	The Committee find during 2003-2004, Rs. 6.13 crore Plan and Rs. 9.12 crore Non-Plan outlay was spent for the purpose of

1	2	3
		<p>administrative expenditure and promotion of study of rural development and social change. The Committee are surprised to note that when asked for the status of said study they were informed that no such study is underway. The Committee fail to understand how the expenditure was made for the study which was never made. By noting the data furnished by the Department the Committee find that major expenditure of NIRD is for imparting training whereas NIRD was established with objectives to undertake research and studies on Panchayati Raj Institutions and rural development programmes for continuous policy and programmes upgradation and dissemination information through publication. The Committee feel that the said objectives are not being fulfilled. While the Committee appreciate conducting training programmes they feel that more stress need to be given to research in policy and programmes so as to bring improvement in implementation of various programmes of rural development.</p>
52.	3.167	<p>The Committee note that three SIRDs are yet to be established in Bihar, Chhattisgarh and Uttaranchal. They are surprised to note that several States like Goa, Sikkim, Tripura and Uttaranchal do not have a single ETC. They hope that steps will be taken by Government to establish SIRDs and ETCs without further delay. They also observe that reappropriation from savings of other Schemes is being widely practised by the Department. As reappropriation is not a healthy practice, the Committee feel that it should be discouraged and desire that utilisation of savings from the same Scheme</p>

1	2	3
		be made to meet higher demands of SIRDs, ETCs and OTCs to the extent possible.
53.	3.178	<p>The Committee note with concern that although more than Rs.71 crore has been released to CAPART which has further been released to the Voluntary Organisations, the CAPART has received Utilisation Certificate of Rs.10 crore only. The Committee are not satisfied with the monitoring of activities of CAPART. As more and more Voluntary Organisations are being blacklisted by CAPART, the Committee desire that proper scrutiny of Voluntary Organisations be made before releasing the funds. They recommend that the monitoring of the funds so released be done on a monthly basis so that chance of having blacklisted VOs are minimised. They also desire that the existing monitoring of different activities of CAPART and its regional committees be further strengthened so that the funds released are meaningfully utilised.</p>
54.	3.179	<p>The Committee are not happy with the establishment of Regional Committees of CAPART in the places where the Schemes of Department of Rural Development were not being implemented viz. Chandigarh and Delhi. They also note that Regional Committees have been set up and are functioning in 9 different places. The Committee, would like to know the jurisdiction of States and Union territories under each of these Regional Committees. They feel that the said jurisdiction should not be administered from a distant area. For example, to oversee the performance of NGOs of Jammu and Kashmir at Chandigarh, is neither justifiable nor</p>

1	2	3
		practical. They, therefore, recommend that CAPART should consider establishment of Committees at the State level.
55.	3.180	The Committee also note that existing Guidelines of submission and approval of project does not categorically mention a fixed percentage for smaller NGOs. They presume bigger and established NGOs are getting more benefits at the cost of smaller NGOs. They, therefore, recommend that it should be ensured that smaller NGOs at least get 50 per cent of assistance in each Scheme being financed by the CAPART. Necessary changes in the guidelines of CAPART be made in this regard and Committee be apprised accordingly.
56.	3.183	The Committee note with concern that the expenditure on IEC activities has been reduced by more than half in two years starting from 2001-2002. They observe that the rural poor is not yet aware of different activities of the Ministry being implemented for their development. They, therefore, desire that both allocation and utilisation of funds for the IEC activities be substantially stepped up so that different Schemes of the Ministry are given wide publicity. The rural poor need to be enlightened about the activities being taken up under IEC. Awareness campaign should be stepped up to involve the rural poor. The Committee should be kept informed about the steps taken in this regard.
57.	3.190	The Committee note with concern that Area Officers Scheme in its 10 years of existence has not been very useful in obtaining utilisation of funds Certificates from the

1	2	3
		States/Union territories. As the coverage of 16 and 11 States in 2002-2003 and 2003-2004 respectively by the Area Officers is too low, they desire that the Government should take adequate steps to ensure that all the States and Union territories are covered under the Scheme during each couple of years.
58.	3.191	The Committee feel that there is a need to expand District Level Monitoring (DLM) to all the districts. They also feel that similar stress should be given to Village based impact assessment studies. The Government should try to cover all the villages from where starvation deaths have been reported in the media recently, under village based impact assessment study, on a priority basis.

