

CHAPTER 3

FELCRA'S ROLE IN LAND DEVELOPMENT

3.1 Introduction

The rural sector dominated the social, political and economic scene in Malaysia over the past few decades. Due to this, the Government placed heavy emphasis on the rural sector as far as policy-making and implementation were concerned. Land development was seen as the key to economic development, social progress and political stability of the country. The idea of land development was initiated in 1955 but only vigorously followed after Independence in 1957. A definitive policy for land development as a basic strategy for the upliftment of the economic status of the rural sector was formulated by the Government after Independence (Bahrin and Lee, 1988).

In the 1950s, the creation of FELDA was a milestone in the history of land development and settlement in Malaysia (Bahrin and Lee, 1988). In the 1960s, parallel with the establishment of FELDA, more than 500,000 acres of land were alienated by the States to groups of individuals under the Group Land Settlement Act (GSA). However, most of the land alienated to groups of individuals were not successfully developed because the participants were provided very little assistance in terms of capital, machinery, technological know-how and agricultural knowledge, particularly the Malays who had limited ability to raise capital. These together with the problem of uneconomic-sized land holdings prompted the Government to set up FELCRA, another land and rural development agency, in 1966 to salvage and rehabilitate the failed state land schemes in the interest of national development.

This chapter discusses FELCRA's formative years, its various land development models, its scheme management system culminating in an assessment of FELCRA's role in land development.

3.2 FELCRA's Formative Years.

The Federal Land Consolidation and Rehabilitation Authority (FELCRA) was established by the Government under the National Land Rehabilitation and Consolidation Authority (Incorporation) Act, 1966 (Parliament Act No. 22) on the 1st of April, 1966. This autonomous agency was set up due to a number of reasons. The main reason was that "many schemes implemented by the State Governments were not successful and as such required urgent salvation and rehabilitation in the interest of national development (FELCRA, 1967). These failed state land schemes were lands that were alienated by the State Governments to groups of individual under the Group Settlement Areas (GSA) Act to be developed into schemes which later failed. The other reasons for the establishment of FELCRA was that there were large areas of fragmented land holdings, fringe alienation areas and new block planting areas which were contiguous to or near such areas where uneconomic-sized holdings existed which required rehabilitation and consolidation. An autonomous agency was required to develop such land holdings into efficient producing units that were capable of generating incomes to the land holders to provide suitable developable or developed land to the excess population in the areas concerned and to supervise, assist and advise the land holders to ensure efficient agricultural practices were followed (FELCRA I Project, 1986). These were some of the main reasons that prompted the Government to establish FELCRA in 1966.

The National Land Rehabilitation and Consolidation Authority (Incorporation) Act, 1966, which underwent several amendments, the latest being made in 1989 (Act 398) specifies the various functions of FELCRA. The main functions of FELCRA with regards to the states in Peninsula Malaysia, are to consolidate, rehabilitate or develop either in its own motion and with

the approval of the appropriate State Authority or at the request of the State Authority, any state land (including land within a Group Settlement Area) and any alienated land at the request of the owner thereof, and upon such terms and conditions as may be agreed to between the owner and FELCRA, any other land other than those specified. As far as the states of Sabah and Sarawak are concerned, FELCRA's functions shall be to consolidate, rehabilitate or develop any lands at the request of the appropriate State Authority.

In order to exercise its functions accordingly, FELCRA is allowed to carry out all such activities that will promote agricultural, residential, transportation, financial, commercial, industrial and social development. FELCRA, with the approval of the Ministry of Rural Development and in concurrence with the Minister of Finance, is also allowed to enter into a partnership, joint-venture, undertaking, co-operation in any manner, an arrangement for sharing profits or otherwise, with any person, body, public authority, corporation or company incorporated under the Companies Act, 1965, carrying on or engaged in or about to carry on or engage in any such activities, and to take or otherwise acquire shares and securities of any such person, body, public authority, corporation or company, and to sell, hold or reissue with or without guarantee such shares and securities or otherwise deal with them (Laws of Malaysia, 1989).

3.3 FELCRA's Land Development Programmes.

In the past three decades, FELCRA has embarked on various land development programmes and activities. Its principal programmes have been the Rehabilitation schemes, Fringe schemes, Youth schemes, In-situ Village Development schemes and the Integrated Agricultural Development Projects (IADP), the RASCOM schemes and the KESBAN schemes.

