

PHYSICAL AND FINANCIAL PERFORMANCE OF
WATERSHED DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMMES IN
HARYANA

Manoj Siwach¹

Reena²

Abstract:

Haryana is primarily an agricultural state and about 75 per cent of the area is irrigated. Even then, large part of the state is remaining rain fed area. Watershed development programmes (WDP) implemented to enable multi-cropping and the introduction of diverse agro-based activities, which help to provide sustainable livelihoods to the people residing in the watershed area. These objectives would be achieved when physical and financial performance has been measured. So, this study was conducted to analysis the physical and financial performance of Pre-Haryali and Haryali watershed development programmes under DDP and IWDP in Haryana. The present study has been taken only the watershed programmes being undertaken by the Haryana Rural Development Department which were Desert Development Programme (DDP) and Integrated Wasteland Development Programme (IWDP). The based on secondary data related to Pre-Haryali projects from 1995-96 to 2002-03 and Haryali Projects taken from 2003-04 to 2006-07 under DDP and IWDP. The study found that financial performance of Pre-Haryali projects were better than Haryali projects under both programmes, but physical performance was not according to the financial performance. The financial performance of Haryali projects was not better than Pre-Haryali projects, but achievement related to physical targets, Haryali projects were perform better than Pre-Haryali projects under the both programmes.

Keywords: *Pre-Haryali, Haryali, Watershed, DDP, IWDP.*

¹ Associate Professor in Economics Department, Registrar of University, C.D.L.U.Sirsa.

² Ph.D Scholar, Department of Economics, C.D.L.U.Sirsa.

Introduction:

Haryana State is primarily an agricultural state and near about 70 per cent of its residents are engaged in agriculture. In Haryana, 86 per cent of the area is arable, and of that 96 per cent is cultivated. About 75 per cent of the area is irrigated, through tube wells and an extensive system of canals. Even then, large part of the state is remaining rain fed area. Haryana contributed significantly to the Green Revolution in India in the 1970s that made the country self-sufficient in food production, but the state faced negative effects of green revolutions like over exploitation of ground water, degradation of the land, depletion of natural resources etc. The changes in the environment directly affect the lives of the people depending on it. A degraded environment means a degraded quality of life of the people. This degradation can be tackled effectively through the holistic development of the watershed. Watershed Management brings about the best possible balance between natural resources on the one side and human beings on the other side. Human beings and the ecology are interdependent. Watershed development refers to the conservation, regeneration and judicious use of all the natural resources (like land, water, plants, animals) by human beings (IWMP, 2010).

Centre Government started many watersheds development programmes with different name like NWDPRA, DDP, IWDP, DPAP etc under the Ministry of Agriculture and Ministry of Rural Development. In 1993, the Government of India constituted a technical committee headed by Dr C.H Hanumantha Rao to review the watershed development programmes. The Committee proposed a revamp, recommending various measures including sanctioning of works on the basis of the action plans on watershed basis, and introduction of participatory modes of implementation, through involvement of beneficiaries of the programme and NGOs. Based on its recommendations a new set of guidelines came into effect in 1995. The watershed programme has become the centre-piece of rural development in India. In 2003 under the “Hariyali” guidelines, watershed development was put under the implementation of the Panchayati Raj Institutions (PRIs). In 2006, an apex national body called the National Rainfed Area Authority (NRAA) was setup and brought out new “Common Guidelines for Watershed Development Projects” in 2008 for a unified approach combining of most programmes into the Integrated Watershed Management Programme (Gandhi and Crase, 2012).

Integrated Watershed Management Programme (IWMP) is a modified programme of erstwhile Drought Prone Areas Programme (DPAP), Desert Development Programme (DDP) and Integrated Wastelands Development Programme (IWDP) of the Department of Land Resources. This consolidation is for optimum use of resources, sustainable outcomes and integrated planning. The scheme was launched during 2009-10. The programme is being implemented as per Common Guidelines for Watershed Development Projects 2008 (DOLR, 2012).

The main objectives of the IWMP are to restore the ecological balance by harnessing, conserving and developing degraded natural resources such as soil, vegetative cover and water. The outcomes are prevention of soil erosion, regeneration of natural vegetation, rain water harvesting and recharging of the ground water table. This enables multi-cropping and the introduction of diverse agro-based activities, which help to provide sustainable livelihoods to the people residing in the watershed area (DOLR, 2012).

