



**STANDING COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE  
(2002)**

**THIRTEENTH LOK SABHA**

**MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE  
(DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH & EDUCATION)**

**DEMANDS FOR GRANTS  
(2002-2003)**

**{Action Taken by the Government on the Recommendations/  
Observations contained in the Thirty First Report of the  
Standing Committee on Agriculture (2002)}**

**THIRTY SIXTH REPORT**

**LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT**

**December, 2002/Agrahayana, 1924 (Saka)**

## **CONTENTS**

### COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE

### INTRODUCTION)

- CHAPTER I            Report
- CHAPTER II        Recommendations/Observations, which have been accepted by the Government
- CHAPTER III        Recommendations/Observations which the Committee do not desire to pursue in view of the Government's replies
- CHAPTER IV        Recommendations/Observations in respect of which replies of the Government have not been accepted by the Committee
- CHAPTER V        Recommendations/Observations in respect of which final replies of the Government are still awaited.

## APPENDICES

- I.        Minutes of the sitting of the Committee held on 17<sup>th</sup> December, 2002.  
          .
- II.       Analysis of Action Taken by Government on the Recommendations contained in the Thirty First Report of the Standing Committee on Agriculture (2002).

## **COMPOSITION OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE (2002)**

**Shri S.S. Palanimanickam - Chairman**

### **LOK SABHA**

2. Shri Ram Tahal Chaudhari
3. Shri Shivraj Singh Chouhan
4. Shri Thawar Chand Gehlot
5. Shri Chintaman Wanaga
6. Shri Ramdas Rupala Gavit
7. Shri Y.G. Mahajan
8. Shri M. Master Mathan
9. Shri Rampal Singh
10. Shri Tejveer Singh
11. Smt. Prabha Rau
12. Shri Bhaskar Rao Patil
13. Shri Tarachand Shivaji Patel
14. Shri Lakshman Singh
15. Smt. Rama Pilot
16. Shri Adhir Chowdhary
17. Shri Abul Hasnat Khan
18. Shri Mahboob Zahedi
19. Shri N.R.K. Reddy
20. Shri Ambati Brahmaniah
21. Prof. S.P. Singh Baghel
22. Shri Chandra Bhushan Singh
23. Shri Bhalchandra Yadav
24. Shri Anant Gudhe
25. Shri Daud Ahmad
26. Shri Raghunath Jha
27. Shri Surinder Singh Barwala
28. Shri Tarlochan Singh Tur
29. Shri Bhan Singh Bhaura
- @ 30. Shri Ramjiwan Singh

### **RAJYA SABHA**

31. Dr.A.R. Kidwai
32. Shri Oscar Fernandes
33. Smt. Jamana Devi Barupal
34. Shri M. Rajashekara Murthy
35. Chaudhary Harmohan Singh Yadav
36. Shri R. Kamaraj
37. Shri R.S. Gavai
38. Shri Rao Man Singh
- \$ 39. Shri Sukhbir Singh Badal
- + 40. Shri Datta Meghe
- % 41. Shri Sudershan Akarapu
- \*42. Prof. R.B.S.Varma
43. Vacant
44. Vacant
45. Vacant

### **SECRETARIAT**

- |                           |   |                      |
|---------------------------|---|----------------------|
| 1. Sh. P.D.T. Achary      | - | Additional Secretary |
| 2. Sh. S.K. Sharma        | - | Joint Secretary      |
| 3. Sh. Raj Shekhar Sharma | - | Deputy Secretary     |
| 4. Shri Hardev Singh      | - | Under Secretary      |

---

\$ Shri SukhbirSingh Badal has been nominated to this Committee w.e.f. 28.3.2002.  
Sardar Balvinder Singh Bhundar has resigned from Rajya Sabha w.e.f. 7.3.2002.  
Shri Suryabhan Patil Vahadane has retired from Rajya Sabha w.e.f. 2.4.2002.  
Shri Balwant Singh Ramoowalia ceased to be the Member of this Committee owing to his nomination to Committee on Tourism w.e.f. 2.4.2002.

@ Shri Ramjiwan Singh has been nominated to this Committee w.e.f. 19.4.2002  
+ Shri Datta Meghe has been nominated to this Committee w.e.f. 22.4.2002  
% Shri Sudershan Akarapu has been nominated to this Committee w.e.f. 2.5.2002.  
Shri Kailash Joshi has resigned from this Committee w.e.f. 28.6.2002  
\*Prof. R.B.S. Varma has been nominated to this Committee w.e.f. 2.8.2002.  
Shri Sharief-Ud-Din Shariq, has resigned from the membership of Rajya Sabha w.e.f. 26.10.2002  
Shri. Gandhi Azad and Sh. Devi Prasad Singh both retired from Rajya Sabha w.e.f. 25.11.2002

## INTRODUCTION

I, the Chairman of the Standing Committee on Agriculture (2002) having been authorised by the Committee to submit the Report on their behalf, present this Thirty Sixth Report on Action Taken by Government on the recommendations/observations contained in the 31<sup>st</sup> Report of the Standing Committee on Agriculture (2002) on Demands for Grants (2002-2003) of the Ministry of Agriculture (Department of Agricultural Research & Education).

2. The Thirty First Report of the Standing Committee on Agriculture (2002) on Demands for Grants (2002-2003) of the Ministry of Agriculture (Department of Agricultural Research & Education) was presented to Lok Sabha on 23.04.2002 and laid in Rajya Sabha on 24.04.2002. The Ministry of Agriculture (Department of Agricultural Research & Education) was requested to furnish action taken replies of the Government to recommendations contained in the Thirty First Report. The replies of the Government to all the recommendations contained in the Report were received.

3. The Committee considered the action taken replies furnished by the Government, approved the draft comments and adopted the Thirty Sixth Report at their sitting held on 17.12.2002. Minutes of the sittings are placed in Appendix-I.

4. An analysis of the Action Taken by the Government on the recommendations/observations contained in the Thirty First Report (13<sup>th</sup> Lok Sabha) of the Committee is given in Appendix-II

NEW DELHI  
17 December, 2002  
26 Agrahayana, 1924(Saka)

**S.S PALANIMANICKAM**  
Chairman  
Standing Committee on Agriculture.

## CHAPTER I

### **REPORT**

This Report of the Committee on Agriculture deals with the action taken by the Government on recommendations contained in the Thirty First Report (Thirteenth Lok Sabha) of the Standing Committee on Agriculture (2002) on Demands for Grants (2002-2003) of the Ministry of Agriculture (Department of Agricultural Research and Education) which was presented to the Lok Sabha on 23 April 2002 and laid in Rajya Sabha on 24 April 2002.

1.2 Action taken replies have been received from the Government in respect of all the 12 recommendations contained in the Report. These have been categorized as follows:-

- (i) Recommendations/Observations that have been accepted by the Government (Chapter - II of the Report)

Recommendation Sl. Nos. 5,7,10 and 12 (Total 4)

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

Recommendation Sl. Nos.3 and 8 (Total 2)

- (iii) Recommendations/Observations in respect of which replies of the Government have not been accepted by the Committee (Chapter - IV of the Report)

Recommendation Sl. No. 4 (Total 1)

- (iv) Recommendations/Observations in respect of which final replies of the Government are still awaited (Chapter - V of the Report)

Recommendation Sl. Nos. 1,2,6,9 and 11 (Total 5)

1.3 The Committee will now deal with the action taken by the Government on some of their recommendations:

## **IXth Plan and Xth Plan (Ist year) allocation to DARE - An analysis**

### **Recommendation No.1**

1.4 The Committee had noted that the Department of Agricultural Research and Education (DARE) was given 0.53% of Central Plan Outlay as Budgetary allocation for the IXth Plan. On the recommendations of the Committee that allocation was enhanced to 0.69% of the Central Plan outlay in the middle of the Plan period. After the completion of the IXth Plan, the Committee found that the allocation was 0.50% of the Central Plan outlay as BE and 0.46% of the Central Plan outlay as RE. The expenditure by the Department had, however, been approximately 99.00% of the RE.

