

Performance Evaluation of Statutory Development Boards (SDBs) in Maharashtra

**Programme Evaluation Organisation
Planning Commission
Government of India**

Contents

1. [Introduction](#)
2. [Objectives and Scope of the Study](#)
 - 2.1 Objectives of the Study
 - 2.2 Methodology
 - 2.3 Data base of the Study
 - 2.4 Reference Period
3. [Statutory Development Boards: Physical Features and Working Mechanism](#)
 - 3.1 Population Composition
 - 3.2 Literacy Rate
 - 3.3 Health Institutions
 - 3.4 Per Capita Income
 - 3.5 Statutory Development Boards
 - 3.6 Composition and Working Mechanism
 - 3.7 Term of Office
 - 3.8 Functions of the Development Board
 - 3.9 Staffing Position
 - 3.10 Coordination
4. [Regional imbalances and Statutory Development Boards](#)
 - 4.1 Determination of Regional Imbalances
 - 4.2 FFC Report and Regional Imbalances
 - 4.3 Indicator and Backlog Committee Report and Regional Imbalances
 - 4.4 Removal of Regional Imbalances
 - 4.5 Increase in Regional Imbalances
 - 4.6 Limitations of Methodology Adopted to Estimate Backlog
 - 4.7 Regional Imbalances in Technical Education and Vocational Training
 - 4.8 Employment in Services Controlled by the State Government in the three Regions
 - 4.9 Role of Development Boards in the Identification of Regional Backlog
 - 4.10 Summary
5. [Planning, Resource Allocation and Regional Imbalance– The Role of Development Boards](#)
 - 5.1 Financial backlog of FFC Report
 - 5.2 Pattern of Allocation and Expenditure for Removal of FFC Backlog
 - 5.3 Backlog Clearance of FFC
 - 5.4 Financial Backlog of IBC Report
 - 5.5 Increase in Regional Backlog
 - 5.6 Pattern of Allocation and Expenditure of Funds
 - 5.7 IBC Backlog Removal

- 5.8 Increase in Regional Backlog
 - 5.9 Backlog Accumulation in Irrigation and Roads Sector
 - 5.10 Reasons for Accumulation of Backlog
 - 5.11 Role of Development Boards in Clearance of Backlog
 - 5.12 Governor's Directives and Compliance on Backlog Removal
 - 5.13 Observations on Governor's Directives
 - 5.14 Role of Planning Department
 - 5.15 Summary
6. [Routine Functions of the Development Boards – An Assessment](#)
- 6.1 [Special Fund](#)
 - 6.1.1 District-wise Allocation of Special Fund
 - 6.1.2 Sector wise Utilization of Special Fund
 - 6.1.3 Perspective Plan for Utilization of Special Fund
 - 6.1.4 Procedure Followed for the Works Under Special Fund
 - 6.2 [Assessing Impact of Various Development Efforts](#)
 - 6.2.1 Vidarbha Development Board
 - 6.2.2 Marathwada Development Board
 - 6.2.3 Rest of Maharashtra Development Board
 - 6.3 [Annual Reports and other Development Activities](#)
 - 6.3.1 Awareness Programmes
 - 6.3.2 Physical and Financial Backlog Clearance
 - 6.3.3 News Letters
 - 6.3.4 State Planning Process
 - 6.3.5 State Literacy Programme
 - 6.3.6 Perspective Plan for the Most Backward Taluka in each Region
 - 6.3.7 Involvement in Planning and Monitoring
 - 6.3.8 Involvement of Development Boards in Sanctioning the Works Under Backlog Removal
 - 6.3.9 Setting up of a Separate Department for Backlog Removal
 - 6.3.10 Powers of Administrative Approval for Irrigation Projects
 - 6.3.11 Constitution of New Indicators and Backlog Committee
 - 6.3.12 Study on Backlog Seats in Medical Education
7. [Performance of the Development Boards –Putting It All Together](#)
- 7.1 Role of Development Boards
 - 7.1.1 Identification of Regional Disparities by Development Boards
 - 7.1.2 Suggestions by Development Boards for Removal of Regional Disparities
 - 7.1.3 Impact of Special Fund on Regional Development
 - 7.2 Development Impact on Major Sectors

[ANNEXURES](#)

[PROJECT TEAM](#)

Preface

Disparities in development across Marathwada, Rest of Maharashtra & Vidarbha of the State of Maharashtra have been a matter of socio-political concern for long. The issue of disparities as it has unfolded over the years, is concerned with unequal access to some key socio-economic infrastructure facilities across regions. Though the Government of Maharashtra had been allocating some plan funds since the mid -1980s to address the issue of regional disparities, yet the gaps in infrastructure availability across regions widened in some sectors during the greater part of 1980s & 1990s. Socio-political imperatives led to the formation of Statutory Development Boards in 1994 to articulate the issues relating to regional disparities and suggest strategies for their removal in a time bound manner for systematic follow-up actions.

The Development Boards were constituted initially for a fixed term of 5 years in exercise of the powers of the President under Article 371(2) of the Constitution. The Governor assigned some special as well as routine functions to the Boards. The special functions included assessment of (i) sector-wise relative levels of development, (ii) impact of various development interventions and (iii) the levels of development expenditure in the three regions. The routine functions included utilizing a small development fund allocated to the Boards, conducting studies on various development interventions, organizing awareness generation programmes and submitting annual reports to the State Legislature. The Development Boards have been functioning for the last nine years as advisory bodies to the Governor. At the time of seeking extensions of the term of the Development Boards, the Government of Maharashtra submitted a fresh proposal for constitution of a separate Board for Konkan region which is currently a part of the Rest of Maharashtra region.

At the instance of the Ministry of Home Affairs, Government of India, Programme Evaluation Organisation (PEO), Planning Commission undertook evaluation of the performance of the Statutory Boards of Maharashtra with reference to their assigned responsibilities and to examine if the objectives for which they were constituted have been fulfilled. To conduct the evaluation exercise, PEO relied on the various committee reports, representations made by the Boards, annual reports, impact study reports and secondary statistics on development parameters for the State of Maharashtra. Discussions with officials of the Development Boards, the Planning Department, the Governor's Office and other government departments were also held to seek clarifications on various issues relating to the functioning of the Boards.

The findings of the Study clearly indicate that not only did the Boards discharge their assigned functions and responsibilities reasonably well, but they also have brought about important changes in the planning process of Maharashtra for balanced regional development. This is, however, not meant

to suggest that all positive changes were brought about by the Boards alone. The role played by the Governor's Office as an arbiter and in directing the activities of the Boards towards constructive purposes has been a very critical input towards this achievement. Also, subjecting the activities of the Boards to normal administrative procedures has helped the Boards in discharging their responsibilities efficiently and objectively. Therefore, the purpose of constituting the Boards for moderating and defusing socio-political tensions arising out of unacceptably large gaps in the level of development across regions has, by and large, been fulfilled.

Based on the detailed findings, an attempt has been made in this report to articulate the lessons keeping in view the possibility of their use in other States where large inter-regional development disparities may exist. A suggestion to re-define the role and functions of the Maharashtra Development Boards has been made to ensure usefulness of their services in the development process and bring about efficiency in use of public resources.

The study received constant support and encouragement from Deputy Chairman, Planning Commission, Chairman (EAC) and Secretary, Planning Commission. At the initial stage of the study Ms. Nutan Raj and Dr. P.D. Joshi (both Directors, PEO) were involved in evaluation design and analysis of some committee reports. The study was, however, completed under the direction and supervision of Dr. S.M. Sirajuddin, Deputy Adviser, PEO. The present shape of the study was given under my overall supervision and guidance. Thanks are due to the staff members of the Headquarters and field staff of PEO and National Informatics Centre (NIC), Yojana Bhavan Unit for their help and assistance in the completion of the study.