APPENDIX-I

STATEMENT SHOWING BUDGET ESTIMATE, REVISED ESTIMATE AND ACTUAL EXPENDITURE, PLAN OUTLAY OF DEPARTMENT OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT DURING 9TH FIVE YEAR PLAN

(Rs. in Crore)

S.N.	Name of the Schemes	9th Plan Outlay	1997-98			1998-99			1999-2000			2000-01			2001-02			Total Ninth Plan		
			B.E.	R.E.	Actuals	B.E.	R.E.	Actuals	B.E.	R.E.	Actuals	B.E.	R.E.	Actuals	B.E.	R.E.	Actuals	B.E.	R.E.	Actuals
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21
1.	Employment Assurance Scheme	8690.00	1970.00	1905.21	1968.27	1990.00	1990.00	1989.88	1700.00	2040.00	2040.00	1300.00	1600.00	1419.51	1600.00	1875.00	1898.23	8560.00	9410.21	9315.89
2.	Jawahar Gram Samridhi Yojana	7095.90	2077.70	1952.70	1951.61	2095.00	2060.00	2062.26	2095.00	1689.00	1689.00	1650.00	1510.00	1384.88	1650.00	1875.00	1895.58	9567.70	9086.70	8983.33
3.	Food for Work Programme														0.00	800.00	800.00	0.00	800.00	800.00
4.	Swarnjayanti Gram Swarozgar Yojana	4690.00	1183.00	1033.00	1034.45	1410.00	1195.94	1196.17	1215.00	950.00	946.76	1000.00	470.00	544.94	500.00	550.00	536.27	5308.00	4198.94	4258.59
5.	DRDA Administration	915.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	110.00	110.00	220.00	200.00	165.97	220.00	200.00	198.90	440.00	510.00	474.87
6.	N.S.A.P.	3280.00	700.00	490.00	559.41	700.00	640.00	640.11	725.00	710.00	709.94	715.00	715.00	700.55	835.00	635.00	629.85	3675.00	3190.00	3239.86
7.	Rural Housing (Indira Awaas Yojana)	7285.00	1190.00	1143.75	1143.55	1600.00	1532.00	1531.92	1710.00	1659.00	1659.00	1710.00	1710.00	1664.17	1527.00	1991.00	1945.33	7737.00	8035.75	7943.97
8.	Annapoorna	596.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	99.80	300.00	100.00	71.63	400.00	200.00	171.43
9.	Grants to National Institute of Rural Dev.	30.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	25.00	25.00	25.00
10.	Strengthening of State Training Centre	15.00	3.25	3.25	4.07	3.25	3.25	4.26	4.25	6.25	6.25	7.25	9.25	10.39	8.75	8.75	8.75	26.75	30.75	33.72
11.	Org. of Training Courses, Seminars	5.00	0.50	0.50	0.27	0.50	0.50	0.82	1.25	1.25	1.25	1.25	1.25	1.41	1.25	1.25	1.25	4.75	4.75	5.00

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21
12.	Strengthening of Ext. Training centre	15.00	3.00	3.00	3.45	3.00	3.00	1.99	3.00	4.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	15.00	16.00	15.44
13.	Communication Cell	45.00	4.00	4.00	4.22	4.00	4.00	4.23	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00	28.33	38.00	38.00	56.78
14.	Assistance to C.A.P.A.R.T.	60.00	12.00	12.00	6.00	12.00	12.00	12.00	13.00	13.00	13.00	13.00	13.00	13.00	30.00	30.00	30.00	80.00	80.00	74.00
15.	Promotion of Voluntary Scheme	115.00	10.00	10.00	1.55	20.00	20.00	19.54	26.00	13.00	13.00	13.00	13.00	13.00	0.00	0.00	69.00	56.00	47.09	74.00
16.	Organisation of Beneficiaries	15.97	3.50	3.50	0.50	3.50	3.00	1.75	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	2.00	2.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	15.00	12.5	8.25
17.	Panchayat Development and Training	10.00	3.00	3.00	3.01	3.00	2.00	1.79	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	5.00	10.50	8.77	17.0	21.50	19.57
18.	Roads in Special Problem Areas	2.00	2.00	2.00	1.02	1.50	0.00	0.00	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.05	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	4.50	2.55	1.52
19.	Agricultural Marketing	0.00	7.25	7.25	5.78	7.25	7.25	4.12	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	14.50	14.50	9.90
20.	Monitoring Mechanism	5.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.50	0.50	0.59	2.00	2.00	2.00	5.00	5.00	4.50	10.00	10.00	8.92	17.5	17.5	16.01
21.	Information Technology	0.00													0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00
22.	International Cooperation	0.00													0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00
23.	Pradhan Mantri Gram Sadak Yojana											2500.00	2500.00	2435.00	2500.00	2500.00	2500.00	5000.00	5000.00	4935.00
Total—Rural Dev. (including PMGSY)		32869.87	7174.20	6578.16	6692.16	7858.50	7478.44	7476.43	7517.00	7220.00	7216.70	9260.00	8869.55	8480.12	9205.00	10606.60	10569.81	41014.70	40752.65	40435.22