The Committee had further observed that in the Ist year of the Xth Plan the Department had got 0.53% of the Central Plan Outlay.

The figures reflected the very low priority given to Agricultural Research. Budgetary allocations were stagnant at 0.53% of the Central Plan Outlay whereas the actual allocations were below 0.50% of the Central Plan Outlay.

The Committee had tried to assess the position with regard to Agricultural Gross Domestic Product (AGDP). They were surprised to note that DARE's BE allocations had been between 0.16% - 0.27% of AGDP at current prices from 1996-97 to 1997-2000.

The Committee had been constantly making an effort to secure budgetary provisions to the tune of at least 1% of AGDP for Agricultural Research. The Committee once again had requested the Planning Commission and Ministry of Finance to provide higher allocations to this Department.

1.5 The Government in their reply have stated that the recommendation of the Committee has been brought to the notice of Ministry of Finance and Planning Commission requesting them to enhance the first year of Tenth Plan's (2002-03) outlay to 1% of AGDP. The Ministry of Finance have informed that they have little role in it since the Plan allocations are made by the Planning Commission. The Planning Commission informed that the Department's Annual Plan (2002-03) outlay had been increased by 13.3% over the previous year's allocation. The Department subsequently requested the Planning Commission that keeping the Committee's positive recommendation in view, the Annual Plan (2002-03) outlay should be raised to 1% of AGDP.

### **Comments of the Committee**

1.6 The Committee note that the Department had approached the Planning Commission for raising the Annual Plan (2002-03) outlay to 1% of AGDP. The efforts of the Department have brought in partial success. The Committee expect the Department to vigorously impress upon the Planning Commission to raise the outlay to 1% of AGDP so that the work pertaining to agricultural research does not suffer due to lack of funds.

## **DARE/ICAR fails to come up with concrete proposals for higher allocations**

### **Recommendation No.2**

1.7 The Committee had observed that DARE/ICAR were given Rs.684.00 crore as BE and the same amount as RE for their Plan Outlay during 2001-02. The Plan Outlay (BE) for 2002-03 had been increased to Rs.775.00 crore and this increase was 13.3% over BE/RE 2001-02. According to the Department, 2002-03 being the first year of the Xth Plan, approval of EFCs and subsequent implementation of approved programmes might take some time. The Department would be carrying out their ongoing activities and meeting some immediate requirements, till then. Hence, the Department would be in need of enhanced funds in second and subsequent years of Xth Plan. There was, therefore, no immediate requirement of funds to the Department in the year 2002-2003.

On the requirement of higher allocations for the 2<sup>nd</sup> to 5<sup>th</sup> years of the Xth Plan, the Planning Commission had assured that, “..... it would always support DARE’s/ICAR’s good projects irrespective of ceilings, even if they were beyond any stipulated limit. Good projects and schemes will never be allowed to suffer for want of funds.....”

The Committee had during evidence on 27 March 2002, requested the Secretary, DARE to furnish a written note giving those projects which were good but rejected by Planning Commission or the Ministry of Finance to enable the Committee to take up the matter at the appropriate level for additional funding. The Department had given the following four core areas of agricultural research and education which immensely needed higher budget allocations during 2002-03:

- |  |   |              |
|--|---|--------------|
| 1. Agricultural Biotechnology                          | - | Rs.300 crore |
| 2. Bio-diversity                                       | - | Rs. 70 crore |
| 3. Biosystematics and Pest Disease and Weed Management | - | Rs. 50 crore |
| 4. First Rate Human Resource Development               | - | Rs.100 crore |

According to the Department, all these projects were new and none of them had been rejected for funding.

The Committee felt that the Department did not project the correct picture to the Committee. Year after year, the Department approached the Planning Commission for rounds of discussions before the Annual Budget and finally came up with a meagre increase. The Department had never felt the need to express their difficulties before the Committee before the Budget was passed. Only at the examination of Demands for Grants stage the Department had put forth their difficulties. By that time the damage was already done.

The Committee had observed that the Department could not give details of a single such rejected project with reasons of rejection and instead had submitted a vague new proposal which was devoid of details, demanding for additional funds to the tune of about Rs.520 crore during 2002-03 for four core projects. The Committee deplored the lack of genuine efforts on the part of the Department, which had failed miserably to come up with concrete/good proposals/projects for getting higher allocations from the Planning Commission and Ministry of Finance, which were more than ready to support all good projects of DARE/ICAR. The Committee urged upon the Department to prepare viable and concrete proposals which were essential for the Agricultural growth and bring forth such proposals before the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Agriculture, Planning Commission and Ministry of Finance. Similarly, the Committee desired that the Department should restructure and modify their ongoing projects to the present day need



of the nation and present such viable modified plans before the Planning Commission for getting higher allocations for the same and apprise the Committee about the outcome from time to time.

1.8 The Government in their reply have stated that as per the existing instructions of the Ministry of Finance/Planning Commission, the Department could submit only those proposals for which the funding availability is first firmed up; then and only then these two agencies were expected to appraise such projects including new initiatives. The Department had already proposed a number of new initiatives through Xth Plan proposals. It is noteworthy that the four core areas, under reference, have already been reflected in various components of the Xth Plan proposals. The Department had even proposed a lump-sum amount of Rs.1,217.58 crore for the proposed new initiatives including pipeline projects, which the Department felt necessary during the course of Xth Plan. The Department, with Annual Plan (2002-03) outlay of Rs.775 crore as allocated by Planning Commission, could only sustain the existing (ongoing) schemes/ projects. It is not possible to take up capital-intensive ventures in the first year of the Xth Plan without adequate funding. It is pertinent to mention here that the Department had submitted proposals for Annual Plan (2002-03) to the tune of Rs.1,500 crore along with the requirement of Rs.200 crore as Catch-up Grant against which only Rs.775 crore had been provided. This Catch up Grant is needed for renovation and modernization of age - old infrastructure including replacement of obsolete equipment and other research facilities. The Department would be submitting the core areas' projects to the Planning Commission after the fund availability is firmed up in accordance with financial projections. In this regard, the Department is taking up the matter with the Planning Commission at the highest level of the Department.

The need-based modifications and restructuring the existing schemes have been attempted by the Department in consultation with the Planning Commission through Zero Based Budgeting Exercise and some schemes outliving the utility have been identified for phasing out/integration/merger etc.

#### **Comments of the Committee**

1.9 The Committee note that as per the existing instructions of the Ministry of Finance/ Planning Commission only those proposals for which funding availability is first firmed up, are considered and thereafter the projects are appraised by these two agencies. The Department have informed that they would be submitting the Core Areas projects to the Planning Commission after the fund availability is firmed up in accordance with the financial projections. The Committee deplores the casual attitude of the Department in failing to firm up the availability of funds from the Planning Commission for the Core Areas projects before submitting the proposals, as required under the existing instructions of the Ministry of Finance/ Planning Commission.