S.P. Pal

Adviser (Evaluation)

Dated: April, 2003
New Delhi

Summary:

Findings, Lessons & Suggestions

Disparities in development across Marathwada, Rest of Maharashtra and Vidarbha regions of the State of Maharashtra have been a matter of socio-political concern since the beginning of the twentieth century. The issue of disparities, as it has unfolded over the years, is concerned primarily with unequal access to some key social and economic infrastructure facilities. The first systematic attempt to articulate the nature and extent of such disparities was made by the Fact Finding Committee (FFC), 1984. The Committee, among other things, worked out the gaps in infrastructure development vis-à-vis the State average in 29 sub-sectors in the three regions and the funds required to eliminate the backlog. According to FFC, the resource requirement for removal of existing backlogs was Rs.3187 crore (at 1982-83 prices) and the estimated regional shares were: 24% for Marathwada, 37% for Rest of Maharashtra and 39% for Vidarbha.

Though, the Government of Maharashtra did not officially accept the recommendations of FFC (1984), some plan funds were being allocated each year for removal of infrastructure backlogs, in keeping with its overall findings. During 1985-1994, a sum of Rs. 3156 crore was spent. Taking into account the rates of inflation during this period, this amount was too small for removal of the (FFC) backlogs, and regional disparity remained a burning issue. Socio-political imperatives led to the formation of Statutory Development Boards in 1994 to take a fresh look at the issue of regional disparities and suggest strategies for their removal in a time-bound manner. The Boards were constituted initially for a fixed term of 5 years, in exercise of the power of the President under Article 371 (2) of the Constitution, following a Resolution of the State Legislature.

The Boards were allocated some Special Fund (Rs.100 crore per annum for the three Boards) and were required to carry out two types of functions, namely: some special functions periodically assigned by the Governor and some routine functions as per the Governor's order (1994). The special functions related to:

- Ascertaining relative levels of development in different sectors in relation to its area on the basis of appropriate indicators, having regard to the levels of development in the State as a whole;
- Assessing the impact of various development efforts in removing backlog and in achieving over-all development within their respective areas;
- Suggesting the levels of development expenditure over the area of the Development board during a plan period, including the annual plan.

In addition to this, the Governor periodically assigned some additional responsibilities to be discharged by the Development Boards by involving them in various Committees.

The Routine functions included:

- Preparation of projects/ programs for utilization of the Special Fund (Rs.100 crore) allocated to them.
- Carrying out studies on various development interventions.
- Conducting awareness generation programmes.
- Submitting annual reports of their activities to the State Legislature.

Evaluation Study

Since their inception, the three Development Boards have been carrying out the functions assigned to them and their tenure was extended by another 5 years up to April, 2004. While requesting for the extension of their tenure, the Government of Maharashtra submitted a fresh proposal for constitution of a separate Board for Konkan region which is originally a part of the Rest of Maharashtra region. The Ministry of Home Affairs, Govt. of India has requested the Planning Commission to assess the performance of the Development Boards with reference to their assigned functions and examine if the objectives for which they were set up have been fulfilled.

Evaluation Criteria

Given the functions of the Boards, their performance has been assessed with reference to the following criteria:

- Whether they have been effective in articulating the nature and extent of regional disparities in Maharashtra for systematic follow-up actions.
- Whether their activities have contributed towards development of a strategy for attaining balanced regional development.
- Whether the tasks periodically assigned to them by the Governor have been discharged satisfactorily.
- Whether their recommendations and suggestions have actually helped reduce regional disparities in development indicators.
- Whether they have used the Special Fund of Rs.100 crore per annum properly.
- Whether they have satisfactorily discharged their routine functions.

While assessing the performance of the Boards with respect to the above criteria, the following aspects have been kept in view in the evaluation study:-

- The Boards are advisory bodies and could not have directly influenced the development pattern of the State. Their performance would also depend on the response from other institutions, such as, the office of the Governor, Departments of Planning and Finance and the State Legislature. Even for utilization of the Special Fund allocated to them, prior approval of the Planning and Finance is required.
- Though the Boards came into existence in 1994, their recommendations and suggestions could not be fully operationalized until the formal acceptance of Indicator and Backlog Committee (IBC) Report in 2000.
- The data / information on most development indicators are available with a long time lag and for many relevant indicators of development, the post-IBC (2000) data are not available.

These limitations notwithstanding, the Boards have carried out their assigned activities ever since their establishment, and outputs of these activities have served as important inputs for the IBC Report which was officially accepted. Since the recommendations of IBC Report have far-reaching implications for the planning process in Maharashtra, an attempt has been made in this Study to judge the performance of the Boards with reference to their contributions that led to articulation of the nature and extent of regional disparities, formulation of a strategy for backlog removal and correcting the inadequacies of the planning process. To bring out this role of the Boards, PEO had to depend on information in the form of:

- Various Committee Reports – FFC, IBC, and others;
- Various representations made by the Boards to the Governor;
- Annual Reports brought out by the Boards;
- Impact studies conducted by the Boards;
- Secondary statistics on development parameters available in the government publications; and
- Discussions with the officials of the Boards, Planning Departments, the Governor’s office and other Government Departments.

Performance of Boards – Main Findings

A: *Special Functions*

1. The Boards immediately after their constitution, highlighted methodological inadequacies in the approach adopted by the FFC Report (1984). According to them, the extent of regional disparities in the availability of infrastructure was worse than that brought out in the FFC Report.

2. Their initiative led to the formation of Indicators and Backlog Committee (IBC) in 1995 for re-examination of the relative levels of development in identified sectors, the current backlog position and the strategy being followed by the Government for removal of regional imbalances. The IBC, in which the technical Members of the Boards participated, worked out the inter-regional disparities in different sectors and the resources required to eliminate the backlog as also the regional shares in the total fund. They also monitored the changes in the backlog position and periodically updated the requirements for funds and regional shares for review by the office of the Governor. Their findings vis-à-vis those of the FFC are summarized below:-

(Regional share in backlog %)			
Region	FFC Report (1984)	IBC Report (1994)	Backlog position of IBC as on 1.4.2000 (*)
Vidarbha	39.1	47.6	48.3
Marathwada	23.6	28.8	29.6
Rest of Maharashtra	37.3	23.6	22.1
Total backlog (in Rs. Crore)	3187 (1982-83 prices)	14007 (1993-94 prices)	11,974 (1993-94 prices)

(*) Figures in the last column indicate backlogs remaining as on that date.

The Table shows that the shares of Marathwada and Vidarbha have been rising over time, implying inadequacies in the approach being followed for removal of backlogs.

1. The Boards also examined the flow of backlog funds to the three regions for the period 1985 to 1994 and observed the following:

- Allocation and expenditure in the identified sectors were not in accordance with the pattern implied in the FFC Report. The Rest of Maharashtra got a larger share than their entitlement, while the other two regions got less.
- The improper methodology adopted by the FFC in the computation of backlogs in the irrigation sector had favoured the Rest of Maharashtra region.

2. A re-examination of the latest backlog position (IBC 2000) revealed that the regional imbalances in the availability of socio-economic infrastructure in some sectors, particularly, in irrigation and roads had, in fact, worsened even though about Rs.3156 crore was spent during 1985 to 1994.