APPENDIX II

STATEMENT SHOWING BUDGET ESTIMATE, REVISED ESTIMATE, ACTUAL EXPENDITURE, PLAN OUTLAY, OUTLAY AGREED TO BY PLANNING COMMISSION, TOTAL RELEASES DURING 10TH FIVE YEAR PLAN AND THE OUTLAY PROPOSED FOR 2004-05 BY THE DEPARTMENT OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT

(Rs. in crore)

Sl.No.	Name of the Scheme	10th Plan			2002-03			2003-04			2004-05		
		Proposed outlay	Outlay agreed to by Plg. Commn.	Total release (upto 15.7.04) in the 10th Plan	B.E.	R.E.	Actual Expenditure	B.E.	R.E.	Actual Expenditure	Outlay proposed	B.E.	Actual Expenditure upto 15.7.2004
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
1.	Sampoorna Grameen Rozgar Yojana	48538.00	30000.00	22449.89	4440.00	9086.00	9085.93	4900.00	10130.00	10129.93	6700.00	5100.00	3234.03
2.	Food for Work Programme	—	—	785.18	600.00	860.00	785.18	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
3.	Swarnjayanti Gram Swarozgar Yojana	9850.00	3955.00	1986.99	710.00	710.00	706.04	800.00	800.00	797.55	1200.00	1000.00	483.40
4.	DRDA Administration	1586.27	1100.00	524.14	220.00	220.00	199.19	220.00	220.00	220.00	250.00	230.00	104.95
5.	Rural Housing—Indira Awaas Yojana	13040.00	8603.00	4832.42	1725.00	1725.00	1693.14	1900.00	1900.00	1899.50	3460.00	2500.00	1239.78
6.	N.I.R.D.	35.00	40.00	14.15	5.00	5.00	5.45	6.00	6.00	6.00	11.00	9.00	2.70

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
7.	Training	315.00	150.00	60.94	20.00	20.00	18.02	39.00	39.00	39.84	60.60	24.40	3.08
8.	Assistance to C.A.P.A.R.T.	250.00	200.00	101.67	30.00	30.00	30.00	50.00	50.00	50.00	80.00	65.00	21.67
9.	Information, Education & Communication	500.00	100.00	24.86	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.50	20.00	20.00	4.36
10.	Monitoring Mechanism	350.00	100.00	27.96	10.00	10.00	10.24	20.00	20.00	15.83	25.00	20.00	1.89
11.	Pradhan Mantri Gram Sadak Yojana	55000.00	12500.00	4958.60	2500.00	2500.00	2500.00	2325.00	2325.00	2328.60	3920.00	2468.00	130.00
12.	Provision for Urban Amenities in Rural Areas	—	—	5.78	—	—	—	0.00	0.00	5.78	0.00	1.00	0.00
	Total—Rural Development	129464.27	56748.00	35772.58	10270.00	15176.00	15043.19	10270.00	15500.00	15503.53	15726.60	11437.40	5225.86

APPENDIX V

ALLOCATION AND RELEASE TO NORTH EASTERN AREA UNDER VARIOUS PROGRAMMES OF DEPARTMENT OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT

(Rs. in Lakh)