The Committee also feel that their renovation and modernization of old infrastructure and replacement of obsolete equipment is absolutely essential. They, therefore, desire that the matter regarding a separate 'Catch up Grant' required for the purpose must be pursued with the Planning Commission at the highest level so that the needful is done at the earliest after the grant is given.

#### **Plan Allocations to DARE for the year 2002-2003**

#### **Recommendation No.4**

1.10 The Committee were informed that the DARE had been allocated Rs.775.00 crore under Plan Head for the year 2002-2003 which was a 13% rise over the Plan allocations for the year 2001-2002. That 13%, in the view of the Department was a substantial increase in the first year of the Xth Plan although it worked out to be only 45.6% of the demand placed by the Department before the Planning Commission.

The Committee were informed that the four core areas of agricultural research and education themselves required funding to the tune of Rs.520 crore for the year 2002-2003. This in addition to Rs.775 crore, would make it possible to do effective research or else DARE would be finding it difficult even to sustain what research had been done in the Ninth Plan. The Department had requested for an allocation of Rs.1,100-1,200 crore for the year 2002-2003.

The Committee were of the opinion that the DARE were making tall claims towards research and the expenditure of allocations towards research. The DARE had found it difficult to explain the reasons of having funds parked in the bank accounts of its autonomous bodies. Although the DARE had no surpluses to surrender to the Government, it had good financial practices to account for expenditure. The DARE had always evaluated research through expenditure of funds and as expressed by the Department itself major expenditure heads in Plan Budget were consumables, operative expenses, telephone charges etc. but very little research. In this scenario, the inflationary addition to Plan allocations of the previous year were sufficient.

The Committee had, therefore, recommended that it was not too late for the Department to have an intensive look into its system in order to take corrective measures and come up with concrete proposals for more funds for research.

1.11 The Government in their reply have stated that under the non plan, it is once again reiterated that the balance of Rs.330.36 crore, 270.40 crore and Rs.223 crore on 31 March during the years 2001, 2000 and 1999 respectively in various bank accounts was the closing balance with the various Institutions of Indian Council of Agricultural Research including its Headquarters. Since ICAR is an autonomous organization it does not bank with treasury and maintains its own bank accounts and will not be in a position to pay the salary for the month of March on 1 April every year in the absence of closing balance as the Government grant is generally drawn after 15 April. Hence the closing balance shown above includes the amount meant for the salary for the month of March payable on 1 April. In addition to above, the closing balance includes the amount pertaining to Deposit Schemes for which the funds are remitted by the sponsoring agencies for the entire project period. Similar is the case for ad-hoc schemes. The closing balance also includes a very small amount of other miscellaneous resources of the Council, which are required to be utilized in the following year. The amount deducted from the salaries of the employees but not remitted to the concerned offices/agency/Department is also included in the closing balance until it is finally remitted to the concerned Department/Agency/Office. Further, it also includes the amount drawn from the Government but not utilized during the year and is refunded to Government in the next financial year after finalization of annual accounts. This amount of closing balance is not the surplus amount with the Council. The Department will however take steps to further reduce the surplus funds in the banks.

As recommended by the Committee, the Department will have an intensive look into its system in order to take corrective measures.

### **Comments of the Committee**

**1.12 The Committee are disappointed to note that the Department have yet to initiate action for an intensive look into the system in order to take corrective measures even after a lapse of more than nine months from the date of presentation of the original Report. The Committee desire that an immediate action should be initiated and complete proposals for more funds for research should be submitted to the concerned Department(s) and the Committee apprised of the same at the earliest.**

### **Viability of Projects and Funding**

#### **Recommendation No.6**

1.13 The ICAR was a research institution. Research projects were open ended in nature and could not be calculated like a mathematical problem. Therefore, the validity of a research project could be ascertained only after results were achieved. The Committee felt that sound proposals and valid projects that the Planning Commission looked for in the ICAR were those, which could apparently convince the Planning Commission members of results. Hence, the ability of the scientists in ICAR to convince also was of paramount importance.

The Committee had suggested that the DARE should make greater efforts and devise methods of convincing the members of the Planning Commission about the obsolete equipments, age old infrastructure, high costs of maintenance etc to get the one time catch up grant for which they were trying for a very long time. The Committee had suggested that the ICAR would do well in sending some of their scientists who were involved in the budgetary process for short-term courses with financial institutions to help them to present their point of view correctly and effectively to the Planning Commission.

1.14 The Department in reply have stated that they are pursuing with the Planning Commission to get funds as 'Catch up Grant' to replace obsolete equipments, age-old infrastructure and other research facilities. Further, the Department have taken note of the recommendations and would send some of the scientists to the financial institutions for short term training courses.

#### **Comments of the Committee**

**1.15 The Committee note that the Department has taken up the matter to get funds as 'Catch up Grant' from the Planning Commission. Since the grant has not been received so far, the Committee reiterate that the Department should make persistent efforts with the Planning Commission to get the grant sanctioned so that obsolete equipments could be replaced and the infrastructure and other research facilities upgraded. A time bound programme for acquainting the scientists involved in the budgetary process of the schemes/projects of ICAR may also be drawn up to help them present their point of view correctly and effectively to the Planning Commission.**

### **Work Analysis of ICAR**

#### **Recommendation No.7**

1.16 The Committee found from the reply of ICAR that it was not prepared to appoint an independent body outside the Government's domain to undertake an evaluation of the worth of the research of a scientist as compared to the expenditure that the Government was incurring on him. The QRTs, PME's and the RAC's are inbuilt systems of the

ICAR. These bodies being manned by functionaries of the system itself were likely to be subjected to internal pressures in reviewing their independent findings to suit the management. Apart from this factor, those people were not specialised into the kind and quality of analysis the Committee expect.

The Committee were firm on their opinion that the ICAR should appoint an independent body, e.g. Private Consultancy Services or the like, which were specialised in the field of manpower analysis, to make a detailed study on the quantum of research which had actually translated into enhancing the production and productivity, quality, etc. with the expenditure made by the Department on the Scientists taking into account all other parameters like level of satisfaction, working conditions, human relations, period taken to come out with the research, etc.

One year had already elapsed since the Committee had recommended for such action and ICAR were still in the nascent stage of decision making. The Committee had, therefore, impressed upon the ICAR to act fast, with speed and alacrity and put before the Committee a report before the next budget.

1.17 The Government in their reply have stated that the Department is going ahead to get the evaluation of research work done through an independent body. A proposal given by the National Productivity Council is under examination by the Department.

### **Comments of the Committee**

**1.18 The Committee are disappointed to note that even after a lapse of more than two years, the Department are still in the process of having the work analysis of ICAR done. The Committee desire that the proposals submitted by the National Productivity Council and other Institutes may be examined urgently and the evaluation work done on priority basis. The outcome of such evaluation should be reported to the Committee within a period of three months of the presentation of this Report.**

### **No Visible Progress seen in Disposal of Pending/Fresh Vigilance and Disciplinary Cases**

#### **Recommendation No.9**

1.19 The Committee had observed that the Department had disposed of 5 Vigilance Cases during 2000-01 and was left with the balance of 20 pending Vigilance and 21 pending Disciplinary Cases by the end of March 2001. The position of pendency in March 2002 was at 20 Vigilance and 27 Disciplinary cases and during the entire one year, i.e. 2001-02, the Department could dispose of only 3 Vigilance Cases and 15 Disciplinary Cases. Two fresh Vigilance and 11 fresh Disciplinary Cases had been initiated during 2001-02.