3. The Boards pointed out that even if the budgetary resources were allocated as per FFC backlogs and shares, regional imbalances could not have been eliminated because of the following reasons:-

- Less than 10% of the annual budgetary (plan) resources was being used for backlog removal, while allocation of the remaining 90% was not oriented towards balanced regional development.
- The extra-budgetary resources which constituted about 26.6% of the total plan resources during the period 1996-2001 were also not being allocated equitably across regions.
- The Boards articulated the basic contradictions in the planning process. They observed that while on the one hand, regional disparities in some sectors are widening because of uneven allocation of the greater part of plan funds across regions, only a small proportion was being used to remove existing disparities on the other. They, therefore, advocated for bringing about changes in the planning process and sought the intervention of the Governor.

B. Routine Functions

- As per Governor's advice, the Boards had identified the areas of developmental concern, formed Study Groups of Experts to assess the impact of various development initiatives taken up by the State Government for regional development and suggested measures for improvement and mid-course corrections.
- Till 2001, the Boards brought out 21 Reports consisting of impact studies, opinion survey reports and feasibility reports. For this, they used the services of local research institutions. These reports were forwarded to the concerned Departments for follow up actions through the Governor's office.
- The Boards have been submitting their Annual Reports regularly. These reports contained information on the number of Board meetings held, development works undertaken out of Special Fund, progress reports on backlog clearance, etc. The Boards are also bringing out newsletters reflecting on various development activities and initiatives in their regions.
- Each year, the Boards are using the Special Fund of Rs.100 crore for undertaking small development projects in their respective regions. An analysis of the flow of funds across districts within a region reveals that a large part of the fund is being spent in one or two districts within the region. It has also been found the use of Special Fund was concentrated in one or two sectors. This has led to some complaints about improper use and unequal spread of the Special Fund.
- The Boards are taking initiatives to conduct awareness generation programmes in areas of health and education, to fund neo- literates, libraries and studies out of the Special Fund.

- The Chairperson and the Members of the Boards have participated in planning process at the State and District levels.

Lessons Learnt

The findings of the study tend to suggest that not only did the Boards discharge their functions and responsibilities reasonably well, but they have also brought about important changes in the planning process for balanced regional development. The purpose of constituting the Boards for moderating and diffusing socio-political tensions arising out of unacceptably large gaps in the level of development across regions, seems to have been, by and large, fulfilled.

It may be noted that inter-regional disparities in development across regions of large Indian States are not uncommon, and in combination with other socio-cultural factors have sometimes caused considerable socio-political tensions and disintegration of States. Keeping in view the possibility of its replicability, it would be useful to bring together the following lessons of Maharashtra Model for wider dissemination and ready reference.

- Decentralization of the planning process helps in articulation and prioritization of the local development needs as also in the assessment of local resources and development potential.
- Establishment of decentralized institutions, however, is only a necessary condition for accommodating regional needs and aspirations in the planning process, but not a sufficient one. Capacity building of the Boards and establishing functional linkages of their activities with those of other institutions are essential for synergetic effects. In the case of Maharashtra Model, the role played by the Governor as an arbiter and in channeling the activities of the Boards towards constructive purposes has been the most critical input. Also, subjecting the activities of the Boards to established administrative procedures has helped the Boards in discharging their responsibilities effectively and without prejudice.
- One important responsibility of the Boards was to ensure equitable allocation of development funds for balanced development across regions. However, instead of focusing on substantive development issues, the functions of the Boards got oriented towards computing the relative levels of availability in socio-economic infrastructure across regions. The shift of emphasis from articulation of regional development issues in terms of specific socio-economic goals to computation of regional disparities in socio-economic infrastructure has serious implications for both “development paradigm” and “effective use of public resources.”
- Each region has a different natural endowment and hence different material growth potential. Undue focus on attaining balanced

infrastructure growth without reference to the regional potentials and needs can lead to both inappropriate development strategies and inefficient use of development resources. In fact, the regional Boards have sometimes recommended for investment in some sectors without properly analyzing the development potentials and economic implications of public investment decisions. Such a trend has to be arrested and the issue of sectoral infrastructure backlog removal should not be stretched beyond 2006, as desired by the Governor.

- The Boards have been concerned with computation of infrastructure backlogs in the (government) public sector and want backlogs to be removed by public investment alone. The real development issue in this context is inequality in access to development opportunities and not the unequal availability of infrastructure in public sector. The government need not be assumed to be the only provider of facilities or services. A broader approach to include the facilities available with other development partners and the role that they could play in development would be more appropriate.
- Undue pre-occupation of the Boards with computation of disparities in infrastructure has often led them to look for methodological twists that would give their regions a larger share of the Backlog Fund. For example, the Boards worked out the regional shares in Backlog Fund by aggregating those in the backward districts and *talukas* within a region without considering the better off districts and *talukas*. This methodology is inappropriate when the primary area of concern is inter-regional disparities. The right approach in this specific context would be to work out backlogs with reference to the development of the region as a whole.
- Unusually long time gap between the constitution of the Boards and acceptance of IBC report points to procedural inadequacies. This happened partly because of lack of access to the requisite information by the Board members and partly due to long time taken by the line departments to send their responses to the first IBC report (1997). This delay in acceptance of the report intensified inter - Board disputes on certain issues. Had a proper institutional mechanism existed, delay and disputes could have been avoided.

Suggestions

The Development Boards were constituted to address certain specific areas of development concern. As per the Governor's order, the Boards are required to function till 2004. The Governor has also desired that all backlogs referred to in the IBC report be removed by 2006.

The performance evaluation brings out both positive and negative aspects of their functioning. While the Boards' activities have generally brought about important changes in the planning process, their approaches and

recommendations were not always in keeping with the objectives of efficient use of public resources and developing a strategy for balanced regional development.

Should the term of the Boards be then extended? For two reasons, it may not be fair to conclude that the services of the Boards will no longer be required. First, the activities of the Boards have helped in bringing about several modifications in the planning process for removal of existing backlogs and the impacts of the changes introduced need to be monitored and evaluated and perhaps, more corrective actions may be required to ensure balanced regional development in the State. Second, being decentralized units, the Boards are better aware of the local resources, needs, development potentials and areas of socio-economic concern. Their experience in articulating the issues of regional development in the planning process can be very useful inputs to the planners and policy makers.

The Boards, however, will not be required to carry on with the special functions that were assigned to them by the Governor for backlog monitoring and updating beyond 2006. It is also felt that some of the routine functions of the Boards need not be carried out by them. In view of these, the role and functions of the Development Boards must be redefined. The following suggestions are made towards this end:-

- The Boards should be given the responsibility of preparing the regional development reports and periodically updating the same. The reports should contain:
 - an analysis of the assessment of local resource base (human, natural and socio-economic) and development potentials;
 - the development status of important population groups and spatial units in terms of development indicators of the various areas of socio-economic concern;
 - computation of development gaps (not disparity in infrastructure) between the regions and the State averages in the broad areas of social concern (material well-being, health, education, etc. as in the Human Development Reports brought out by Planning Commission, different State Governments and the UNDP); and
 - an outline of the regional development plan for consideration of the Planning Department, based on resources and potentials of regions.
- Based on the regional development reports prepared by the Boards, appropriate allocative principles for allocation of development resources across regions may be worked out. An Expert Committee may be constituted to study the reports and recommend appropriate allocation principles.

