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State Level Study
State DILRMP Progress: Computerisation of RoRs

1. RoRs have been digitised in approximately 46,000 out of 47,918 villages.

2. Revenue records are stored in a secure state-level server which is online 24/7. This is located in Ajmer.

3. A copy of the RoR for all tehsils has been made available online. There are no tehsils for which a local electronic copy is available, without an online version.

4. Only a small proportion of the RoRs are available with a digital signature of the designated official (3,632 villages out of 47,918), and almost all of the RoRs are not available in a legally usable form (42,683 villages).

Test Check Results: Records were available in 87.6 percent of the checks, or 13,580 records out of 15,505.
1. Most tehsils in Rajasthan have functional and usable maps, albeit in paper form. 88 tehsils out 242 have some proportion of damaged or mutilated maps. In all other tehsils, 90 percent or more of maps are in a usable condition.

2. The state has not made significant progress in preparing maps using modern survey techniques. As per conversations with government officials surveys and re-surveys have been initiated in approximately 10 districts in the past year.

3. While old maps have been scanned, they have not yet been made available online. This is due to the fact that map digitisation is still in progress. This is the case for the entire state except for the tehsil of Uniara.

**Test Check Results:** We were able to access maps in less than 5% of cases (20 out of 420).
1. Rajasthan has a total of 527 Sub-Registrar Offices. The Inspector General’s office is in Ajmer.

2. In 2015-16, the SROs handled a total of 9,99,725 documents, out of which 3,24,942 were sale deeds. This covers the entire state, and not just rural land under DILRMP.

3. 350 SROs out of 527 handled transactions manually without any computerised support in 2015-16. This amounts to two-thirds of all SROs.

4. 143 SROs had a stand-alone computerised system for their work.

5. About a fourth of SROs have online systems for verifying documents and stamp fee duty.

6. Updating of circle rates is done annually and circle rates for the entire state are available online.

7. There are no legacy records available online for any SRO.
Test Check Results:

**Title search:** Out of 1,334 unique records checked, records were available in 775 cases, or 58 percent of the checks. In 32 percent of cases (427), the village-level database was empty.

**Collecting requisite documents:** The Rajasthan registration website does not allow for online filing. It does however facilitate eStamping, booking appointments, and tracking applications.

**Applicable stamp duty and fees:** The registration website has a centralised system for providing information on stamp duty and other fees for all SROs on its website.
Test Check Results:

- No facility available for:
  - Getting the conveyance deed prepared
  - Making online payments
  - Verifying documents submitted online
  - Online submission of documents

- A copy of the registered document can be accessed online, as evidenced by the test-checks. The document is however not a legally valid/authenticated copy.
1. 9 SROs throughout the state have systems that check the revenue records database for details of ownership, parcel size, etc.

2. The process of registration alerts the revenue records database by noting the fact of registration in some form in 15 SROs.

3. RoRs and cadastral maps have been integrated in 1 tehsil.

**Test Check Results:** Accessing the Record of Rights on the land record website allows a user to also extract the cadastral map for the relevant khasra number, but only for Tonk district.
1. The aggregate data confirms other information collected during the study: work on digitisation of RORs has been mostly completed, while computerisation of cadastral maps is at a preliminary stage.

2. Fresh survey work has been done in a little over 3,200 villages out of 47,918.

3. 4,145 villages now have computerised systems to complete the mutation process.

4. There has been mixed progress on the computerisation of registration. 176 out of 527 SROs have computerised their registration systems. 111 SROs accept E-stamps.

5. Very few modern record rooms have been constructed (14).

6. Only 9 SROs are integrated with land record databases.
Administrative Issues at State Level

1. Vacancies in lower level posts:
   - Tehsildar: 271 vacant out of 646
   - Naib-tehsildar: 556 vacant out of 952
   - Inspector of Land Records: 1386 vacant out of 3971
   - Patwari: 5600 vacant out of 12280
   - Assistant Settlement Officer: 24 vacant out of 42
   - Inspector: 54 vacant out of 178
   - Surveyor (Amin): 440 vacant out of 715

2. Maps updated only after new settlement i.e. every 20 years
Tehsil level study
Tehsil Selection

Selection criteria were as follows:

1. one “typical” tehsil and one “model” tehsil,
2. different agro-climatic zones,
3. historically part of different *riyasats*,
4. one rural, and one peri-urban.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Typology</th>
<th>Uniara</th>
<th>Girwa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DI-LRMP Progress</td>
<td>Model</td>
<td>Typical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban proximity</td>
<td>rural</td>
<td>peri-urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agro-climatic zone</td>
<td>Semi-arid eastern plain</td>
<td>Sub-humid southern plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(flat terrain)</td>
<td>(hilly terrain)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erstwhile <em>Riyasat</em></td>
<td>Tonk</td>
<td>Udaipur</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. **Sample village selection:** Random sampling to select 10 villages from the tehsil. Out of these five villages which had the highest transaction intensity were picked.