3.3.1 Rehabilitation Schemes.

Prior to the establishment of FELCRA, the State Governments had embarked on land development activities such as the Fringe Schemes and Group Land Schemes which were established based on the "*Land (Group Settlement Areas) Act, 1960*". However, many of these state land schemes were unsuccessful mainly due to under-capitalisation and poor management, poor planning and the lack of proper supervision (FELCRA, 1982).

Due to this, FELCRA was directed by the Government to concentrate its efforts on the rehabilitation and salvation of these failed state land schemes which had been initiated and developed with minimal success by the various State Governments. The states which required assistance were requested to submit particulars of each failed scheme that required rehabilitation.

FELCRA first started undertaking the task of rehabilitating these failed land schemes in 1967 . These rehabilitated schemes were managed on a group operation basis similar to the estate management system. Each participant was charged for the land development expenditure incurred while management and administrative expenses were borne by the Federal Government. Scheme participants were given priority to work in the schemes and as a result received wages for work done. In addition to that, they also received dividends based on their share of land holdings ownership.

In the early 1970s, some schemes were already producing and thus there was an inflow of revenue to the participants or settlers from the sale of their scheme produce. The settlers of these schemes were thus able to slowly repay their development loans. This was taken as a positive sign for FELCRA to continue its role vigorously in the field of land development because its initial efforts were beginning to pay off. The schemes that had started generating incomes were all rehabilitation schemes, which showed that FELCRA had

succeeded in its efforts to rehabilitate failed state land schemes which would have otherwise deteriorated or been left idle.

In the 1980s, the Central Government issued a directive to FELCRA to concentrate its efforts on rehabilitation of alienated idle land. Prior to this, FELCRA only rehabilitated Group Alienation Schemes which had been rather tedious because it was very difficult and cumbersome to get the consent of every person in the group alienated area to allow FELCRA to rehabilitate its land. This difficulty brought about the problem of there being no contiguous plot of land and so the task of development became more difficult and expensive. That was the reason why FELCRA was directed to concentrate only on the rehabilitation of individual alienated idle land rather than group alienated idle land.

Despite the fact that FELCRA's two main roles were to rehabilitate and consolidate land, the authority had no power at all under the Act to effectively carry out any land consolidation work. Between 1967 and 1969, FELCRA was directed by the Government to concentrate on rehabilitating failed state land schemes to arrest any further deterioration.

3.3.2 Fringe Schemes.

FELCRA was directed by the National Development and Planning Committee (NDPC) to develop fringe land schemes in 1970 after the Federal Government decided to discontinue financial aid to the State Governments for this purpose hence passing the responsibility to FELCRA.

FELCRA's fringe schemes entailed the development of government land surrounding existing villages in the radius of three kilometres, thus termed as *fringe schemes* which did not undergo prior development by the State Government. Based on soil suitability studies, and having been granted the necessary clearance by the State Government, FELCRA would proceed to develop the fringe schemes concerned. The purpose of these

schemes were to expand the uneconomic sized holdings of the villagers so as to ensure economies of scale of land and to supplement their incomes (FELCRA, 1982). This was a form of land consolidation whereby the government land surrounding the villages are consolidated and developed as fringe schemes. FELCRA implemented its first fringe scheme in Air Hitam, Bahau, Negri Sembilan in 1970.

The participants are selected by the State Government and they come from the villages around these schemes. As it is assumed that the participants are to remain in their villages, no settlement is provided.

FELCRA's fringe scheme participants are not given individual plots of land to work on but instead collectively work for the overall scheme. The scheme participants are employed and paid a salary for work done in the scheme and as such employment and income opportunities are provided to the participants and hence the success of each scheme is in the hands of the participants themselves under the supervision and management of FELCRA. The participants of the fringe schemes also have to repay the development loans taken to finance the development of their schemes.

3.3.3 Youth Schemes.

In the 1960s, a high percentage of unemployment in Peninsular Malaysia existed amongst the youths. In 1962, more than 64 percent of all registered unemployed belonged to the age group between 15 and 20 years and this increased to exceed 75 percent in 1967 (Senftleben, W.).

Due to this, the Economic Planning Unit in its capacity as secretariat to the National Development and Planning Committee (NDPC) stressed the necessity of halting the rural exodus of unemployed youths and young school drop-outs through integrating them in the land settlement programme (EPU, 1970).

Initially, all youth land schemes were purely state schemes without financial assistance or interference from the Federal Government. This however changed in 1970 due to the limited financial resources of the various states. The NDPC agreed in 1970 to provide federal finance to open youth land schemes. Initially, the Ministry of National and Rural Development only co-ordinated federal financial assistance for the youth scheme programme which were implemented by the State Governments but due to the unpleasant experiences of other joint land development projects, the National Action Council authorised FELCRA to embark on Youth Land Schemes in 1972.