- The Planning Department must regularly give feedback to the Development Boards on the status of proposals and suggestions made by the Boards with explanations wherever needed.
- The services of the Boards should be used for monitoring and evaluation (M&E) of plan programmes and overall regional development. They can monitor the physical and financial performance of plan schemes more effectively than being done at present by the line departments. They can also undertake evaluation of development interventions in collaboration with the research institutions. Results of the independent M&E exercises can be forwarded to the concerned line Departments through the office of the Governor for follow-up actions. Perhaps, some capacity development of the Boards may be necessary for the purpose.
- Spending the large part of the Special Fund on various development schemes, as is being done at present, is not advisable as many such development schemes can be taken up under the normal State Plan and M.P./M.L.A. Local Area Development Schemes. Instead, they should carry on with the compliance of Governor's directives of using some proportion of this fund for adopting the most backward *talukas* in the region for intensive development.
- The Boards should carry on with the task of conducting awareness generation programmes and supporting capacity building of the grassroots level institutions and other such schemes which cannot be adequately funded under the normal plan activities.

:-:

Chapter – I

Introduction

Development and change is a continuous process in all its forms in different parts of the world. However, due to intrinsic, historical and geographical conditions certain regions/areas and communities remain at the farther end of the development spectrum compared to other regions. In Maharashtra State also, development problems, regional imbalances and subsequently setting- up of the three Statutory Development Boards can be traced to geo-historical and political reasons that prevailed during the last few centuries.

The genesis for establishment of Development Boards goes back to Maha Vidarbha movement in 1905, which continued for a separate State for Vidarbha region even after independence due to its backwardness. This unrest arising out of backwardness of socio-economic development, language of the region, coupled with the glaring regional imbalances culminated in the Nagpur Agreement in 1953. As Government of India had appointed States Reorganisation Commission in December 1953 deliberations took place among eminent social and political leaders of Maharashtra on the formation of a separate State of Marathi speaking areas of the then Bombay, Madhya Pradesh and Hyderabad states, and they signed an agreement at Nagpur on 28-09-1953 which is known as Nagpur Agreement (Annexure-1.1). This agreement, among other things, refers to three regions of the State: Vidarbha, Marathwada and Rest of Maharashtra and deliberates on the procedure to be adopted for allocation of funds, composition and recruitment to the Government services, admissions to all educational institutions, setting up of a High Court Bench at Nagpur and shifting of at least one session of State Legislature to Nagpur in a year.

The State's Reorganisation Commission in their report (December 1955) recommended a bilingual state for Bombay comprising broadly the Marathi speaking areas of the then Bombay and Hyderabad and Gujarati speaking areas of the then Bombay, Saurashtra and Kutch. Apart from this, the Commission also recommended a separate State for Vidarbha area though the Nagpur Agreement did not make a formal demand of this. However, Government of India agreed for bifurcation of Bombay State into Maharashtra and Gujarat States, but did not accept the recommendation of a separate State for Vidarbha region. The States Reorganisation Commission recommendation for the Statehood to Vidarbha was based on the regional imbalances, backwardness, the perception of the local people's fear of neglect and impracticality of shifting administrative set-up to Nagpur from Bombay periodically.

After the adoption of the Bill for Reorganization of States (Ninth Amendment Act, 1956), the State of Maharashtra was formed in 1960 by merging the contiguous Marathi speaking areas of the then Bombay,

Madhya Pradesh and Hyderabad regions. Bombay region was better developed at the time of formation of Maharashtra state whereas Hyderabad region (Marathwada) and Madhya Pradesh region (Vidarbha) were relatively backward. Article 371(2) was incorporated at the instance of the members from Vidarbha and with the support of members from other areas of Maharashtra to take care of the backward regions of the State. Article 371(2) enables the President of India to provide for special responsibility of the Governor for the establishment of Development Boards for Vidarbha, Marathwada and Rest of Maharashtra regions for balanced development (Annexure 1.2).

After the formation of Maharashtra State in 1960, development efforts continued in the three regions during the subsequent five year plans and some of the points raised in the Nagpur Agreement, like shifting of Legislative session to Nagpur, setting up of a High Court bench and decentralization process were followed. However, the regional imbalances continued in Vidarbha and Marathwada regions in spite of governmental efforts. During Sixth plan (1980-85), State Planning Department undertook a study on district-wise development achievement and pointed to the noticeable disparities across regions in irrigation, roads, public health and technical education sectors. During the sixth plan, Government announced a 38-point, a 35-point and a 17-point development programmes for the three regions; Vidarbha, Marathwada and Konkan respectively for the removal of regional imbalances. Due to the persistence of glaring developmental imbalances, political leaders highlighted this in several fora and sessions of State Assembly and Parliament. Consequently, Maharashtra Government appointed a Fact Finding Committee under the chairmanship of Dr.V.M.Dandekar in July 1983 to probe in detail the developmental imbalances and backlog in various sectors in the three regions of the state.

The Fact Finding Committee (FFC) submitted its report in April 1984 in which it had worked out a backlog of Rs.3186.78 crores for 9 development sectors, namely, roads, irrigation, village electrification, general education, technical education, health services, water supply, land development & soil conservation and veterinary services. The share of the backlog fund of the three regions came to 23.6%, 39.1% and 37.3% for Marathwada, Vidarbha and Rest of Maharashtra regions respectively. The Government appointed an Empowered Committee to study in detail the suggestions of the FFC report, which submitted its report in April 1987.

The FFC report suggested its implementation through appropriate allocation of resources in the three regions to remove the backlog within a period of 5-7 years. Though the Government did not formally accept the FFC recommendations, it started allocating special outlays for the removal of backlogs in the three regions from 1985-86 onwards. However, low budgetary outlays for backlog removal, inadequate deployment of implementing machinery and inequitable allocation of funds for non-backlog schemes resulted in the increase of regional imbalances.

On 26th July, 1984 both the houses of Maharashtra State Legislature passed a unanimous resolution requesting the President to make an order in exercise of his powers under article 371(2) of the Constitution for the establishment of three Development Boards: Vidarbha, Marathwada and the Rest of Maharashtra to remove the regional imbalances. The President accepted the resolution passed by the Legislature and issued an order on 9th March 1994 assigning the Governor of Maharashtra the responsibility for the establishment of the three Boards for a period of five years (Annexure 1.3). On 30th April 1994, the Governor of Maharashtra issued the orders constituting separate Development Boards for Vidarbha, Marathwada and Rest of Maharashtra. On 5th August 1994, rules and guidelines were issued for the composition, the terms of office of the Chairman and members of the Boards, functions of the Boards, allocation of funds for development expenditure and equitable arrangement for education, training and employment in services under the control of the State Government (Annexure 1.4 and 1.5). The Governor's orders implicitly take care of the spirit and points raised in the Nagpur Agreement.

After the appointment of the Chairman and Members in June 1994 the three Statutory Development Boards: Vidarbha, Marathwada and Rest of Maharashtra started functioning with their headquarters at Nagpur, Aurangabad and Mumbai respectively. Initially, there were handicaps and the pace of work to the Boards was slow due to various reasons, including the State elections and lack of infrastructure facilities. The Boards were reconstituted many times later due to changes in party positions in Government. The Governor constituted three Committees in exercise of his powers to strengthen the activities of the Development Boards. A Joint Committee of the three Development Boards called the Indicators and Backlog Committee (IBC) was set- up for assessing the relative levels of development and computing the backlog of different regions of Maharashtra in 1994, which submitted its report in July, 1997. The first report of Indicators and Backlog Committee indicated a backlog of Rs. 15335.77 crores in the three regions as on 31st March 1994 for the same 9 sectors dealt earlier by FFC. The physical backlog calculated by the Indicators and Backlog Committee was not acceptable to the Irrigation, Health, and Water supply & Technical Education departments of the State. The Governor reconstituted the Indicators and Backlog Committee with the additional terms of reference and this Committee submitted the report in September, 2000. As per this Committee's report, a backlog of Rs. 14006.77 crores was reported as on 31st March 1994 for the same 9 sectors considered by earlier Committee. The reconstituted Indicators and Backlog Committee submitted its second report in 2000 for additional 15 indicators and a detailed mechanism for the removal of backlog.