A programme's objectives would be achieved when finance must be provided according to need and on the right time, because it is the first step to meet the objectives of the programme. The watershed development programmes' objectives cannot be completed without to measure the physical achievement from the programmes. Hence, an effort has been made in this paper to analyse the physical and financial performance of Pre-Haryali watershed development projects under DDP and IWDP and to evaluate the physical and financial performance of Haryali watershed development projects under DDP and IWDP.

Methodology:

Selection of Sample:

The watershed development programmes are being run in Haryana through the Haryana Rural Development Department and Haryana Agriculture Department. Among these, the programmes under Haryana Rural Development Department are carried out through the entire state except Kurukshetra district, while, the programmes under Haryana Agriculture Department cover only a few districts of the state. Therefore, the present study has been taken only the watershed programmes being undertaken by the Haryana Rural Development Department. The Haryana Rural Development Department has implemented the watershed development

programmes under the Desert Development Program (DDP) and Integrated Wasteland Development Program (IWDP).

Sources of Data:

The study has been made intensive reference to secondary data in trying to analysis the study objectives. Secondary data have been collected from the Haryana Rural Development Department. Pre-Haryali projects have been taken from year 1995-96 to 2002-03 and Haryali Projects taken from 2003-04 to 2006-07 under DDP and IWDP.

Analytical Techniques:

The study has been descriptive in the nature and percentage method has been used to analysis the objectives of the study.

Results and Discussion:

Watershed development programmes implemented for harvesting rain water, developing degraded natural resources for uplifting the socio-economic status of rural peoples. These objectives could be achieved, when financial and physical performance of watershed programmes analysed. The study found the following results related to financial and physical performance of watershed programmes:

Physical and financial Status of Pre-Haryali Projects under DDP:

Table-1: Physical and financial Status of Pre-Haryali Projects under DDP up to 31/07/2013

(Rs. In Lakhs) (Area in Hectare)

Name of Districts	Total cost	Total fund available	Expenditure	Unspent balance	Targeted Area	Achieved Area	Fore-close project	Completed Project	Total Projects
Bhiwani	3345 (100)	3349.58 (100)	3312.51 (99)	37.08 (1)	64647 (100)	58381 (90)	15 (12.5)	105 (87.5)	120 (100)
Hisar	3790 (100)	3686.96 (97)	3579.15 (97)	107.81 (3)	67193 (100)	64618 (96)	44 (33)	90 (77)	134 (100)
Fatehabad	1550 (100)	1276.27 (82)	1256.88 (98)	19.39 (2)	26500 (100)	11328 (43)	53 (100)	0 (0)	53 (100)
Jhajjar	2075	1957.94	1896.51	61.43	40025	40394	12	64	76

	(100)	(94)	(97)	(3)	(100)	(101)	(16)	(84)	(100)
Sirsa	3225 (100)	2499.30 (77)	2330.6 (93)	168.702 (7)	58500 (100)	47738 (82)	62 (53)	55 (47)	117 (100)
Narnaul	2040 (100)	2064.03 (101)	2032.72 (98)	31.31 (2)	39543 (100)	38601 (98)	0	79 (100)	79 (100)
Rewari	1935 (100)	1957.14 (101)	1793.22 (91)	163.92 (9)	37726 (100)	34262 (91)	6 (8)	69 (92)	75 (100)
Total	15885 (100)	16791.22 (105.7)	16201.22 (96)	590 (4)	334134 (100)	295322 (88)	192 (29)	462 (71)	654 (100)

(Sources: Haryana Rural Development Department)

Note: Figures in the parentheses represent the percentage and percentage in round figure.

Table-1 explained that the fund availability and efficiency of administrative persons in proper managing fund availability played main role in achievement of physical targets. Fatehabad and Sirsa districts get less fund availability that's why their physical targets were not achieved that were 43 per cent and 82 per cent respectively and so, not completed projects in Fatehabad District was 100 per cent and 53 per cent in Sirsa District. However Narnaul, Rewari and Bhiwani got 100 per cent and above fund but, still physical target 100 per cent not achieved by these districts due to not efficient use of the fund by administration except Narnaul district. All the districts spent above 90 per cent fund available and remaining unspent balance send to the Government of India and State Government.