FELCRA undertook the youth land scheme programme to create employment opportunities to the unemployed rural youth through agricultural development so that they became responsible, modern and progressive farmers. Single male youths between the ages of 17 to 23 years who were Malaysian citizens were eligible to participate in these schemes. The youths were brought into the schemes after jungle clearing and planting had been done by external contractors. The planning and implementation of these youth land schemes were based on the youths *collective participation* in developing their schemes. Each scheme was managed on a co-operative basis, each youth having a share equivalent to 4.05 hectares (10 acres). As directed by the NDPC, FELCRA adopted the share system for both its oil-palm and rubber schemes. Instead of granting direct land ownership to individual settlers, shares of the undivided plantation was distributed to the settlers. The implementation of this programme, however ceased in 1984. Nevertheless the existing youth schemes and those that had initially been planned would still be maintained.

3.3.4 In-Situ Village Development Schemes.

FELCRA embarked on a new concept of development, that is, the in-situ village development. The in-situ schemes involved the consolidation of Government land with

individual land holdings. Both fringe and in-situ schemes involved land consolidation. The main objective of consolidation was to expand the land base of the participants to economic-sized holdings and to provide a supplementary source of income to participants (FELCRA, 1990).

FELCRA made its first attempt towards land consolidation in 1974 when it proposed that efforts be made to consolidate lands in the Kemubu irrigation area in Kelantan. The Government, through the NDPC, agreed that FELCRA undertake, on a pilot scheme basis, a land development programme which featured land consolidation. The scheme was known as the In-Situ or Traditional Village Development Programme which brought about two concepts viz. land consolidation and regrouping of villages. The In-situ Village Development concept involved the restructuring of traditional villages, relocation of participants, maximisation of land utilisation activities and provision of infrastructure. The participants involved are accommodated in a new housing area provided with basic infrastructure. The traditional village development concept features land consolidation, that is, the integration of nearby Government land with alienated land within the traditional village where serious land fragmentation had taken place. The Teratak Batu Scheme in Kelantan (1978), the Kampung Ulu Brang Scheme in Trengganu (1979) and the Kampung Kok Scheme in Langkawi Island, Kedah (1980) are examples of In-Situ Village Development Schemes. Based on the positive response from all parties towards FELCRA's In-Situ pilot projects, FELCRA moved on to emphasise on consolidation programmes involving alienated land and new land readily available nearby.

The main thrust of agricultural development programmes under the Fifth Malaysian Plan was the In-Situ land development approach. Both new and In-Situ land development programmes contributed significantly to increases in output and improvements in income of the agriculture sector. The Integrated Agricultural Development Project (IADP) was a major In-Situ component. The IADP projects were designed to provide an integrated

package of infrastructural and support facilities which included the provision of drainage and irrigation systems, flood control, farm roads as well as agricultural support services to existing areas.

3.3.5 Integrated Agricultural Development Project (IADP).

The Government proposed that, during the Fourth Malaysian Plan period (1981-1985), several Integrated Agricultural Development Programmes be implemented by several land development agencies. The Integrated Agricultural Development Project was a concept of the Ministry of Agriculture. FELCRA was chosen as the main implementing agency of one such project, i.e. the Trans-Perak IADP in 1981, which was financed by the World Bank (Loan No. 1960-MA, 1981). Prior to this, development loans were provided by the Government, but now there were external sources of loan, i.e. the World Bank and the Asian Development Bank.

The Trans-Perak IADP covers an area of approximately 16,437 hectares where FELCRA is directly involved in its rehabilitation and development of paddy, oil palm and cocoa areas as well as providing settlement for the participants of the project. The project's objectives were to resettle 4,000 landless farmers and those with uneconomic-sized holdings, assist existing farmers to increase income and productivity, become the country's eighth rice granary to assist rice self-sufficiency, increase foreign exchange earnings from tree crops, and balance regional distribution of development. The project started in mid-1981 and was completed in mid-1989. To-date, FELCRA has developed 4,500 hectares of new paddy area, to be operated as a fully mechanised paddy estate, and some 8,000 hectares of new oil-palm area with more than 1,000 settler families being emplaced in the project so far (Kok Kam Sang, 1995).