The Governor also constituted a joint committee on equitable arrangements for Technical education and Vocational training and another joint committee on representation of three regions in Government services. These Committees submitted their reports in September 1996 and October 98 respectively. Based on the former report, and the Governor's directive the

State Government framed the rules of admission for professional courses, which was, however, challenged in the Court for its Constitutional validity. The Governor issued elaborate directives on 15th December 2001 for the allocation of funds, removal of backlog and implementation mechanism based on the IBC report.

Need for the Study

Since their inception in June, 1994 the three Developmental Boards have been carrying out their functions and the tenure of the Boards was to be completed on 30th April 1999. As per the request of the Government of Maharashtra, the President of India vide an order dated 29th April, 1999 extended the tenure of the three Development Boards by another 5 years up to 30th April, 2004. While requesting the extension of the tenure of the existing Statutory Development Boards, the Government of Maharashtra also submitted a proposal for setting -up a separate Board for Konkan region which forms a part of the present Development Board of Rest of Maharashtra. Ministry of Home Affairs has requested Planning Commission to evaluate the functioning of the Boards for assessing the effectiveness with which the three Development Boards constituted for Vidarbha, Marathwada and the Rest of Maharashtra region are functioning towards attainment of objectives set for them and the impact of their creation on the balanced regional development.

Chapter – II

Objectives and Scope of the Study

The scope of the present study is mainly to analyse in detail the functioning of the three Maharashtra State Statutory Development Boards; Vidarbha, Marathwada and Rest of Maharashtra since their inception. The Evaluation study also covers the role and functions of the other associative administrative authorities, Governor's office, State Planning Department – which have a bearing on the functioning of the Statutory Development Boards. Maharashtra State Statutory Development Boards came into existence in June 1994 and the study covers the reasons behind the setting-up of the Boards and reviews the functioning of Development Boards in Maharashtra with reference to their assigned powers and responsibilities. It also examines the efficacy of the system, the supportive role of the State Government and the constraints for their effective functioning.

2.1 Objectives of the Study

The main objectives of the study is to evaluate the functions of the three Statutory Development Boards of Maharashtra as pronounced in the Maharashtra Governor's Order, 1994. Thus the study analyses the Boards functions in terms of:

1. Whether relative levels of development in different sectors in relation to its area on the basis of appropriate indicators, having regard to the levels of development in the state as a whole have been ascertained.
2. Whether the impact of various development efforts in removing backlog and in achieving overall development within its areas have been assessed.
3. Whether the levels of development expenditure over the area of the Development Board during the plan periods including the annual plan have been suggested and implemented.
4. Whether annual reports on the working of the Board have been prepared and sent within three months after the end of every financial year to the Governor for placing it before the Maharashtra State Legislature.

The study also covers the Special responsibility entrusted to the Governor towards the functioning of the boards as enshrined in the Governor's order of the establishment of the Boards namely:

- (a) Equitable allocation of funds for development expenditure over the three regions.

- (b) Equitable arrangements for providing adequate facilities for technical education and Vocational training.
- (c) Adequate opportunities for employment in the services under the control of the State Government in the three regions subject to be requirements of the State as a whole.

The evaluation study also focuses on:

- i) The supportive role played by the Planning Department of Government of Maharashtra and the financial resources allocated by the Maharashtra Government.
- ii) Examination of the programmes/schemes taken - up by the Planning Department in removing backwardness of the region and
- iii) The monitoring mechanism of the schemes and projects for the proper functioning of the Statutory Development Boards in the State Government.

The findings of the study may help in (a) assessing the extent to which the specific objectives of the establishment of boards are being met, (b) identifying the areas of success and failure and (c) in making diagnostic analysis of success and failure and its causal factors. The evaluation results will also help us in ascertaining the feasibility of setting- up of another Statutory Development Board for Konkan region in the State.

2.2 Methodology

As the data for the present study are based on secondary sources and the scope and objectives are very specific, broadly two approaches have been adopted for analysis i.e. pre-Board position and post-Board position. The performance of the Boards have been evaluated on this criteria of physical development and backlog position before the existence of Statutory Development Boards and performance of Boards after 1994-95. The two Committee reports: Fact Finding (Dandekar) Committee (1984) and Indicators & Backlog Committee (2000) have been taken as bench mark works for this purpose. These Committee reports dealt in detail the developmental position, physical and financial backlog and the mechanism for its removal. The following 9 sectors (and 29 sub-sectors/indicators) dealt by these Committees have been critically examined for this purpose: (1) roads, (2) irrigation, (3) village electrification, (4) general education, (5) technical education, (6) health services, (7) water supply, (8) land development and soil conservation and (9) veterinary services. The aspects of physical, financial and impact analysis also revolves around these major sectors year wise. An assessment is also made of the two Joint Committee report of Development Boards on higher/technical education, and opportunities for employment in Government Services Vis-à-Vis of the role

and performance of the Boards, Planning Department and Governor's office since the Boards set-up in 1994.

2.3 Data base of the Study

The scope of the present study is different from that of the usual programme Evaluation Organisation (PEO) studies wherein an integrated overview of performance, implementation mechanism, process of delivery and the resultant impact of the scheme/ programme on the beneficiaries is evaluated through sample study. The present evaluation study is based mainly on the secondary information of annual reports of Development Boards, Government publications obtained from the Development Boards, Planning Department, Development Boards Secretariat office of the Governor and the reports of various Committees set-up by the Boards, Government and Governor. Detailed discussions were also held with functionaries of the three Statutory Development Boards, Senior Officers of the Governor's office and Planning Department regarding the functioning of the Statutory Development Boards and reconciling of the data.

2.4 Reference Period

The study covers the reference period since the setting up of the boards from 1994-95 to 2001-2002.

Chapter – III

Statutory Development Boards: Physical Features and Working Mechanism

Maharashtra State located on the West coast of the Arabian Sea was carved out as a linguistic state of Marathi speaking people. It is the second largest in terms of population and the third largest in terms of area in the country. The state of Maharashtra with an area of about 3.08 lakh sq. kms has 35 districts spread over 6 revenue divisions namely Nashik, Pune, Konkan, Aurangabad, Nagpur and Amaravati. Vidarbha Development Board (VDB) has Nagpur and Amaravati revenue Divisions and Marathwada Development Board (MDB) has Aurangabad division under them. The Rest of Maharashtra Development Board is the largest Statutory Development Board and covers three revenue divisions of Nashik, Pune and Konkan including greater Mumbai. The Rest of Maharashtra Development Board (RoM) has 16 districts against 11 in Vidarbha and 8 in Marathwada. Four districts, i.e. Hingoli, Washim, Gondia and Mumbai sub-urban, have been carved out recently (Table 3.1).