Name of the State	2000-2001		2001-2002		2002-2003		2003-2004		2004-2005	
	Central Allocation	Release	Central Allocation	Release	Central Allocation	Release	Central Allocation	Release	Central Allocation	Release upto 30.6.2004
Arunachal Pradesh	10637.58	8729.58	10506.53	9323.98	11015.9	10416.82	11202.41	7552.58	11834.24	4058.48
Assam	67907.41	31752.69	66404.87	59147.56	59855.28	50326.74	67954.81	75275.8	76103.87	32108.61
Manipur	9572.51	6396.1	9445.4	6974.43	9331.16	2733.84	7514.2	4158.51	7972.85	1829.02
Meghalaya	9735.86	7847.18	9264.12	8458.32	8755.42	9418.73	9765.47	5044.68	10192.23	986.39
Mizoram	5267.11	4991.37	5184.62	6272.75	5635	9484.76	5166.32	5759.47	4870.68	1525.58
Nagaland	7307.78	6205.03	7414.62	8170.38	7623.50	7537.21	8277.23	8228.55	6756.61	1927.97
Sikkim	3824.76	2989.1	4007.45	4227.01	3526.15	3612.48	3840.71	4142.66	3686.59	573.16
Tripura	10486.32	10489.94	10876.75	12382.33	9367.24	11969.58	10242.08	8251.64	11320.39	4818.13
Total	124739.33	79400.99	123104.36	114956.76	107486.15	105500.16	123963.23	118414	127866.78	47827.34

APPENDIX VI

FINANCIAL AND PHYSICAL PROGRESS UNDER SGSY DURING 2003-04

Sl.No.	States/U.Ts.	Till Month	Self-Help Groups			No. of Activities Taken-up	Members Covered under SHGs	Number of Individual Swarozgaris Assisted	Total Swarozgaris Assisted (7 + 8)	Coverage of Disadvantaged Groups							
			Group Formed since April, 99	No. of SHGs Passed Grade-I	No. of SHGs Passed Grade-II					(Numbers)				(Percentage)			
										Scheduled Castes	Scheduled Tribes	Women	Handicapped	Scheduled Castes	Scheduled Tribes	Women	Handicapped
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
1.	Andhra Pradesh	2	464673	36888	26463	4385	55974	12802	68776	23383	5688	55559	1310	34.00	8.27	80.78	1.902
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	2	198			4	114	398	512		512	124		0.00	100.00	24.22	0.00
3.	Assam	2	98502	12710	4350	2141	24613	566	25179	2822	4943	14770	247	11.21	19.63	58.66	0.98
4.	Bihar	1	43929	7347	2111	1703	12440	74406	86846	28130	1683	19385	248	32.39	1.94	22.32	0.29
5.	Chhattisgarh	2	45330	1514	351	235	1738	6556	8294	1178	3355	1302	42	14.20	40.45	15.70	0.51
6.	Goa	2	446	36	3	5	47	253	300	37	0	99	3	12.33	0.00	33.00	1.00
7.	Gujarat	2	111255	5105	3168	517	4607	13160	17767	3135	5495	6679	304	17.65	30.93	37.59	1.71
8.	Haryana	2	7183	1086	777	703	7359	3033	10392	4621	0	6232	80	44.47	0.00	59.97	0.77
9.	Himachal Pradesh	2	5876	484	372	423	3546	1253	4799	1887	545	2820	60	39.32	11.36	58.76	1.25
10.	Jammu & Kashmir	2	7276	414	63	368	2683	2867	5550	229	867	2297	3	4.13	15.62	41.39	0.05