2. **Tehsil Test checks:** Examined 5 random entries in registers maintained at the tehsil office and SRO.

3. **Revenue village test check:** Examination of mutation files for randomly selected cases, including the entire sample of title-holders whose land parcels were surveyed.

4. **FGDs With Local Residents / Service Users:** FGDs at the GP buildings. Respondents consisted of GP members, local residents invited by the patwari to participate, and title-holders who are part of the sample for parcel surveys.

5. **FGDs with Revenue Officers:** Semi-structured discussions with the Tehsildar, the Patwari in charge of Land Records Computerisation, and 4-5 Patwaris and LRIs, at the Tehsil office.
6. **Land Parcel Survey Sampling:**

6.1 A list of persons whose lands had undergone any type of mutation in the year 2016-17 was made with the help of the Patwari.

6.2 These persons were invited to the GP for interviews.

6.3 Parcels from the mutation records of those persons who were willing to participate in the study were randomly sampled.

6.4 In some of the villages the number of persons willing to participate, or able to participate was lower than 10. In such cases we sampled more than one parcel belonging to the same title-holder, and part of the same mutation.

7. **Land Parcel Survey:**

7.1 Interviews with the title-holders were conducted at the GP, prior to conducting parcel measurement.

7.2 Parcel surveys were conducted using a Garmin GPSMAP64 instrument.
In 49% of the parcels, the difference between the area on record as compared to the area as measured, is more than 10%.

**Figure 1:** Difference Between Area on Record vs Measured
Tehsil Survey Findings: Causes for Deviation

NOTE: Only for parcels where difference is 10% or larger.

Figure 2: Causes of Difference Between Area on Record vs Measured

In most places width of farm roads has decreased from 7-8 ft to 2 ft or less.
1. In Girwa, there was only 1 case of delay. Cause: GP did not conduct meetings as per schedule.

2. In Uniara, delays caused by segregation work, and centralisation of mutation process. All mutations initiated at Tehsil due to partial computerisation of the process.

3. There are 3 cases of extreme delay in Uniara (over 1 year). 2 cases of mutation held up due to non-payment of GP Development Fees. 1 case where a parcel was overlooked because large number of parcels were involved.
1. Prioritisation of DI-LRMP:
   - Patwaris perform a huge variety of functions which reduces the time available for land records related work
   - Gram Panchayats are not part of the computerised land records network under DI-LRMP.

2. Land recording variance and shortcomings:
   - There is no provision for updating cadastral maps in between two settlements.
   - There is no uniformity in format or contents of recording data in RoRs in physical form.
   - Encumbrances other than mortgages are not recorded
   - Easement rights are not recorded
   - Possession and tenancy are not recorded
   - Land-use changes are not recorded unless they require conversion.
7. DI-LRMP implementation issues:

- Existing cadre of Patwaris are not well versed with the e-Dharti software.
- The currently used scale for cadastral maps (1:4000) is unsuitable for recording changes for 20+ years.
- Registration process does not check RoRs before registering a document.
- The e-Dharti software is not equipped to accept two separate mutation registers for one Patwar mandal (required under latest land conversion rules)
1. Revenue Department is short-staffed.
2. There is no provision for an operating budget for Patwar mandals.
3. Patwaris do not have computers or modern survey instruments.
4. Gram panchayat meetings are infrequent and irregular.
Recommendations

1. Patwaris’ duties should be limited to land records related work, i.e. maintaining and updating land records, processing mutations, and surveying and demarcation.
2. Patwaris need to be provided tablets/laptops, internet connections, and printers. Budgetary provisions need to be made for O&M of Patwari offices.
3. Modern technology should be leveraged for automating iterative tasks (crop survey, mapping etc.)
4. Changes to laws and regulatory requirements:

• Land revenue collection should be rationalised in view of its costs and benefits.
• Legal provisions have to be made for allowing cadastral maps to be updated as and when the situation on the ground changes.
• Legal provisions have to be made to allow amalgamation mutation
• GPs need to be included in DI-LRMP for streamlining the mutation process
• GPs should be compensated for administrative costs for sanctioning mutations
• The State Government needs to specify state-wide standard formats for recording land related data
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