3.3.6 The Rajang Area Security Command or RASCOM Schemes.

FELCRA's activities in the RASCOM areas in Sarawak started in 1979 when the NDPC directed it to implement land development and settlement schemes within these areas for security purposes; especially in dealing with the communist threat. FELCRA started its agricultural development activities in Nanga Tada, Nanga Ngungun and Nanga Jagau in 1979, Nanga Sekuan I in 1982 and Nanga Sekuan II in 1983. As of 1994, the Government directed the Sarawak Land Consolidation and Rehabilitation Authority (SALCRA) to take over all RASCOM projects implemented by FELCRA thus far.

3.3.7 KESBAN Schemes at the Malaysian-Thailand Border.

The National Security Council directed FELCRA to be the lead agency to implement security schemes under the KESBAN programme in which agricultural land development projects would be implemented at the Malaysia-Thailand border.

Based on Directive No. 11 dated 5th of February 1980, FELCRA planned and implemented land development under the KESBAN programme in the States of Perlis, Kedah, Perak and Kelantan. The purpose of the KESBAN programme was to improve the socio-economic and security situation for the people living in the Malaysia-Thailand border areas.

In conclusion, Table 3.1 shows the different types of land development models implemented thus far by FELCRA. Some of these models or scheme-types are a combination of FELCRA's main functions of land consolidation, rehabilitation and development. As mentioned earlier, both fringe schemes and In-Situ Village Development schemes are types of consolidation schemes. As indicated in Table 3.1, a breakdown of the various development models according to the year they were first implemented is shown.

Table 3.1**Felcra's Development Scheme Models**

Year First Implemented	Development Model	Participants New Existing	New Development	Purpose of New Land Development	Group Farming	Housing ; Village Development	Supply of Power, Water Etc
1967	Rehabilitation	No Yes	No	-	Sometimes	No	Sometimes
1970	Fringe	No Yes	Yes	Amalgamation with existing landholdings	Individual holdings in existing area; group farming in amalgamation land	No	No
1972	Youth	Yes No	Yes	New Development	Yes	No housing until after production commences	Yes
1978	Consolidation (In-Situ)	No Yes	Yes	Amalgamation with existing landholdings	Yes; in both existing and amalgamation		
1979	RASCOM Schemes	Resettlement	Yes	Security Purposes	Yes		
1980	KESBAN Schemes	No Yes	Yes	Improving socio-economic situation	Yes		
1981	Trans-Perak IADP	No Yes	Rehabilitation and development		Yes		
1982	Security Schemes	Resettlement	Yes	Security Purposes	Yes		

Source : FELCRA : Pahang Barat Integrated Agricultural Development Project : Rubber/Oil Palm Component (FELCRA), 1982.

3.4 Scheme Management System.

The management system used by FELCRA to manage all its schemes is based on the group farming approach. FELCRA manages the schemes over an extended period until the scheme settlers are able to repay their development loans. Under FELCRA's scheme management system, the whole scheme is regarded as a unit with all the settlers as co-owners

who jointly enjoy the benefits of the output of the scheme and at the same time are responsible for the running of the scheme on the whole. Under this system, individual lots are not identified but each settler is given a certain amount of shares according to the size of his land holdings.

This scheme management system is advantageous because it ensures that the benefits of the scheme are evenly shared among the settlers according to their shareholdings. Besides that, it also ensures that the production period of the scheme is extended and sustained. This system also provides dividends out of profits derived from the schemes and the settlers feel a sense of responsibility over the management of their overall scheme. It also promotes a sense of belonging and a close rapport amongst the settlers. Finally, this system also ensures repayment of development cost or loan by the settlers.

3.5 An Assessment of FELCRA's Land Development Programme.

In order to assess FELCRA's land development programmes, an evaluation of its performance must be made. Performance indicators such as total area developed, productivity and quality indicators and total sales of output will be discussed. Besides assessing the performance of FELCRA's overall land development programme in general, a specific assessment of some selected FELCRA schemes in the Pahang Barat Integrated Agriculture Development Project will also be done as a further exercise in assessing FELCRA's role in land development. This specific evaluation will be based on a socio-economic survey done by a private consultant company, that is, Syarikat Sailcos Sdn. Bhd. in association with the Asian Development Bank.

3.5.1 Area Developed.

FELCRA's physical land development performance can be assessed by either the total area developed by main programmes or the total annual area developed by crops. Table 3.2 shows the total area during a span of twenty-eight years (1967-1995). Initially, the rehabilitation programme played a very important role where failed state land schemes were rehabilitated by FELCRA. In 1970, consolidation programmes in the form of fringe schemes (a type of consolidation scheme) were implemented. During the Second, Third and Fourth Malaysia Plan, FELCRA embarked on rehabilitation, consolidation and youth scheme programmes. Youth scheme programmes were phased out completely after the Fourth Malaysia Plan. At present, FELCRA's role as far as land development is concerned is to concentrate on rehabilitation and consolidation of idle land, development of Integrated Agriculture Development Projects (IADPs) and the implementation of the New Approach to Rural Development which comprises the Village Restructuring programme and the establishment of processing facilities.