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
11.	Jharkhand	2	17580	1487	326	786	10550	16123	26673	4385	12123	8975	224	16.44	45.45	33.65	0.84
12.	Karnataka	2	33562	2772	1833	1709	23766	3559	27325	8124	2306	23368	154	29.73	8.44	85.52	0.56
13.	Kerala	2	47389	6766	2884	915	9814	4736	14550	5164	388	11218	244	35.49	2.67	77.10	1.68
14.	Madhya Pradesh	2	254885	14139	5801	3000	25501	4644	30145	8061	8874	11632	170	26.74	29.44	38.59	0.56
15.	Maharashtra	2	104971	8948	4232	2571	27681	10327	38008	12314	7375	24169	462	32.40	19.40	63.59	1.22
16.	Manipur		NR						0								
17.	Meghalaya	2	2850	340	204	178	2296	557	2853	2	2851	1354	0	0.07	99.93	47.46	0.00
18.	Mizoram	2	1150	95	72	206	297	51	348	0	348	116	4	0.00	100.00	33.33	1.15
19.	Nagaland	8	754	129	26	50	1873	1663	3536		3536	744	2	0.00	100.00	21.04	0.06
20.	Orissa	2	109345	8122	3549	2663	31572	14670	46242	10643	15114	29763	237	23.02	32.68	64.36	0.51
21.	Punjab	2	2407	130	48	228	2462	2771	5233	3158	0	2925	92	60.35	0.00	55.90	1.76
22.	Rajasthan	2	23092	1010	375	209	2559	12863	15422	4956	2405	6805	85	32.14	15.59	44.13	0.55
23.	Sikkim	2	509	53	18	18	207	1225	1432	100	644	364	4	6.98	44.97	25.42	0.28
24.	Tamil Nadu	2	130218	20359	5244	3225	56103	1682	57785	21388	1065	56270	998	37.01	1.84	97.38	1.73

NR : Not Reported.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
25.	Tripura	2	18151	1316	163	1053	228	5405	5633	1068	2065	1944	11	18.96	36.66	34.51	0.20
26.	Uttar Pradesh	2	353791	26923	11299	8244	97966	15711	113677	52256	854	33914	733	45.97	0.75	29.83	0.64
27.	Uttaranchal	2	18030	2340	1201	797	7690	138	7828	1961	346	3999	2	25.05	4.42	51.09	0.03
28.	West Bengal	2	73033	10402	1711	883	9179	11942	21121	4550	517	9194	9	21.54	2.45	43.53	0.04
29.	A&N Islands	2	163	2	10	10	341	9	350		119	143		0.00	34.00	40.86	0.00
30.	Daman & Diu	10	0						0								
31.	D & N Haveli	2	54					91	91	10	81	39		0.11	8.10	0.48	0.00
32.	Lakshadweep	2	1	1			1	24	25		25	10	1	0.00	100.00	40.00	4.00
33.	Pondicherry	1	1124	23	13	38	668		668	378		668		56.59	0.00	100.00	0.00
TOTAL			1977727	170941	76667	37267	423875	223485	647360	203940	84124	336881	5729	31.50	12.99	52.04	0.88

FINANCIAL PROGRESS UNDER SGSY DURING 2003-04
As on 31.3.2004

(Rs. in Lakh)

Sl.	States/U.T.	Till Month	Opening Balance As on 1.4.2003	Central Alloca- tion	State Alloca- tion	Total Alloca- tion	Centrl Releases	State Release	Misc. receipts	Total Funds Available	Utilisation	%age of Utilisation	Total Credit Target	Total Credit Disbursed	(in % age) Credit Disbursed
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
1.	Andhra Pradesh	2	326.25	4238.88	1412.96	5651.84	3942.42	1014.98	264.51	5548.16	4973.47	89.64	11620.10	8319.71	71.60
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	2	84.82	221.53	73.84	295.37	139.77	30.66	2.19	257.44	87.57	34.02	537.59	52.37	9.74
3.	Assam	2	1100.65	5756.15	1918.72	7674.87	5313.00	17.06	2003.86	8434.57	4210.13	49.92	14159.90	2102.86	14.85
4.	Bihar	1	7453.49	10084.97	3361.66	13446.63	5488.81	1279.10	779.26	15000.66	8272.05	55.14	27392.77	13620.91	49.72
5.	Chattisgarh	2	36.54	2238.84	746.28	2985.12	2025.44	535.35	69.71	2667.05	1592.23	59.70	6033.70	1985.02	32.90
6.	Goa	2	57.72	50.00	16.67	66.67	25.00	5.88	1.61	90.21	44.14	48.93	140.80	51.59	36.64
7.	Gujarat	2	248.69	1595.58	531.86	2127.44	1508.00	498.12	21.20	2276.01	2036.45	89.47	4372.65	2657.57	60.78
8.	Haryana	2	10.90	938.70	312.90	1251.60	932.06	296.60	172.05	1411.61	1272.81	90.17	3537.27	2137.06	60.42
9.	Himachal Pradesh	2	77.77	395.33	131.78	527.11	304.77	103.85	41.97	528.36	395.42	74.84	2244.90	1135.20	50.57
10.	Jammu & Kashmir	2	164.10	489.27	163.09	652.36	427.45	155.65	31.33	778.53	432.91	55.61	3113.25	1453.55	46.69