The Committee had tried to analyse these figures and found that if 3 Vigilance and 15 Disciplinary Cases disposed of during 2001-02 were subtracted from the balance carried forward in 2001-02, viz 20 pending Vigilance and 21 Disciplinary Cases, they arrived at 17 Vigilance and 6 Disciplinary Cases and if 2 fresh Vigilance and 11 fresh Disciplinary Cases initiated during 2001-02 were added to the balance figures, they arrived at 19 Vigilance and 17 Disciplinary cases. The Department had furnished pendency figures in March 2002 as 20 Vigilance and 27 Disciplinary Cases. So, there was a clear additional difference of 1 Vigilance Case and 10 Disciplinary Cases, which could not be accounted for.

The Committee were perturbed to see the false high claims made by the Department for quicker disposal of pending vigilance and disciplinary cases as there had been practically an increase in the pendency of these cases.

The Committee had, therefore, once again recommended in the interest of the Department that they should evolve a procedure for quicker disposal of pending as well as fresh Vigilance/Disciplinary cases arising in DARE/ICAR within a stipulated period of 2 years.

1.20 The Government in their reply have stated that in so far as disciplinary cases are concerned, as intimated, there were 31 Disciplinary cases pending on 31 March 2001. Out of these pending 31 cases, 15 disciplinary cases were disposed off. These cases were pending for years together for various reasons like non-finalization of inquiry proceedings, non-submission of Inquiry Officer's Report, some procedural infirmities, non-availability of relevant documents, change of Inquiry Officer/Presenting Officer etc.

It is submitted that since disciplinary cases have to go through various time consuming procedures and invite legal litigations, the performance in disposing of 15 disciplinary cases in one year is considered reasonable.

To make the issue clear, the following is submitted.

**Disciplinary cases:-**

- 1) As per the statement, showing pendency, submitted to the Committee, there were 31 disciplinary cases pending on 31 March 2001.
- 2) Out of these 31 pending cases, 15 cases have been disposed of during 2001-02.
- 3) In the meanwhile, 11 new cases were initiated during 2001-02.
- 4) Hence as on 26 March 2002, there are 27 disciplinary cases pending.

In so far as the vigilance cases are concerned, the following is submitted:

**Vigilance Cases:**

- (1). As per the statement, showing pendency, submitted to the Committee, there were 21 vigilance cases pending on 31 March 2001.
- (2). Out of these 21 pending cases, 3 cases have been disposed off.
- (3). In the meanwhile 2 new cases have been initiated during 2001-02.
- (4). Hence as on 26 March 2002, there are 20 disciplinary cases pending.

Incidentally one more vigilance case, out of the new 2 cases as mentioned at (3) above was disposed of during March 2002 itself.

**Comments of the Committee**

**1.21 The Committee note that a number of vigilance/disciplinary cases in DARE/ICAR have been pending for quite some time. The Committee, therefore, desire that a time bound programme may be laid down for disposal of all the pending vigilance/disciplinary cases in DARE/ICAR.**

**World Bank/Externally Aided Projects**

**Recommendation No.10**

1.22 The Committee found that the World Bank/Externally Aided Projects were time-bound programmes and required strict adherence to financial and physical targets. The Committee noted that the total allocation for the IXth Plan was Rs.638.97 crore out of which Rs.460.47 crore were utilised giving a 72.06% of utilisation. Since the projects were time bound, the staff was also contractual for the specific project, releases for which by the Planning Commission were spread on a year-to-year basis.

The Committee had closely studied the reasons given by the Department for not being able to utilize the 100% allocation. One of the reasons was delay in filling up posts and the other related to release of funds, which was less in comparison to requirements.

The Committee were surprised to note that a time bound project was being run in absence of adequate manpower without any adverse impact on the programme. Once the time schedule had expired and the project was not complete, the World Bank or the particular agency would have to be approached for extension of time. Thus, the completion of the project would be at the mercy of the assisting agency. The Committee were aware of such situations wherein the time schedule had expired and extension was not given. Thereafter, the incomplete project suffered because the Government did not come to its rescue and fund that project once the foreign agency withdrew.

The Committee, therefore, recommended that externally aided projects should strictly adhere to the time schedule so that the Planning Commission had no reason to withhold funds.

1.23 The Government in their reply have stated that the matter has been brought to the notice of the Planning Commission requesting that the allocation for externally-aided project need not be clubbed with the annual Budgetary allocation so that the externally-aided projects which are time bound, do not suffer or slow down on account of inadequacy of funds.

In so far as availability of staff is concerned, the Department has made available the required staff by redeployment in phased manner as the project progressed. At present, there is adequate staff strength for implementation of the Project. Provision made for Contractual Services has been utilised for smooth operation of the project.

Externally Aided Projects are time bound and their reimbursement is linked with growth of expenditure. Donors also required audited statement of expenditure for making further reimbursement. However, the Auditor General of India generally takes more time to audit accounts because of various backlogs. The donor was prepared to accept auditing by the Chartered Accountant and the same was not agreed to by the concerned authority. As a result of that reimbursement could not be realised for some time. Ultimately, special efforts were made with Auditor General to commission special audits and this also took some time. It will be still better if auditing by the Chartered Accountants is permitted so as to cope up with the tight schedule of the donors.

In so far as adhering to time-schedule of Externally Aided Projects/World Bank Projects is concerned, the Department are taking full precaution to observe the same. However, this also largely depends upon the availability of adequate funds, for which the Department are continuously pursuing with the Planning Commission.

### **Comments of the Committee**

**1.24 The Committee desire that in view of the difficulties faced by the Department in getting the audit of the statements of expenditure of Externally Aided Projects done by the Auditor General of India, the matter may be taken up with the Auditor General for auditing of such statements of expenditure on a priority basis so that the useful projects do not suffer for want of funds to be released by the donors.**

### **Internal Resource Generation**

#### **Recommendation No.11**

1.25 The Committee found that the Department fixed targets every year for generation of funds from internal resources, such as (i) Sale proceeds of farm produce; (ii) Sale proceeds of land building, vehicle etc; (iii) Sale Proceeds of Livestock; (iv). Sale of

publications and through advertisements; (v) Licence Fee from quarters; (vi) Interest on loans and advances; (vii) Interest earned on short-term deposits etc.

The Committee felt that the DARE/ICAR being an apex council for doing pioneer agricultural research in the country, had the potential research findings with them. They also suggested that if these findings were passed on in time to the industry at the national and international level for its commercial uses for royalty/fees, then the DARE/ICAR would certainly be in a position to generate more funds than earned at the present.

The Committee had, therefore, desired that the Department should switch over to this new area of untapped potential for generating more funds by way of sharing research findings with industrial and commercial users on royalty/fee basis.