Konkan Division consists of Mumbai, Thane, Raigad, Ratnagiri, and Sindhudurg districts on the coastal side with small land holdings and less irrigation facilities. Nashik Division with five districts of Nashik, Dhule, Nandurbar, Jalgaon and Ahmednagar districts has a considerable tribal population, large land holdings, forests, and a few fertile tracts with good rainfall. Pune, Sangli, Satara, Kolhapur, Sholapur districts constitute the Pune division and have relatively lower rainfall but well served by canals and wells. The Nashik and Pune divisions being contiguous form into a single geographical region and is known as Western Maharashtra. One part of Vidarbha comprising Buldhana, Akola, Amaravati, Washim and Yavatmal is administered by the Amaravarti division and the rest of the Vidarbha region comprising Nagpur, Wardha, Bhandara, Gondia, Chandrapur and Gadchiroli districts is assigned to Nagpur division. Vidarbha is a plateau region with black soil having large tribal population and forest cover. Marathwada's 8 districts (Table 3.1) are culturally uniform, all of them being a part of the erstwhile State of Hyderabad and the region is rocky and dry with low rainfall. The board-wise coverage of districts is also shown in Figure 3.1.

Figure 3.1

Map of Maharashtra State showing the three Statutory Development Board Regions

Table 3.1

Statutory Development Boards and their districts in Maharashtra State

Vidarbha Board	Marathwada Board	Rest of Maharashtra Board
1. Buldhana	1. Aurangabad	1. Greater Mumbai**
2. Akola	2. Jalna	2. Mumbai sub-urban *
3. Amravati	3. Parbhani **	3. Thane
4. Yavatmal	4. Beed	4. Raigad
5. Wardha	5. Nanded	5. Ratnagiri
6. Nagpur	6. Osmanabad	6. Sindhudurg
7. Bhandara**	7. Latur	7. Nashik**
8. Chandrapur	8. Hingoli *	8. Dhule
9. Gadchiroli		9. Jalgaon
10. Washim*		10. Ahmednagar
11. Gondia*		11. Nandurbar **
		12. Pune
		13. Satara
		14. Sangli
		15. Solapur
		16. Kolhapur

* New Districts as per 2001 Census

** Districts, which were bifurcated during 1991-2001.

3.1 Population Composition

According to 2001 Census, the population of Maharashtra State is 96,752,247 and approximately 63% of the total population of the State reside within the ambit of Rest of Maharashtra Development Board compared to 21% in Vidarbha and 16% in Marathwada region. As per geographical area, the Rest of Maharashtra Development Board covers 47% of the total geographical area of the State against 32% and 21% by Vidarbha and Marathwada Development Boards respectively. The density of population per square kilometer in Rest of Maharashtra (RoM) is quite high i.e. 477 against 409 for the State as a whole and 212 and 241 for Vidarbha and Marathwada Development Boards respectively. Out of the total Scheduled Caste population of 87.58 lakhs and 73.18 lakhs of Scheduled Tribes about 48% and 41% respectively of this reside in the RoM Board region. 25% of the Rest of Maharashtra region population is urban, where as urban population is only 8% in Vidarbha and 9% in Aurangabad regions. Of the 27,86,982 main workers in the State as per 2001 Census (excluding greater Mumbai region) 49.5% are in Rest of Maharashtra region, 26.2% in Marathwada and 24.3% in Vidarbha region.

3.2 Literacy Rate

The Marathwada region is educationally backward compared to the other two regions. As per 2001 Census, the average literacy rate (male and

female taken together) in Maharashtra is 77.27%. This varies between 79.04% in the Rest of Maharashtra region to 78.17% in Vidarbha and 69.48% in Marathwada. In respect of male literacy also, the Marathwada region lags behind the other two regions. The literacy level among females in Marathwada is quite low, i.e. 56.56% compared to 68.98% in Vidarbha and 70.86% in the ROM region and 67.51% for the state as a whole.

3.3 Health Institutions

Rest of Maharashtra region is better served with the number of Public Health Centres and Sub-Centres with an average of 73 and 384 respectively compared to Marathwada (48 and 262) and Vidarbha (47 and 322) regions during the year 2000. The other health indicator of population served per government medical institution during the year 2000 also shows better delivery of health services in Rest of Maharashtra (96,140) and Vidarbha (94,437) than in Marathwada region (1, 69,668).

3.4 Per Capita Income

The average per capita income of the district in the State during 1998-99 was Rs.15, 804 whereas the average for the three regions was Rs. 9,565 in Marathwada region compared to Rs. 11,754 in Vidarbha region and Rs. 15, 752 in Rest of Maharashtra region. During the same year, the other economic indicators like Net District Domestic Product (NDDP) also had wide disparity between Rest of Maharashtra (Rs.5, 17, 799) to Vidarbha (Rs.2, 70,266) and Marathwada (Rs.2, 02,512) regions. The percentage share of district domestic income to State income was also higher in Rest of Maharashtra (3.7%) than in Vidarbha (1.9%) and Marathwada (1.4%) during the same period.

3.5 Statutory Development Boards

Due to the persistence of the Socio- economic imbalances in the three regions (which is evident even at present) for a long time, this was highlighted by the social activists, politicians and intellectuals in different platforms. Even after the formation of the separate Maharashtra State, the regional imbalances increased so, the Maharashtra State Legislature passed an unanimous resolution requesting the Central Government to set-up three Development Boards so that decentralisation and all round regional development can be brought out. The three Statutory Development Boards: Vidarbha, Marathwada and Rest of Maharashtra were set-up by a Presidential order under article 371 (2) of the constitution on 9th March 1994. The Governor of Maharashtra was assigned the special responsibilities for the constitution of the Boards, framing rules and guidelines, allocation of funds for development expenditure and equitable arrangement for education, training and employment in services under the control of the State Government. After constituting the three Boards on 30th April 1994 with their Head Quarters at Nagpur for Vidarbha, Aurangabad for Marathwada and Mumbai for Rest of Maharashtra, the Governor issued

detailed orders and guidelines for the proper functioning of the three Statutory Development Boards (Annexure 1.4 and 1.5). The Governor's order and the guidelines implicitly take care of the spirit and points raised in the Nagpur agreement of 1953.

3.6 Composition and Working Mechanism

Each Development Board had initially seven members on it, out of which one member was a member of Maharashtra State Legislature from the area of respective Development Board. One member was from a local authority, and three expert members having special knowledge or experience are appointed from the field of Planning, Finance, Administration, Irrigation, and Public Health etc. One Commissioner of the Revenue Division from the area of respective Development Board was also appointed to the Board and an officer of the State Government of the rank of Additional Commissioner of a Revenue Division from the respective Development Board, was appointed as Member Secretary of the Development Board. Recently two more expert members, one more member of the State Legislature and Chairman of the State Planning Board as an ex-officio member have been included in the Board. In addition, Divisional Commissioners of the Revenue Divisions in each board area have also been taken as members of the respective Development Board. The list indicating the names of the Chairmen and members of the three Statutory Development Boards for the year 2002-2004 is at Annexure - 3.1.

3.7 Term of Office

- (i) The term of office of the Chairman and members is as the Governor may specify while appointing them. The Governor may terminate the appointment of any member, including the chairman or reconstitute the Board before the expiry of the term of the member or as the case may be of the Board. The term of the Boards is normally for three years.
- (ii) Any member, including the Chairman other than the Government functionary members may at any time resign his office by writing under his hand, addressed to the Governor and the date on which the Governor accepts his resignation he shall be deemed to have vacated the office.
- (iii) The Chairman and members are entitled to such fees and allowances for attending the meetings of the Development Boards.
- (iv) The Chairman of the Board is appointed from the expert members and is given the status of State Cabinet Minister rank with requisite facilities.

The Development Boards completed the term of 5 years on April 30, 1999 and the President of India vide Amendment Order dated 15 December

1999 extended the term of the three Development Boards by another 5 years up to April 30, 2004. .