8

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
11.	Jharkhand	2	853.63	3801.08	1267.03	5068.11	2817.41	537.80	68.23	4277.07	1890.43	44.20	9344.58	413.16	4.42
12.	Karnataka	2	1001.64	3200.94	1066.98	4267.92	2777.12	533.49	21.71	4333.96	3105.94	71.67	8604.01	4337.86	50.42
13.	Kerala	2	81.73	1436.25	478.75	1915.00	1435.18	472.61	27.12	2016.64	1498.88	74.33	3891.38	1784.17	45.85
14.	Madhya Pradesh	2	669.61	4799.65	1599.88	6399.53	4397.14	1172.25	286.88	6525.88	5121.94	78.49	13270.65	6645.56	50.08
15.	Maharashtra	2	799.20	6327.49	2109.16	8436.65	5712.39	1538.75	504.86	8555.20	5765.27	67.39	16512.58	6277.36	38.02
16.	Manipur			385.88	128.63	514.51	56.75		0.00	56.75			926.11	0.00	
17.	Meghalaya	2	227.18	432.33	144.11	576.44	117.12	9.16	2.01	355.47	107.07	30.12	1055.97	178.81	16.93
18.	Mizoram	2	4.60	100.04	33.35	133.39	99.96	15.69	0.00	120.25	81.39	67.68	247.12	16.86	6.82
19.	Nagaland	8	39.93	296.58	98.86	395.44	157.80	60.00	0.03	257.76	105.63	40.98	719.16	22.20	3.09
20.	Orissa	2	-77.62	4848.38	1616.13	6464.51	4553.07	808.06	7.62	5291.13	4769.66	90.14	11121.59	5257.66	47.27
21.	Punjab	2	12.49	456.20	152.07	608.27	444.25	96.80	90.54	644.08	537.84	83.51	1539.49	1108.99	72.04
22.	Rajasthan	2	931.15	2430.60	810.20	3240.80	2261.24	573.67	90.88	3856.94	1849.70	47.96	8207.50	4368.66	53.23
23.	Sikkim	2	10.42	110.76	36.92	147.68	110.76	60.00	18.62	199.80	143.93	72.04	294.90	143.58	48.69

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
24.	Tamil Nadu	2	346.59	3748.10	1249.37	4997.47	3690.70	975.31	250.29	5262.89	4957.40	94.20	7332.16	3311.56	45.16
25.	Tripura	2	33.47	696.73	232.24	928.97	696.74	232.24	21.33	983.78	817.63	83.11	1978.87	1451.56	73.35
26.	Uttar Pradesh	2	8874.08	14518.73	4839.58	19358.31	11756.85	1768.13	371.35	22770.41	15605.65	68.53	37055.07	15021.29	40.54
27.	Uttaranchal	2	239.76	763.00	254.33	1017.33	686.02	200.97	62.20	1188.95	1006.92	84.69	3436.29	1028.78	NR
28.	West Bengal	2	4346.82	5388.01	1796.00	7184.01	2617.59	659.54	379.54	8003.49	4103.16	51.27	13778.51	2686.18	19.50
29.	A&N Islands	2	26.33	50.00		50.00	0.00		0.94	27.27	4.21	15.44	90.08	0.00	0.00
30.	Daman & Diu	10	64.42	50.00		50.00	0.00		0.00	64.42		0.00	90.00	0.00	0.00
31.	D & N Haveli	2	6.05	50.00		50.00	0.00		0.00	6.05	4.15	0.00	90.00	8.68	
32.	Lakshadweep	2	45.83	50.00		50.00	0.00		1.61	47.44	2.43	5.12	90.34	6.10	6.75
33.	Pondicherry	1	8.71	50.00		50.00	25.00		11.50	45.21	44.50	98.43	103.48	62.24	60.15
	TOTAL		28106.96	80000.00	26583.33	106583.33	64519.81	13651.72	5604.95	111883.43	74840.91	66.89	212932.77	87647.10	41.16%
	Other Schemes						15235.19								
	GRAND TOTAL						79755.00								

NR : Not Reported