1.26 The Government in their reply have stated that DARE/ICAR have over a period of time developed a large number of technologies to benefit farmers, farmer entrepreneurs, local craftsmen, an un-organized cottage and agro-industries spread across the whole country. At the same time, it caters to the needs of a small but growing number of medium, large commercial farmers and entrepreneurs involved in production, processing and marketing of inputs, products and by-products. As Public Agricultural Research System, the Department have taken a series of initiatives for linkages with the industry/ private sector. The issues involved were discussed in two separate workshops on ICAR- Industry Interface held during April 1998 and February 2000. The Department have also constituted a Committee to frame rules and procedures for partnership for research with private sectors. To accelerate commercialisation of technologies development by the Department, a publication entitled “Technologies from ICAR (for industrial liaison)” was brought out. This compendium presents information briefly on each technology indentified by the Subject Matter Divisions of Crop Sciences, Horticulture, Natural Resource Management, Agricultural Engineering, Animal Sciences, Fisheries, Agricultural Education and Extension. These efforts of the Department in terms of resource generation are yet to yield results as the issues relating to sharing of costs, one time payment, and royalty on sales and sorting out of Intellectual Property Rights are under consideration.

### **Comments of the Committee**

**1.27 The Committee note that the Department have taken a series of initiatives for linkages with the industry/private sector. The Committee desire that the issues relating to sharing of costs, one time payment, royalty of sales and sorting out of Intellectual Property Rights should be decided on a priority basis so that a clear picture of the internal resource generation of the Department emerges.**

**CHAPTER II**  
**RECOMMENDATIONS/OBSERVATIONS WHICH HAVE BEEN  
ACCEPTED BY THE GOVERNMENT**

**Accounting Errors**

**Recommendation No. 5**

2.1 Every year the Committee are faced with a situation wherein the figures in some of the schemes are either omitted or incorrectly mentioned.

The Committee request the Department to be careful and forward correct figures. Omissions or wrong figures lead to a lot of inconvenience in the scrutiny of Demands for Grants.

**Reply of the Government**

2.2 The recommendation of the Committee has been noted for future compliance.

**Work Analysis of ICAR**

**Recommendation No.7**

2.3 The Committee find from the reply of ICAR that it is not prepared to appoint an independent body outside the Governments' domain to undertake an evaluation of the worth of the research of a scientist as compared to the expenditure that the Government is incurring on him. The QRTs, PME's and the RAC's are inbuilt systems of the ICAR. These bodies being manned by functionaries of the system itself are likely to be subjected to internal pressures in reviewing their independent findings to suit the management. Apart from this factor, these people are not specialised into the kind and quality of analysis the Committee expect.

The Committee are firm on their opinion that the ICAR should appoint an independent body, e.g. Private Consultancy Services or the like which are specialised in the field of manpower analysis, to make a detailed study on the quantum of research which has actually translated into enhancing the production and productivity, quality etc with the expenditure made by the Department on the Scientists taking into account all other parameters like level of satisfaction, working conditions, human relations, period taken to come out with the research etc.

One year has already elapsed since the Committee has recommended for such action and ICAR are still in the nascent stage of decision making. The Committee, therefore, impress upon the ICAR to act fast, with speed and alacrity and put before the Committee a report before the next budget.

**Reply of the Government**

2.4 The Department is going ahead to get the evaluation of research work done through an independent body. A proposal given by the National Productivity Council is under examination by the Department.

**Comments of the Committee**

2.5 For comments of the Committee please refer to paragraph No. 1.18 of Chapter II of the Report.



## **World Bank/Externally Aided Projects**

### **Recommendation No. 10**

2.6 The Committee find that World Bank/Externally Aided Projects are time bound programmes and require strict adherence to financial and physical targets. The Committee note that the total allocation for the IXth Plan was Rs.638.97 crore out of which Rs.460.47 crore were utilised giving a 72.06% of utilisation. Since the projects are time bound the staff is also contractual for the specific project, releases by the Planning Commission are spread on a year-to-year basis.

The Committee have closely studied the reasons given by the Department for not being able to utilize the allocation 100%. One of the reasons is delay in filling up posts and the other relates to release of funds, which was less in comparison to requirements.

The Committee are surprised to note that a time bound project is being run in absence of adequate manpower without any adverse impact on the programme. Once the time schedule has expired and the project is not complete, the World Bank or the particular agency will have to be approached for extension of time. Thus, the completion of the project will be at the mercy of the assisting agency. The Committee are aware of such situations wherein the time schedule has expired and extension was not given. Thereafter, the incomplete project suffers because the Government does not come to its rescue and fund that project once the foreign agency withdraws.

The Committee, therefore, recommend that externally aided projects should strictly adhere to the time schedule so that the Planning Commission has no reason to withhold funds.

### **Reply of the Government**

2.7 The matter has been brought to the notice of the Planning Commission requesting that the allocation for externally aided project need not be clubbed with the annual Budgetary allocation so that the externally aided projects which are time bound, do not suffer or slow down on account of inadequacy of funds.

In so far as availability of staff is concerned, the Department has made available the required staff by redeployment in phased manner as the project progressed. At present there is adequate staff strength for implementation of the Project. Provision made for Contractual Services has been utilized for smooth operation of the project.

Externally Aided Projects are time bound and their reimbursement is linked with growth of expenditure. Donors also required audited statement of expenditure for making further reimbursement. However, the Auditor General of India generally takes more time to audit accounts because of various backlogs. The donor was prepared to accept auditing by the Chartered Accountant and the same was not agreed to by the concerned authority. As a result of that reimbursement could not be realized for sometime. Ultimately, special efforts were made with Auditor General to commission special audits and this also took some time. It will be still better if auditing by the Chartered Accountants is permitted so as to cope up with the tight schedule of the donors.

In so far as adhering to time-schedule of Externally Aided Projects/World Bank Projects is concerned, the Department is taking full precaution to observe the same. However, this also largely depends upon the availability of adequate funds, for which the Department is continuously pursuing with the Planning Commission.

### **Comments of the Committee**

2.8 For comments of the Committee please refer to paragraph no. 1.24 of Chapter 1 of the Report.

### **Pulses Production**

#### **Recommendation No. 12**

2.9 The Committee note that pulses production is coming down during the last two years and even after spending crores of Rupees on the research of pulses year after year the Department has not been able to achieve any breakthrough in pulses production. The reasons attributed to decrease in pulses production from 14.9mt in 1998-99 to 13.2mt in 1999-2000 and 10.7mt in 2000-01 were mainly on account of drought in several parts of pulses growing areas and pest infestation.

The Committee feel that it is the prime mandate of the DARE/ICAR to tackle all these abiotic and biotic stresses caused every year to the agricultural crops. ICAR, has claimed to have released varieties resistant to abiotic and biotic stresses year after year.

The Committee demand a clarification from the Department for this ironical situation. Whereas on the one hand thousands of crore of Rupees worth crops every year goes waste owing to abiotic and biotic stresses, on the other hand ICAR claims to have been doing the needful by providing varieties resistant to abiotic and biotic stresses.

The Committee also urge upon the Department to make concerted efforts to actually come up with genuine research to counter these biotic and abiotic stresses affecting the agricultural crops on top priority basis.

#### **Reply of the Government**

2.10 Pulses are grown primarily in rainfed situations. In the year 1998-99 a total production of 14.9 mt. was achieved. In the successive years of 1999-2000 and 2000-2001, the production declined due to severe drought and failure of rains in major pulses growing states as a result the area of pulses declined from 23.5 mha. in 1998-99 to 21.1 mha. in 1999-2000 and 20 mha. in 2000-2001. Thus the adverse effect on production of pulses during 1999-2000 and 2000-2001 was mainly due to reduction in area. The ICAR has developed a number of improved varieties some of which have capacity to withstand drought and some can escape drought due to shorter maturity duration of new varieties. However, in an event of failure of rains the production of pulses is bound to be affected.