3.8 Functions of the Development Board

Development Board functions as laid down in the Governor's order are:

1. To ascertain relative levels of development in different sectors in relation to its area on the basis of appropriate indicators, having regard to the levels of development in the state as a whole.
2. To assess the impact of various development efforts in removing backlog and achieving overall development within its area.
3. To suggest levels of development expenditure over the area of Development Board during a plan period including annual plan, and
4. To prepare an annual report on its working and to send it as far as possible within three months after the end of every financial year to the Governor for placing it before the Maharashtra State Legislature Assembly.

The Governor has also institutionalised the involvement of Development Boards in the State Planning Process. The Chairmen of the Development Boards have been appointed as ex-officio members of the State Planning Board. The members of the Boards have been appointed as ex-officio members on the District Planning Committees, which prepare the district plan.

The Development Boards have to conduct at least 6 meetings in a year and the period between two consecutive meetings should not be more than 60 days. As per the directives to the Development Boards, proceedings of all the meetings held by the Board are to be recorded and maintained in a permanent file. During these meetings various resolutions are passed, projects proposals are sanctioned and development issues are discussed related to the region. The decisions in the meeting are taken based on the majority opinion as a consensus and in case of lack of unanimity the Chairman's decision prevails.

The Development Boards in the formative years used to have regular meetings/discussions most of which were scheduled at the Head Quarters of the Boards. The Board members also participated in the joint meetings of three Development Boards addressed by the Governor as and when necessary to share important issues pertaining to the Development Boards. Besides this, the Board members took part in the meetings at the district and other places of their region in connection with the development work (Table 3.1). From time to time, the Development Boards conducted/participated in the seminar/ workshop and conferences arranged relating to developmental issues in the Board areas the details of which are dealt in the

next chapter. The meetings at the Head Quarters are considered important in view of the policy decisions taken pertaining to the Board's activity, but at the district level these are review meetings of physical and financial progress of projects/schemes undertaken for development of the districts. Table 3.2 shows that, out of 37 meetings conducted by Vidarbha Board in 1994-95, 22 meetings were held at Nagpur and in the corresponding year Marathwada Development Board had 92% of its meeting at the Head Quarters out of 35 meetings and none in the Rest of Maharashtra out of only 4 meetings of that year. It is mandatory to conduct at least 6 meetings by the Boards in a year at Head Quarters and this has not been adhered during 1997-98 in Vidarbha, 98-99 in Marathwada and during 94-95 in Rest of Maharashtra. Vidarbha Board had been more active than the other two Boards in conducting meetings and seminars regarding the backlog and development issues. Meetings are conducted generally smoothly on important aspects like allocation, expenditure, backlog clearance, special fund proposals and awareness programme. However, instances were brought to our notice in the field that, Chairman of the Board being a Politician with overriding authority expert members role is minimized to only for advisory purposes.

Table 3.2

Meetings/Seminars arranged by Development Boards

Year	Development Board					
	Vidarbha		Marathwada		RoM	
	Total	Headquarter	Total	Headquarter	Total	Headquarter
1994-95	37	22	38	35	4	-
1995-96	59	17	48	20	12	10
1996-97	10	9	39	14	19	10
1997-98	15	5	33	12	15	8
1998-99	23	8	8	5	6	6
1999-2000	34	10	10	8	8	8
2000-01	53	12	21	10	7	7
2001-02	40	14	30	8	8	8
Total	271	97	227	112	79	57

Source: Annual Reports of Vidarbha, Marathwada and Rest of Maharashtra 1994-95 to 2000-01.

3.9 Staffing Position

The offices of the Chairman and Member Secretary have a support of administrative/technical staff to help the Chairman/ Member Secretary for carrying out day-to-day functions concerning the activities of each Development Board. The staff strength at Chairman's office comprises of Private Secretary, Personal Assistant, Stenographer, Clerk/Typist, Driver, Peon/Messenger. At Member Secretary's office, Joint Director, Research Assistant, Stenographer, Assistant Accounts Officer, Clerk/Typist and Peon are the normal staff.

The Chairman of the Board is always a senior member of the State Legislature of the respective Board. The Member Secretary is always a person from administrative department. The posts sanctioned and actually filled in the office of the Chairman and Member Secretary during the past 8 years for each Development Board is presented in Table 3.3. The sanctioned posts and staff in position vary depending upon the availability of the staff and workload at a particular point of time in any Board. Most of the staff members of the Boards are from the Planning Department of the State on deputation basis. A few posts are technical in the office of the Member Secretary. The staff in position was always lower than the posts sanctioned in all the Boards. It is around 80% in Marathwada and Vidarbha Development Boards against 69% in the Rest of Maharashtra Development Board. The sanctioned strength as well as the staff in position was comparatively better in Vidarbha Board in the last 8 years compared to the Rest of Maharashtra Board and Marathwada Board. Due to the implementation of the economic measures by the Maharashtra Government, the staff strength in position had been reduced in all the three Boards during the last six years. While staff strength in the office of the Chairman and Member Secretary may not be considered as an indicator of effective functioning, however, it has a bearing on development activities and removal of backlog. It is the government's policy of allocation and expenditure and the projects executed and the resultant impact, which has played a crucial role in the redressal of regional disparities in one area compared to the other.

Table 3.3

Staffing pattern in the Office of the Chairman and Member Secretary

Year	Development Board					
	Vidarbha		Rest of Maharashtra		Marathwada	
	Sanctioned	In position	Sanctioned	In position	Sanctioned	In position
1994-1995	18	18	30	19	29	29
1995-1996	18	18	30	21	30	21
1996-1997	31	28	31	21	31	24
1997-1998	31	25	31	22	31	24
1998-1999	31	27	31	19	31	23
1999-2000	31	25	31	19	31	24
2000-2001	23	21	23	21	31	25
2001-2002	23	20	23	19	23	18

Source: Annual Reports of Vidarbha, Marathwada and Rest of Maharashtra, 1994-95 to 2001-2002.

3.10 Coordination

Two institutions; Governor's office and Planning Department are also involved in the functioning of Development Boards. The Governor controls

the Boards and his office coordinates with the three Development Boards on one hand and the Planning Department on the other. The special responsibility entrusted with the Governor of Maharashtra under the constitution is for ensuring (a) equitable allocation of funds for development expenditure over the three regions subject to the requirements of the State as a whole; and (b) equitable arrangements for providing adequate facilities for technical education and vocational training and (c) equitable opportunities for employment in the services under the control of the State Government in the three regions subject to the requirements of the State as a whole.

The Governor since 1995-96 makes an equitable allocation of overall plan funds among the three Board regions. The distribution is not based on a fixed formula but tentatively on 1991 Census population percentage covered in each region and on the basis of backlog identified by the Fact Finding Committee in 1984. The area-wise allocations, as per the above criteria were made for the first time, after the setting-up of the Boards. The backlog funds are also quantified and earmarked for each region based on the same criteria, as for the overall funds. The allocations so made are non-divertible from the region of one Board to another. Governor periodically gives directions to the Development Boards, Planning Department, besides visiting and reviewing the functions of the Development Boards.