Table 3.2

Felcra's Land Development (1967 - 1995)

Plan	Rehabilitation (Hectares)	%	Consolidation (Hectares)	%	Youth (Hectares)	%	Total (Hectares)
First MP 1967-1970	6, 022	97	206	3	-	-	6, 228
Second MP 1971-1975	3, 714	13	16, 260	58	8, 275	29	28, 249
Third MP 1976-1980	6, 633	20	14, 836	45	11, 580	35	33, 049
Fourth MP 1981-1985	32, 762	48	33, 554	50	1, 428	2	67, 744
Fifth MP 1986-1990	38, 376	35	70, 561	65	-	0	108, 937
Sixth MP 1991-1995	12, 256		11, 226		-	0	23, 482
Total	99, 763		146, 643		21, 283		267, 689

- Source : FELCRA's Annual Reports (various issues)
 Malaysian five-year plans (various issues)
- * : Consolidation schemes include fringe schemes
 and in-situ schemes.

The area developed by FELCRA can also be shown in terms of area developed by crops as in Table 3.3. In the 1960s and 1970s, rubber was the main crop grown in FELCRA's schemes but from the 1980s onwards, oil palm became the main crop grown. Paddy was grown in the 1980s when FELCRA embarked in the Trans-Perak IADP where it was the main crop grown.

The status of FELCRA's scheme area developed by states is indicated in Table 3.4. Until the end of 1995, FELCRA had developed a total of 1, 721 schemes covering 267, 689 hectares which were cultivated with oil palm, rubber, paddy and mixed crops.

TABLE 3.3

Area Developed by Crop Up to End of 1995 (Hectares)

Type of Crop/ Project	Rubber	Oil Palm	Paddy	Others	Total
Rehabilitation	24, 887	70, 841	1, 145	2, 890	99, 763
Consolidation	61, 120	98,985	5,568	2,253	167,926
Total	86,007	169,826	6,713	5,143	267,689

Source : FELCRA's Annual Report 1995

TABLE 3.4**Area Developed by States Up to End of 1995 (Hectares)**

State	No. of Projects	Area
JOHORE	208	43,634
MELAKA	69	4,921
N. SEMBILAN	209	21,616
SELANGOR	90	13,078
PERAK	259	49,609
KEDAH	152	16,822
PERLIS	7	3,186
PENANG	48	637
TERENGGANU	208	30,148
PAHANG	284	50,092
KELANTAN	116	19,565
SARAWAK	66	13,258
SABAH	5	1,123
Total	1,721	267,689

Source : FELCRA's Annual Report 1995

Since its inception in 1966 right up to the end of 1995, FELCRA has rehabilitated and consolidated a total of 267, 689 hectares of land which was initially idle or uneconomically used. This amount cannot be compared to FELDA's land development hectareage of 722, 626 hectares from 1956-1987 since both agencies have different targets set by the Government and different functions to undertake. Therefore, it is not viable to make such comparisons. What is noted here is that FELCRA succeeded in rehabilitating many state land schemes that had failed, consolidated many fragmented land holdings, developed new land schemes for youths (Youth Schemes) and even progressed rapidly in In-Situ development. During the periods covering the Fourth and Fifth Malaysia Plans, FELCRA demonstrated its capacity of developing a large amount of land that it has been regarded as one of the foremost agency for land development. Although the amount of idle land is declining, the Government still has plans

for FELCRA in the development of upstream and downstream activities associated with land and agricultural development.

3.5.2 Production of Output.

Another method of assessing FELCRA's performance is via its production of output. This is shown in Table 3.5 which shows the total cumulative area in production. As of December 1996, a total of 42, 234 hectares was planted with rubber, 93, 410 hectares of area planted with oil palm and 5, 583 hectares planted with paddy had started producing as shown in Table 3.5. The total area in production of 142, 101 hectares represents approximately 53 percent of total area developed by FELCRA. Therefore, in conclusion, more than half of the total area developed by FELCRA has already started producing and this has benefited the scheme settlers in terms of revenue accrued through the sale of their crop produce and their by-products.