The ICAR has developed a number of varieties of pulses, which are resistant to major biotic factors specially diseases. These include wilt resistant varieties of chickpea, wilt and sterility mosaic resistant varieties of pigeonpea, yellow mosaic resistant varieties of green gram and black gram etc.

As a major break through cytoplasmic male sterility has been developed in pigeonpea, which will make the hybrid pigeonpea commercially viable. The integrated pest management have been developed for control of pod borer, which is the major pest in chickpea and pigeonpea.

**CHAPTER III**  
**RECOMMENDATIONS/OBSERVATIONS WHICH THE COMMITTEE DO NOT DESIRE TO PURSUE IN VIEW OF THE GOVERNMENT'S REPLIES**

**Plan and Non Plan Expenditure of DARE**

**Recommendation No.3**

3.1 The Committee note that the Plan allocation of DARE constitutes expenditure heads pertaining to building maintenance, machinery operative expenses, telephone and electricity charges, stationery levies, pay and allowances (Plan Posts), travelling charges etc. The Non-Plan allocation constitutes of salary, maintenance of establishment facilities etc. All the above heads of expenditure are non-productive and do not account for research and education. As such the actual plan allocation is far less than which is placed under Plan (Rs.775.00 crore for the year 2002-2003).

The Committee feel that the 13.3 percent increase in Plan allocation for the year 2002-2003 over the year 2001-2002 is misleading and the 1.6% increase in allocation for Non-Plan is also misleading.

The Committee, therefore, recommend that there must be a clear distinction between such heads as mentioned above and actual research input within the Plan Budget itself.

**Reply of the Government**

3.2 So far as Non-plan outlay is concerned, it is a fact that it involves committed expenditure in the form of salaries and allowances etc. i.e. almost whole of the Non-plan expenditure is incurred on this item and limited amount remains for other heads of expenditure. This is the main reason that other items of expenditure pertaining to research schemes have to be met out from Plan Fund. Moreover, the schemes like Krishi Vigyan Kendras, National Seed Project and All India Coordinated Research Projects (AICRPs) do not have the non-plan component, the whole expenditure on these schemes/projects is met out from the Plan Fund. These are the basic reasons why plan funds are being utilised on items of expenditure other than salary component.

**Merger/Integration of NRCs/AICRPs**

**Recommendation No.8**

3.3 In 1999-2000 when the Committee enquired about the difference in the NRC/AICRP/PD etc, they had in view duplication of work performed by these institutes/schemes. The Department convinced the Committee of the importance of the existence of NRCs as well as AICRPs on the same crops at that time.

In 2002-2003, the Planning Commission has asked the ICAR to phase out/merge/integrate/converge its existing schemes under Zero Based Budgeting. The Department is following the suggestion without any reservations.

The Committee feel, that this is still another case wherein the Department lacks the acumen to convince. AICRPs are accredited as the most successful research network programme in the world which contributes in a unique way in developing location specific, production, protection, processing, product development and value addition technology corresponding to location specific requirements but still ICAR is ready to merge them on the advise of the Planning Commission.

In the opinion of the Committee if AICRPs are such very good projects then the ICAR should approach the Planning Commission to allow the Department to continue

these by convincing them about their utility. Simple surrender before the Planning Commission for merger and negation before the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Agriculture to their similar suggestions made earlier will send wrong signals to the Committee.

### **Reply of the Government**

3.4 The Department subscribes to the view that All India Co-ordinated research Projects (AICRPs) are very good projects. The importance of AICRPs can not be underestimated because they are most successful network programme in the World which contribute in a unique way in developing location specific, production, protection, processing, product development and value addition technology corresponding to location specific requirements.

The integration of AICRPs with respective Institutes/NRCs/PDs has been done in consultation with the Planning Commission taking into consideration the crops/discipline/commodity location of the project with which they are integrated for better coordination, monitoring and efficiency. The integration will not affect the research activity of AICRPs.

**CHAPTER IV**  
**RECOMMENDATIONS/OBSERVATIONS IN RESPECT OF WHICH REPLIES**  
**OF THE GOVERNMENT HAVE NOT BEEN ACCEPTED BY THE**  
**COMMITTEE**

**Plan Allocations to DARE for the year 2002-2003.**

**Recommendation No.4**

4.1 The Committee are informed that the DARE has been allocated Rs.775.00 crore under Plan Head for the year 2002-2003 which is a 13% rise over the Plan allocations for the year 2001-2002. This 13% in the view of the Department is a substantial increase in the first year of the Xth Plan although it works out to be only 45.6% of the demand placed by the Department before the Planning Commission.

The Committee are informed that the four core areas of agricultural research and education themselves require funding to the tune of Rs.520 crore for the year 2002-2003. This in addition to Rs.775 crore will make it possible to do effective research for else DARE will be finding it difficult even to sustain what research has been done in the Ninth Plan. The Department has requested for an allocation of Rs.1100-1200 crore for the year 2002-2003.

The Committee are of the opinion that the DARE is making tall claims towards research and the expenditure of allocations towards research. The DARE had found it difficult to explain the reasons of having funds parked in the bank accounts of its autonomous bodies. Although the DARE has no surpluses to surrender to the Government, it has good financial practices to account for expenditure. The DARE has always evaluated research through expenditure of funds and as expressed by the Department itself major expenditure heads in Plan Budget are consumables, operative expenses, telephone charges etc. but very little research. In this scenario, the inflationary addition to Plan allocations of the previous year are sufficient.

The Committee, therefore, recommend that it is not too late for the Department to have an intensive look into its system in order to take corrective measures and come up with concrete proposals for more funds for research.

**Reply of the Government**

4.2 Under the non plan, it is once again reiterated that the balance of Rs. 330.36 crore, 270.40 crore and Rs. 223 crore on 31<sup>st</sup> March during the years 2001, 2000 and 1999 in various bank accounts was the closing balance with the various Institutions of Indian Council of Agricultural Research including its Headquarters. Since ICAR is an autonomous organisation it does not bank with treasury and maintains its own bank accounts and will not be in a position to pay the salary for the month of March on 1<sup>st</sup> April every year in the absence of closing balance as the Government grant is generally drawn after 15<sup>th</sup> April. Hence the closing balance shown above include the amount meant for the salary for the month of March payable on 1<sup>st</sup> April. In addition to above the closing balance includes the amount pertaining to Deposit Schemes for which the funds are remitted by the sponsoring agencies for the entire project period. Similar is the case for ad-hoc schemes. The closing balance also includes a very small amount of other miscellaneous resources of the Council, which are required to be utilized in the following year. The amount deducted from the salaries of the employees but not remitted to the concerned offices/agency/Department is also included in the closing balance until it is finally remitted to the concerned Department/Agency/Office. Further, it also includes the amount drawn from the Government but not utilized during the year and is refunded to

Government in the next financial year after finalization of annual accounts. This amount of closing balance is not the surplus amount with the Council. The Department will however take steps to further reduce the surplus funds in the banks.

As recommended by the Committee, the Department will have an intensive look into its system in order to take corrective measures.