Table-2: Physical and financial Status of Haryali Projects under DDP up to 31/07/2013

(Rs. In Lakhs) (Area in Hectare)

Name of Districts	Total cost	Total fund available	Expenditure	Unspent balance	Targeted Area	Achieved Area	Fore-close project	Completed Project	Total Projects
Bhiwani	3780 (100)	3799.77 (100)	3775.57 (99)	24.19 (1)	63000 (100)	63000 (100)	0	126 (100)	126 (100)
Hisar	3210 (100)	3246.66 (101)	3176.65 (98)	70.01 (2)	53624 (100)	53168 (99)	0	107 (100)	107 (100)
Fatehabad	1680 (100)	530.42 (32)	505.12 (95)	25.3 (5)	28000 (100)	6480 (23)	56 (100)	0	56 (100)
Jhajjar	1710	1045.22	727.23	371.22	26699	12447	57	0	57

	(100)	(61)	(30)	(70)	(100)	(47)	(100)		(100)
Sirsa	2940	2975.48	2929.89	45.59	49000	51038	0	98	98
	(100)	(101)	(98)	(2)	(100)	(104)		(100)	(100)
Narnaul	1530	1540.28	1534.54	5.74	25500	25268	0	51	51
	(100)	(101)	(99.6)	(.04)	(100)	(99)		(100)	(100)
Rewari	1200	1198.57	886.45	312.12	20000	14043	10	30	40
	(100)	(99.8)	(74)	(26)	(100)	(70)	(25)	(75)	(100)
Total	16050	14336.40	13535	801.4	265823	225444	123	412 (77)	535
	(100)	(89)	(94)	(6)	(100)	(85)	(23)		(100)

(Sources: Haryana Rural Development Department)

Note: Figures in the parentheses represent the percentage and percentage in round figure.

Table-2 showed that fund availability and management of fund were influenced the achievement of targets either Area wise or project wise. Fatehabad and Jhajjar districts have been less fund availability which is 32 per cent and 61 per cent respectively. So, physical targets were not achieved which were 23 per cent in Fatehabad and 47 per cent in Jhajjar district and 100 per cent projects not completed in both districts. But, in Jhajjar district fund was not properly managed that's why 70 per cent of available fund were not spend and physical targets not achieved.

Physical and financial Status of Pre-Haryali Projects under IWDP

Review of Table-3 explained that fund availability played the main role in achievement of physical targets; it could be seen by Ambala and Gurgaon districts which have less fund comparison to other districts and achieved less physical targets which were 55 per cent in Ambala and 52 per cent in Gurgaon in area wise and projects were not completed in both districts. This trend also seen in Faridabad and Mewat Districts where physical targets less achieved. But in Panchkula district, 26 per cent of funds not spend, that's why physical targets according to area not achieved but still project was completed.

Table-3: Physical and financial Status of Pre-Haryali Projects under IWDP up to 31/07/2013

(Rs. In Lakhs) (Area in Hectare)

Name of Districts	Total cost	Total fund available	Expenditure	Unspent balance	Targeted Area (in hect.)	Achieved Area (in Hect.)	Fore-close project	Completed Project	Total Projects
Ambala	354	154.98	154.98	0	5900	3261	1	0	1

	(100)	(44)	(100)		(100)	(55)			
Guargaon	218.92 (100)	144.74 (66)	121.19 (84)	23.55 (16)	5473 (100)	2846 (52)	1	0	1
Faridabad	512.28 (100)	388.39 (76)	388.27 (99.9)	0.12 (0.1)	6444 (100)	5839 (91)	0	1	1
Mewat	492 (100)	481.07 (98)	435.47 (90)	45.06 (10)	8200 (8200)	7860 (96)	0	1	1
Panchkula	458.4 (100)	466.33 (101)	343.58 (74)	122.75 (26)	7640 (100)	4551 (59)	0	1	1
Panipat	478.88 (100)	452.66 (94)	452.66 (100)	0	11972 (100)	12986 (108)	0	1	1
Total	2514.48 (100)	2025.17 (80.54)	1896.15 (93.6)	191.48 (6.4)	45629 (100)	37343 (81.84)	2 (33)	4 (67)	6 (100)

(Sources: Haryana Rural Development Department)

Note: Figures in the parentheses represent the percentage and percentage in round figure.