Table 3.5

Total Cumulative Area Producing As Of December 1996 (Hectares)

Year	Rubber	Oil Palm	Paddy	Others	Total
1993	39,258	72,037	5,102	415	116,812
1994	36,882	79,614	5,583	1,536	123,615
1995	39,205	84,216	5,583	874	129,878
1996	42,234	93,410	5,583	874	142,101

Source : FELCRA's Annual Report (1993-1995)

: Key Performance Indicators Report (1994-1996),
Planning and Evaluation Division, FELCRA

3.5.3 Average Productivity Per Hectare.

Table 3.6 shows the average productivity per hectare of major crops planted in FELCRA schemes from 1993 to 1996. In all cases, the productivity level has improved though

there was a slight drop in rubber and oil palm productivity in 1993 and 1994. The productivity improvements shows that FELCRA's land development programmes had a positive impact on productivity per hectare levels which are even higher than the national levels. Therefore, it can be said that FELCRA's land development programmes, especially its agricultural practices are fairly efficient.

Table 3.6

Average Productivity Per Hectare By Crops as of 1996

Crop-Type	1993	1994	1995	1996	FELCRA's Highest	National Average
Rubber (kg/ha/yr)	1,058.0	955.0	994.0	1,070.0	1,332.0	1,240.0
Oil Palm (mt/ha/yr)	14.8	13.2	16.0	15.4	21.0	17.8
Paddy (mt/ha/yr)	6.0	8.0	7.9	8.3	8.8	4.1

Source : FELCRA's Annual Report, 1993, 1994, 1996

: Key Performance Indicators Reports, Depts. of Planning and Evaluation (1995-1996)

Table 3.7 and Table 3.8 shows the production achievements of oil palm and rubber by states until December, 1996. As shown in these tables, Melaka had the highest productivity per hectare for oil palm and Johor had the highest productivity per hectare for rubber. It is also noted that the average productivity per hectare for these two states exceeded the national standards which is an indication that FELCRA's schemes are a success and if the land development programmes are implemented and managed properly, the results would be very beneficial not only to the settlers but also to the nation as well.

Table 3.7

**Production Performance By States Until December 1996
(Oil Palm)**

State	No. of Producing Schemes	Producing Area	Production of Output (mt)	Productivity Per Hectare (mt/ha)	Ranking
KEDAH	31	788	11,572	14.69	6
P.PINANG	16	431	6,989	16.22	4
PERAK	177	24,525	469,257	19.13	2
SELANGOR	25	3,860	71,025	18.40	3
N. SEMBILAN	100	4,284	61,182	14.28	7
MELAKA	51	2,192	45,146	20.60	1
JOHOR	114	13,465	201,759	14.98	5
PAHANG	161	22,636	321,929	14.22	8
TERENGGANU	171	16,122	193,469	12	9
KELANTAN	66	4,474	51,058	11.41	10
SARAWAK	14	633	2,177	3.44	11
Total	926	93,410	1,435,563	15.4	

Source : Key Performance Indicators Reports, Dept. of Planning
and Evaluation (1995-1996)

Table 3.8

**Production Performance By States Until December 1996
(Rubber)**

State	No. of Producing Schemes	Producing Area	Production of Output (mt)	Productivity Per Hectare (mt/ha)	Ranking
PERLIS	7	877	891,848	1,016.93	5
KEDAH	67	8,029	7,863,831	979.43	6
PERAK	17	3,344	4,266,909	1,275.99	2
N. SEMBILAN	35	6,660	5,922,362	889.24	8
MELAKA	4	865	936,740	1,082.94	4
JOHOR	26	5,745	7,654,663	1,332.40	1
PAHANG	57	10,283	12,013,442	1,168.28	3
TERENGGANU	15	2,676	2,460,339	919.41	7
KELANTAN	22	3,755	3,160,937	841.79	9
SELANGOR	0	0	0	0	
Total	250	42,234	45,171,071	1,069.54	

Source : Key Performance Indicators Reports, Dept. of Planning
and Evaluation (1995-1996)

3.5.4 Revenue from Sales of Scheme Produce.

The revenue received from the sales of scheme produce and its by-products are shown in Table 3.9. There has been a steady increase in revenue received over the years although a slight downfall in revenue was noted in 1996. This was due to a fall in prices of major crops in 1996. However, the trend has been very positive in that the revenue collected on the whole has been increasing over the years and this proves FELCRA's success.

Table 3.9

Revenue Received From Sales Of Scheme Produce (RM Millions)

Crop-Type	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996
Rubber	77.4	78.30	94.7	120.1	132.30
Oil Palm	142.9	166.12	257.7	344.8	302.9
Paddy	30.8	34.3	29.3	29.8	31.8
	0.86	0.6	0.85	0.66	0.95
Total	251.96	279.32	382.55	495.36	467.95

Source : FELCRA's Annual Reports : 1992 - 1994.