### **Comments of the Committee**

4.3 For comments of the Committee please refer to paragraph no. 1.12 of Chapter I of the Report.

**CHAPTER V**  
**RECOMMENDATIONS/OBSERVATIONS IN RESPECT OF WHICH FINAL  
REPLIES OF THE GOVERNMENT ARE STILL AWAITED**

**IXth Plan and Xth Plan (1st year) allocation to DARE - An analysis**

**Recommendation No.1**

5.1 The Committee note that the DARE was given 0.53% of Central Plan Outlay as Budgetary allocations for the IXth Plan. On the recommendations of the Committee this allocation was enhanced to 0.69% of the Central Plan outlay in the middle of the Plan period. After the completion of the IXth Plan, the Committee find that the allocation was 0.50% of the Central Plan outlay as BE and 0.46% of the Central Plan outlay as RE. The expenditure by the Department has, however, been approximately 99.00% of the RE.

The Committee further observe that in the 1st year of the Xth Plan the Department has got 0.53% of the Central Plan Outlay.

The figures reflect the very low priority given to Agricultural Research. Budgetary allocations are stagnant at 0.53% of the Central Plan Outlay whereas the actual allocations are below 0.50% of the Central Plan Outlay.

The Committee tried to assess the position with regard to Agricultural Gross Domestic Product (AGDP). They were surprised to note that DARE's BE allocations have been between 0.16% - 0.27% of AGDP at current prices from 1996-97 to 1997-2000.

The Committee have been constantly making an effort to secure budgetary provisions to the tune of at least 1% of AGDP for Agricultural Research. The Committee once again requests the Planning Commission and Ministry of Finance to provide higher allocations to this Department.

**Reply of the Government**

5.2 The Department has again brought the recommendation of the Committee to the notice of Ministry of Finance and Planning Commission requesting them to enhance the first year of Tenth Plan's (2002-03) outlay to 1% of AGDP. The Ministry of Finance have informed that the Plan allocations are made by the Planning Commission and that the Ministry of Finance has little role in it. The Planning Commission informed that the Department's Annual Plan (2002-03) outlay had been increased by 13.3% over the previous year's allocation. The Department subsequently requested the Planning Commission that keeping the Committee's positive recommendation in view, the Annual Plan (2002-03) outlay should be raised to 1% of AGDP.

**Comments of the Committee**

For comments of the Committee please refer to paragraph no. 1.6 of Chapter I of the Report.

## **DARE/ICAR fails to come up with concrete proposals for higher allocations**

### **Recommendation No.2**

5.3 The Committee observe that DARE/ICAR was given Rs.684.00 crore as BE and the same amount as RE for their Plan Outlay during 2001-02. The Plan Outlay (BE) for 2002-03 has been increased to Rs.775.00 crore and this increase is 13.3% over BE/RE 2001-02. According to the Department 2002-03 being the first year of Xth Plan approval of EFCs and subsequent implementation of approved programmes may take some time. The Department would be carrying out its ongoing activities and meeting some immediate requirements, till then. Hence, the Department would be in need of enhanced funds in second and subsequent years of Xth Plan. There is, therefore, no immediate requirement of funds to the Department in the year 2002-2003.

On the requirement of higher allocations for the 2<sup>nd</sup> to 5<sup>th</sup> years of the Xth Plan the Planning Commission has assured that, “..... it would always support DARE’s/ICAR’s good projects irrespective of ceilings, even if they were beyond any stipulated limit. Good projects and schemes will never be allowed to suffer for want of funds.....”

The Committee during evidence on 27.3.2002, had requested the Secretary, DARE to furnish a written note giving those projects which were good but rejected by Planning Commission or the Ministry of Finance to enable the Committee to take up the matter at the appropriate level for additional funding. The Department has given the following four core areas of agricultural research and education, which immensely need higher budget allocations during 2002-03:

- |   |   |               |
|---|---|---------------|
| 1. Agricultural Biotechnology                         | - | Rs.300 crore  |
| 2. Bio-diversity                                      | - | Rs. 70 crore  |
| 3. Biosystematic and Pest Disease and Weed Management | - | Rs. 50 crore  |
| 4. First Rate Human Resource Development              | - | Rs. 100 crore |

According to the Department all these projects are new and none of them has been rejected for funding.

The Committee feel that the Department do not project the correct picture to the Committee. Year after year, the Department approaches the Planning Commission for rounds of discussions before the Annual Budget and finally come up with a meagre increase. The Department has never felt the need to express its difficulties before the Committee before the Budget is passed. Only at the examination of Demands for Grants stage the Department puts forth its difficulties. By that time the damage is already done.

The Committee observe that the Department could not give details of a single such rejected project with reasons of rejection and instead has submitted a vague new proposal which is devoid of details, demanding for additional funds to the tune of about Rs.520 crore during 2002-03 for four core projects. The Committee deplore lack of genuine efforts on the part of the Department, which has failed miserably to come up with concrete/good proposals/projects for getting higher allocations from the Planning Commission and Ministry of Finance, who are more than ready to support all good projects of DARE/ICAR. The Committee urge upon the Department to prepare viable and concrete proposals which are essential for the Agricultural growth and bring forth such proposals before the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Agriculture, Planning Commission and Ministry of Finance. Similarly, the Committee desire that the Department should restructure and modify their ongoing projects to the present day need of the nation and present such viable modified plans before the Planning Commission for



getting higher allocations, for the same and apprise the Committee about the outcome from time to time.

### **Reply of the Government**

5.4 As per the existing instructions of Ministry of Finance/Planning Commission the Department could submit only those proposals for which the funding availability is first firmed up; then and only then these two agencies were expected to appraise such projects including new initiatives. The department had already proposed a number of new initiatives through Xth Plan proposals. It is noteworthy that the four core areas, under reference, have already been reflected in various components of the Xth Plan proposals. The Department had even proposed a lump-sum amount of Rs. 1217.58 crore for the proposed new initiatives including pipeline projects, which the Department felt necessary during the course of Xth Plan. The Department, with annual plan (2002-2003) outlay of Rs. 775 crore as allocated by Planning Commission, could only sustain the existing (ongoing) schemes/project. It is not possible to take-up capital-intensive ventures in the first year of Xth Plan without adequate funding. It is pertinent to mention here that the Department had submitted proposals for Annual Plan (2002-03) to the tune of Rs. 1500 crore along with the requirement of Rs. 200 crore as catch-up grant against which only Rs. 775 crore has been provided. This catch up grant is needed for renovation and modernisation of age-old infrastructure including replacement of obsolete equipment and other research facilities. The Department would be submitting the core areas' projects to the Planning Commission after the fund availability is firmed up in accordance with financial projections. In this regard, the Department is taking up the matter with the Planning Commission at the highest level of the Department.

The need based modifications and restructuring the existing schemes have been attempted by the Department in consultation with the Planning Commission through Zero Based Budgeting Exercise and some schemes outliving the utility have been identified for phasing out/integration/merger etc.

### **Comments of the Committee**

5.5 For comments of the Committee please refer to paragraph no. 1.9 of Chapter I of the Report.

### **Viability of Projects and Funding**

#### **Recommendation No.6**

5.6 The ICAR is a research institution. Research projects are open ended in nature and cannot be calculated like a mathematical problem. Therefore, the validity of a research project can be ascertained only after results are achieved. The Committee feel that sound proposals and valid projects that the Planning Commission looks for in the ICAR are those, which can apparently convince the Planning Commission members of results. Hence, the ability of the scientists in ICAR to convince also is of paramount importance.