The data of Table-4 revealed that those districts having in sufficient fund, achieved less physical targets. Ambala, Jind and Karnal districts have less funds compare to other districts and all these three districts were least achieved physical targets according to area and according to projects. Same trend have been seen in other districts where less fund available and achieved low physical targets.

Table-4: Physical and financial Status of Haryali Projects under IWDP up to 31/07/2013

(Rs. In Lakhs) (Area in Hectare)

Name of Districts	Total cost	Total fund available	Expenditure	Unspent balance	Targeted Area (in hect.)	Achieved Area (in Hect.)	Fore-close project	Completed Project	Total Projects
Ambala	510 (100)	139.92 (27)	134.82 (96)	5.10 (4)	8500 (100)	1472 (17)	2 (100)	0	2 (100)
Jind	750 (100)	174.41 (23)	150.94 (87)	23.47 (13)	12500 (100)	1371 (11)	3 (100)	0	3 (100)
Kaithal	540 (100)	541.82 (100)	539.90 (99.6)	1.61 (0.4)	9000 (100)	9000 (100)	0	2 (100)	2 (100)
Karnal	420 (100)	136.74 (33)	106.93 (65)	29.81 (5)	7000 (100)	948 (14)	2 (100)	0	2 (100)

Mewat	270 (100)	202.51 (75)	197.85 (98)	5.58 (2)	4500 (100)	3058 (68)	1 (100)	0	1 (100)
Rohtak	1140 (100)	1057.83 (93)	1016.07 (96)	41.76 (4)	19000 (100)	19000 (100)	0	5 (100)	5 (100)
Sonepat	300 (100)	222.47 (74)	217.16 (98)	5.31 (2)	4810 (100)	3710 (77)	1 (100)	0	1 (100)
Y/Nagar	720 (100)	684.36 (95)	637.18 (93)	47.18 (7)	12000 (100)	9767 (81)	1 (33)	2 (67)	3 (100)
Total	4650 (100)	3160.06 (68)	2893.92 (91.57)	266.14 (8.43)	77310 (100)	48326 (62.51)	10 (53)	9 (47)	19 (100)

(Sources: Haryana Rural Development Department)

Note: Figures in the parentheses represent the percentage and percentage in round figure.

Conclusion:

The Pre-Haryali projects under DDP have been gotten larger fund from their cost in actual terms and in proportional terms also in comparison to Haryali projects, but physical targets have not been achieved according to fund availability (88 per cent according to area wise and 71 per cent number of projects completed). The basic reason behind the physical targets has been not achieved; even getting more funds from the cost, was the funds have not evenly distributed according to cost among the districts. But, in Haryali projects 89 per cent fund have been available even though 85 per cent area has been treated and 77 per cent projects completed. The reason behind that two districts have been gotten less fund availability, so consequently less physical targets achieved.

Further the study has found that under the both programmes DDP and IWDP, more funds received in Pre-Haryali projects which were 80.54 per cent and 68 per cent respectively comparative to Haryali projects. But physical targets were higher achieved in Haryali Projects at given financial availability under DDP, and Pre-Haryali projects under IWDP. Less achieved physical targets in Haryali projects under IWDP was mainly due to less funds availability comparatively to cost of projects. So, financial performance of Pre-Haryali projects was better than Haryali projects under both programmes, but physical performance was not match according to financial performance. The financial performance of Haryali projects was not better

than Pre-Haryali projects, but achievement related to physical targets, Haryali projects better perform than Pre-Haryali projects under both programmes.

Reference:

1. Department of Land Resources, Government of India-Ministry of Rural Development 10 May, 2012 (http://dolr.nic.in/dolr/iwmp_main.asp)
2. Gandhi, P.Vasant and Lin Crease (2012) “Determinants of Institutional Performance in Watershed Management: A Study of the Nature and Performance of Watershed Development Institutions in Andhra Pradesh, India” paper presented at 56th AARES Annual Conference Fremantle, Western Australia, Feb 7-10, 2012.
3. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Economy_of_Haryana. Accessed 14 October, 2014.
4. http://www.rd.ap.gov.in/iwmp/IWMP_Note_Jan_2010.pdf. Accessed 14 October, 2014.



IJMRA