: Key Performance Indicators Reports, Department of Planning and Evaluation (1995-1996).

3.6 Specific Assessment - Selected FELCRA Schemes.

Section 3.5 assessed FELCRA's land development programmes as a whole without specifying any schemes in particular. However, to further strengthen the assessment of FELCRA's land development programme, an evaluation of some selected FELCRA schemes must be done. This random study is a reflection of FELCRA's overall picture in land development. It is based on a socio-economic survey done by a consultant company, that is

Syarikat Sailcos Sdn. Bhd., in association with the Applied Agro-Economics Consultancy for the Asian Development Bank (ADB, 1995).

The schemes selected are situated in the Pahang Barat IADP. They are Kampung Ulu Renggol, Kg. Kuala Medang, Bertam II, Kg. Ulu Seli, Kg. Ulu Kerut and Kg. Ulu Atok. As far as land development was concerned, the physical findings of the survey included the agricultural activities undertaken by the selected schemes and its achievements in terms of area developed, output and input and comparisons made between the year 1984 and 1994.

3.6.1 Agricultural Activities, Area, Output and Input, 1984 - 1994.

Tables 3.10 to 3.15 shows the types of crops and agricultural activities undertaken by the three different project schemes and their comparisons in 1984 and 1994. Comparisons are made on the total areas cultivated by crops and output produced.⁴

As shown in **Table 3.10**, there is a marked increase in the total area planted with rubber-lump from 129.5 acres to 209.5 acres and the output produced from 26, 491.4 kg to 43, 197.2 kg for FELCRA's smallholders estates between 1984 and 1994. Even rubber for latex grew in volume in total area grown and output produced. This shows that FELCRA's development programmes improved the schemes' performance and hence benefited the settlers via higher revenues derived from sales of these increased output.

Table 3.11 also shows an even bigger improvement or increase in total acreage of oil palm (106.7 percent). The oil palm trees were probably planted in the early 1980s accounting for the zero output in 1984 and 23, 980 kg in 1994. The same goes for the cocoa products where total acreage and output increased. However, total acreage and output of paddy in FELCRA's smallholders estates dropped between 1984 (2 acres) and 1994 (1 acre). New crops such as sweet corn/maize, papaya and langsung which were never grown in FELCRA's smallholders estates in 1984 had been planted and some had even started producing in 1994. The total acreage and output for bananas, durians and rambutans also increased in 1994 as compared to 1984 as shown in **Table 3.12, 3.13, 3.14** for FELCRA's smallholders estates.

⁴ Agricultural produce here includes plants and livestock.

Table 3.15 shows the development of growth of livestock and fisheries. FELCRA's smallholders estates have increased their productivity in livestock rearing. This can be seen by the fact that even though total acreage used for rearing these livestock has decreased, the number of livestock reared have increased tremendously and therefore productivity has increased. FELCRA's smallholders have also embarked in fish rearing in 1994 which was never undertaken in 1984. Tables 3.10 to 3.15 are shown below.

3.7 Conclusion.

FELCRA's unique models especially in developing idle and failed land schemes has not been emulated by any other authority in the country as well as very few in other countries in the World. From the assessment above, as even been studied by others found FELCRA successful in achieving the objectives set by the Government.

Table 3.10
Agricultural Activities And Output For 1994 And 1984

Scheme (1994)	Rubber : Lump			Rubber : Raw Sheet			Rubber : Smoked Sheet			Rubber : Latex		
	Area (acre)	Age Of Tree	Output Kg	Area (acre)	Age Of Tree	Output Kg	Area (acre)	Age Of Tree	Output Kg	Area (acre)	Age Of Tree	Output Kg
Felcra Smallholders	209.5	284.5	43,197.2	3.0	15.0	1,200.0	-	-	-	18.0	21.0	6,586.5
Cases	35			1						3.0		
Average	6.0	8.1	206.2	3.0	15.0	400.0	-	-	-	6.0	7.0	365.9
Scheme (1984)												
Felcra Smallholders	129.5	391.0	26,491.4	17.0	41.0	6,073.6	-	-	-	-	-	-
Cases	24			3								
Average	5.4	16.3	204.6	5.7	13.7	357.3	-	-	-	-	-	-

Source : Asian Development Bank - Socio-Economic Survey by Syarikat Sailcos Sdn. Bhd.
Post Evaluation of Pahang Barat Integrated Agriculture Development Project.