The Committee suggest that the DARE should make greater efforts and devise methods of convincing the members of the Planning Commission about the obsolete equipments, age old infrastructure, high costs of maintenance etc to get the one time catch up grant for which they are trying for a very long time. The Committee suggest that the ICAR would do well in sending some of their scientists who are involved in the

budgetary process for short-term courses with financial institutions to help them to present their point of view correctly and effectively to the Planning Commission.

### **Reply of the Government**

5.7 The Department is pursuing with the Planning Commission to get funds as Catch up Grant to replace obsolete equipments, age-old infrastructure and other research facilities. Further, the Department has taken note of the recommendations and would send some of the scientists to the financial institutions for short term training courses.

### **Comments of the Committee**

5.8 For comments of the Committee please refer to paragraph No. 1.15 of Chapter I of the Report.

### **No Visible Progress seen in Disposal of Pending/Fresh Vigilance and Disciplinary Cases**

#### **Recommendation No.9**

5.9 The Committee observe that the Department has disposed of 5 Vigilance Cases during 2000-01 and was left with the balance of 20 pending Vigilance and 21 pending Disciplinary Cases by the end of March 2001. The position of pendency in March 2002 is at 20 Vigilance and 27 Disciplinary cases and during the entire one year, i.e., 2001-02, the Department could dispose of only 3 Vigilance Cases and 15 Disciplinary Cases. Two fresh Vigilance and 11 fresh Disciplinary Cases has been initiated during 2001-02.

The Committee tried to analyse these figures and found that if 3 Vigilance and 15 Disciplinary Cases disposed of during 2001-02 are subtracted from the balance carried forward in 2001-02 viz 20 pending Vigilance and 21 Disciplinary Cases, they arrive at 17 Vigilance and 6 Disciplinary Cases and if 2 fresh Vigilance and 11 fresh Disciplinary Cases initiated during 2001-02 are added to the balance figures, they arrive at 19 Vigilance and 17 Disciplinary cases. The Department has furnished pendency figures in March 2002 as 20 Vigilance and 27 Disciplinary Cases. So, there is a clear additional difference of 1 Vigilance Case and 10 Disciplinary Cases, which could not be accounted for.

The Committee are perturbed to see the false high claims made by the Department for quicker disposal of pending vigilance and disciplinary cases, as there has been practically an increase in the pendency of these cases.

The Committee, therefore, once again recommend in the interest of the Department that they should evolve a procedure for quicker disposal of pending as well as fresh Vigilance/Disciplinary cases arising in DARE/ICAR within a stipulated period of 2 years.

### **Reply of the Government**

5.10 In so far as disciplinary cases are concerned, as intimated, there were 31 Disciplinary cases pending on 31.03.2001. Out of these pending 31 cases, 15 disciplinary cases were disposed off. These cases were pending for years together for various reasons like non-finalisation of inquiry proceedings, non-submission of Inquiry Officer's Report, some procedural infirmities, non-availability of relevant documents, change of Inquiry Officer/Presenting Officer etc.

It is submitted that since disciplinary cases have to go through various time consuming procedures and invite legal litigations, the performance in disposing of 15 disciplinary cases in one year is considered reasonable.

To make the issue clear, the following is submitted.

**Disciplinary cases:-**

1. As per the statement, showing pendency, submitted to the Committee, there were 31 disciplinary cases pending on 31.03.2001.
2. Out of these 31 pending cases, 15 cases have been disposed of during 2001-02.
3. In the meanwhile 11 new cases were initiated during 2001-02.
4. Hence as on 26.03.2002, there are 27 disciplinary cases pending.

In so far as the vigilance cases are concerned the following is submitted.

**Vigilance Cases:**

1. As per the statement, showing pendency, submitted to the Committee, there were 21 vigilance cases pending on 31.03.2001.
2. Out of these 21 pending cases, 03 cases have been disposed off.
3. In the meanwhile 02 New Cases initiated during 2001-02.
4. Hence as on 26.03.2002, there are 20 disciplinary cases pending.

Incidentally one more vigilance case, out of the new 2 cases as mentioned at (3) above was disposed off during March 2002 itself.

**Comments of the Committee**

5.11 For comments of the Committee please refer to paragraph no. 1.21 of the Report.

## **Internal Resource Generation**

### **Recommendation No.11**

5.12 The Committee find that the Department every year fixes targets for generation of funds from internal resources, such as (i). Sale proceeds of farm produce; (ii) Sale proceeds of land building, vehicle etc; (iii). Sale Proceeds of Livestock; (iv). Sale of publication & Advertisement; (v) Licence Fee from quarters; (vi) Interest on loans and advances; (vii) Interest earned on short-term deposits etc.

The Committee feel that the DARE/ICAR being an apex council for doing pioneer agricultural research in the country, have the potential research findings with them. They also suggest that if these findings are timely passed on to the industry at the national and international level for its commercial uses for royalty/fees, then the DARE/ICAR will certainly be in a position to generate more funds than earned at the present.

The Committee, therefore, desire that the Department should switch over to this new area of untapped potential for generating more funds by way of sharing research findings with industrial and commercial users on royalty/fee basis.

### **Reply of the Government**

5.13 DARE/ICAR over a period of time has developed a large number of technologies to benefit farmers, farmer entrepreneurs, local crafts men, an un-organised cottage and agro-industries spread across the whole country. At the same time, it caters to the needs of a small but growing number of medium, large commercial farmers and entrepreneurs involved in production, processing and marketing of inputs, products and by-products. As public Agricultural Research System, the Department has taken a series of initiatives for linkages with the industry/private sector. The issues involved were discussed in two separate workshops on ICAR-Industry Interface held during April 98 and February, 2000. The Department has also constituted a Committee to frame rules and procedures for partnership for research with private sectors. To accelerate commercialization of technologies developed by the Department a publication entitled “ technologies from ICAR (for industrial liaison)” was brought out. This compendium presents information briefly on each technology identified by the Subject Matter Divisions of Crop Sciences, Horticulture, Natural Resource Management, Agricultural Engineering, Animal Sciences, Fisheries, Agricultural Education and Extension. These efforts of the Department in terms of resource generation are yet to yield results as the issues relating to sharing of costs, one time payment, and royalty on sales and sorting out of Intellectual Property Rights are under consideration.

### **Comments of the Committee**

5.14 For comments of the Committee please refer to paragraph no. 1.27 of Chapter 1 of the Report.

NEW DELHI  
17 December, 2002  
26 Agrahayana, 1924 (Saka)

**S.S PALANIMANICKAM**  
Chairman  
Standing Committee on Agriculture.

## APPENDIX II

### ANALYSIS OF ACTION TAKEN BY GOVERNMENT ON THE 31<sup>ST</sup> REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE (13<sup>TH</sup> LOK SABHA)

(i)	Total number of Recommendations	12
(ii)	Recommendations/Observations which have been Accepted by the Government	
	Serial Nos. 5, 7, 10 & 12	
	Total	4
	Percentage	33.33%
(iii)	Recommendations/Observations which the Committee Do not desire to pursue in view of the Government's replies	
	Sl. Nos. 3 & 8	
	Total	2
	Percentage	16.66%
(iv)	Recommendations/Observations in respect of which replies Of the Government have not been accepted by the Committee	
	Serial Nos. 4	
	Total	1
	Percentage	8.33%
(v)	Recommendations/Observations in respect of which Final replies of the Government are still awaited	
	Serial No. 1, 2, 6, 9 & 11	
	Total	5
	Percentage	41.66%