Table 3.11
Agricultural Activities And Output For 1994 and 1984

Scheme (1994)	Oilpalm			Cocoa:- Pod			Cocoa:- Dry Bean			Cocoa:- Wet Bean		
	Area (acre)	Age Of Tree	Output Kg	Area (acre)	Age Of Tree	Output Kg	Area (acre)	Age Of Tree	Output Kg	Area (acre)	Age Of Tree	Output Kg
Felcra Smallholders	244	476	23,980	12	-	-	19	81	12,171	2	16	3,628.7
Cases	50			2			12			2		
Average	5	10	98	6	-	-	2	7	641	1	8	1,814.4
Scheme (1984)												
Felcra Smallholders	118	64	-	-	-	-	8	13	2,229.5	2	7	720
Cases	27		-				4			2		
Average	4	2	-	-	-	-	2	3	297	1	4	360

Source : Asian Development Bank - Socio-Economic Survey by Syarikat Salicos Sdn. Bhd.
Post Evaluation of Pahang Barat Integrated Agriculture Development Project.

Table 3.12
Agricultural Activities And Output For 1994 And 1984

Scheme (1994)	Paddy		Sweetcorn/Maize		Papaya		Banana					
	Area (acre)	No. of Output Planting Kg	Area (acre)	No. of Output Trees Pieces	Area (acre)	Number Of Trees	Area (acre)	Number Of Trees				
Felcra Smallholders	1	1	375	3	2400	6500	3.5	1200	3400	17.5	3110	13700
Cases	1			2			2			10		
Average	1	1	375	1.5	1200	2167	1.8	600	971.4	1.8	311	782.9
Scheme (1984)												
Felcra Smallholders	2	2	850	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	2200	1800
Cases	2									2		
Average	1	1	425	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1100	300

Source : Asian Development Bank - Socio-Economic Survey by Syarikat Salicos Sdn. Bhd.
Post Evaluation of Pahang Barat Integrated Agriculture Development Project.

Table 3.13
Agricultural Activities And Output For 1994 And 1984

Scheme (1994)	Snakefruit		Citrus		'Durian		Rambutan		
	Area (acre)	No. of Trees	Output	Area (acre)	Age of Trees	Output pieces	Area (acre)	Age of Trees	Output Kg
Felra Smallholders	0	0	0	0	0	0	28.4	532	16452
Cases							19	10	
Average	0	0	0	0	0	0	1.5	28	580.3
Scheme (1984)									
Felra Smallholders	0	0	0	0	0	0	13.5	504	11983
Cases							9	5	
Average	0	0	0	0	0	0	1.5	56	891
							0.7	27.6	951.4

Source : Asian Development Bank - Socio-Economic Survey by Syarikat Salicos Sdn. Bhd. Post Evaluation of Pahang Barat Integrated Agriculture Development Project.

Table 3.14
Agricultural Activities And Output For 1994 And 1984

Scheme (1994)	Langsat		Lain		Buahan		Sayuran		Tanaman Rumput	
	Area (acre)	Age of Trees	Output Kg	Area (acre)	No. of Trees	Output Kg	Area (acre)	Age of Trees	Area (acre)	Age of Trees
Felcra Smallholders	4	110	700	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cases	3									
Average	1.3	36.7	175	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Scheme (1984)										
Felcra Smallholders	0	0	0	1	20	200	0	0	0	0
Cases				1						
Average	0	0	0	1	20	200	0	0	0	0

Source : Asian Development Bank - Socio-Economic Survey by Syarikat Sailcos Sdn. Bhd.
Post Evaluation of Pahang Barat Integrated Agriculture Development Project.

Table 3.15
Agricultural Activities And Output For 1994 And 1984

Scheme (1994)	Cattle and Buffalo Rearing		Poultry Rearing		Goat Rearing		Fish Rearing					
	Area No. of Output (acre) Cattles	Area No. of Output (acre) Poultry	Area No. of Output (acre) Of Goats	Area Number Output (acre) Of Fishes								
Felcra Smallholders	9.4	21	4	0.4	400	840	0.8	520	132	2	7700	140
Cases	3			1			2			2		
Average	3.1	7	0.4	0.4	400	840	0.4	260	176	1	3850	70
Scheme (1984)												
Felcra Smallholders	10.3	39	4	2	200	100	5	3	1	0	0	0
Cases	3			1			1					
Average	3.4	13	0.4	2	200	50	5	3	0.2	0	0	0

Source : Asian Development Bank - Socio-Economic Survey by Syarikat Salicos Sdn. Bhd.
Post Evaluation of Pahang Barat Integrated Agriculture Development Project, 1995.