Once the Governor approves the total allocation, it is the Planning Department, which allocates the district wise funds further. At present, the Chairmen of the Boards or their nominees has been appointed on the State Planning Board as ex-officio members. The schemes under backlog are fixed, and this provides the scope for consultation with Development Boards. A special provision of Rs. 100 crores had been made annually for the three Development Boards at the instance of Governor since Annual Plan 1995-96. The Governor's office allocated the special fund on the basis of FFC report backlog and population in the three regions to the three Development Boards. Accordingly, the shares are Rs. 43.86 crores for Vidarbha, Rs. 27.28 crores for Marathwada and Rs. 28.86 crores for Rest of Maharashtra region which were revised after the approval of the I&B Committee report. Under this special fund, the Boards are expected to take up schemes, which they consider important from the point of view of development. The Governor's office and Planning Department has prepared broad norms and admissibility of funds under which special funds works can be approved. For the utilization of these special funds, the proposals are invited by the Development Boards from the peoples' representatives, Regional and Mantralaya level officers. There is no specific format for sending a proposal to the Statutory Development Boards and these can be in the form of a plain application on a paper. These are submitted to the concerned administrative departments with a copy marked to the Planning Department for approval.

The backlog funds for three regional boards are allocated by the Governor subject to the requirement of the State as a whole. The schemes to

be taken up under backlog and Annual Plan are decided by the Planning Department in consultation with the administrative departments. The Planning Department examines the proposals and accords approval to schemes in conformity with the approved schematic pattern. The Planning Department also coordinates with other Ministries/ Departments and monitors the progress annually of the physical and financial performance of the backlog and special fund schemes in the three regions.

The schemes recommended by the Statutory Development Boards under special fund along with all development schemes recommended by the Planning Department are executed by the concerned line departments. The Planning Department forwards approved proposals to the concerned implementing agency and the finance Department for budgeting/releasing the funds. The final amount is budgeted by the Finance Department and directly given to the concerned implementing agency. Supervision of all the works is carried out by the concerned implementing agencies. The Statutory Development Boards have no role once the scheme has been recommended by the Planning Department for its execution.

Chapter -IV

Regional imbalances and Statutory Development Boards

Socio-economic and infrastructure development is uneven between different regions in Maharashtra State. As pointed out earlier (Chapter-III), the regions of Vidarbha and Marathwada are less developed compared to the level of development in other regions and also to the overall State development indicators since a long time. To ensure balanced development, the three Development Boards; Vidarbha, Marathwada and Rest of Maharashtra were set up in April, 1994. Balanced regional development and clearance of backwardness in different sectors is an yardstick on the performance of the Boards indirectly as the two important functions assigned to the Development Boards are to ascertain the relative levels of development in different sectors with reference to appropriate indicators and to suggest budgetary allocations for its removal (Annexure 1.4). The present chapter analyses the nature and pattern of imbalances in the three regions before and after their coming into being with reference to the overall development in Maharashtra State. An assessment is also made on the role and performance played by the Boards in terms of identification and highlighting the socio-economic and infrastructure development issues and the effect of this on regional development. The role of Development Boards in the planning and development processes in terms of allocation and expenditure for removing regional imbalances and balanced regional development will be dealt separately in the next chapter.

4.1 Determination of Regional Imbalances

Due to the persistent demands both in State Assembly and outside for the identification of the levels of development and the special measures needed for removal of inter-regional development gaps the Planning Department undertook a study of the district-wise progress in various sectors as on 1st April, 1980. This study could not comprehensively analyse the level of backwardness in the three regions and different sectors, but revealed “noticeable disparities” in irrigation, roads, public health and technical education sectors. It was recognized that huge investment is needed for the removal of disparities in these sectors and there is a need for detailed study for the determination of backwardness.

Table 4.1

Statement showing Region-wise and Sector-wise Financial Backlog of The Fact Finding Committee as on 31 March 1984

(Rs. in lakh)

Sl. No.	Development Sector	Vidarbha	Marathwada	Rest of Maharashtra	Total	Sector % to total Backlog
1.	Roads	29143 (48.55)	10982 (18.29)	19904 (33.16)	60029	18.84
2.	Irrigation	52731 (38.05)	31671 (22.85)	54190 (39.1)	138592	43.49
3.	Village Electrification	10829.73 (45.00)	7246.46 (30.11)	5988.86 (24.89)	24065.05	7.55
4.	General Education	3121.74 (34.10)	3415.59	2617.23 (28.59)	9154.56	2.87
5.	Technical Education	2342.22 (28.08)	1938.41 (23.24)	4059.2 (48.67)	8339.83	2.62
6.	Health Services	4921.6 (22.25)	7247.3 (32.76)	9952.1 (44.99)	22121	6.94
7.	Water Supply	15392.08 (40.68)	7655.39 (20.24)	14776.4 (39.06)	37823.87	11.87
8.	Land Development Soil & Water Conservation	5978.29 (33.63)	4631.39 (26.05)	7167.47 (40.32)	17777.15	5.58
9.	Veterinary Services	194.85 (25.13)	298.2 (38.46)	282.3 (36.41)	775.35	0.24
Total		124654.5 (39.12)	75085.74 (23.56)	118937.56 (37.32)	318677.81	100.00

Source : FFC Report, 1984.

In 1983, the Government appointed a Fact Finding Committee (FFC) of experts under the chairmanship of Dr. V.M.Dandekar (so also known as Dandekar Committee) to assess the relative levels of development in different regions in relation to the level of achievement in the State as a whole. The Committee submitted its report in April 1984 and identified backlog amounting to Rs. 3186.78 crore (1982-83 prices) for Vidarbha, Marathwada and Rest of Maharashtra, with a share of 39.12%, 23.56% and 37.32% respectively for the three regions (Anexure 4.1 & Table 4.1). The FFC identified 9 broad sectors and 29 sub sectors and examined physical achievement and calculated per district and region backlog compared to the average for the State as a whole. These broad sectors are irrigation, road development, education both general and technical, water supply, command area development, soil conservation including horticulture, village electrification, pumpset energisation, public health, animal husbandry and veterinary services. The physical backlog identified as on 1984 and its clearance during different periods; 1984-94, 1994-2001 and backlog still remaining in different sectors/sub-sectors as on 2001 in each Development Board is presented in Table 4.2 and in detail in Annexure 4.1.

4.2 FFC Report and Regional Imbalances

The total backlog as per the FFC report during 1984 amounted to Rs. 3186.78 crore at 1982-83 prices. The Government had appointed an Empowered Committee to study the findings and suggestions of the Fact Finding Committee which submitted its report in April, 1987. Although the Government had not formally accepted the FFC report recommendations, small allocations were made from 1985 onwards for removal of backlog as an interim measure. Between 1984 and 1994, the State Government had spent Rs.3155.72 crore for removal of backlog in the three regions of the State. But, unfortunately the impact of this expenditure had not resulted in the liquidation of backlog in backward areas due to lack of implementation strategy in a time bound manner.

Although Planning Department claimed that the physical backlog identified by Dandekar Committee had been cleared in most of the sectors/sub-sectors (Annual Plan 2000-01), but in a number of sectors/sub-sectors backlog was still pending. As on 1st April, 2001, in Marathwada the backlog was pending in 12 sectors/sub sectors against 11 in Vidarbha and 8 in Rest of Maharashtra region (Table 4.2). In 6 sectors/sub-sectors such as irrigation, primary education, junior college, urban water supply, command area development and contour bunding, the backlog still remained in all the three regions.

Out of 29 sectors/sub-sectors having backlog in 1984, 16 sectors/sub-sectors in Vidarbha namely adult education, bore/dug well, terrace bunding, Government and Government aided technical high school/centre, Government and Government aided higher secondary school, + 2 vocational centre, piped water supply to villages, horticulture development, village electrification, health sub-centres, primary health centres, rural/cottage hospital, beds per lakh population in rural hospital, veterinary hospitals manned by Para veterinary staff and manned by veterinary surgeon and artificial insemination centres the physical backlog was cleared during 1984-94, i.e. before the formation of the Statutory Development Boards. After the Boards formation, backlog in 10 sectors/sub-sectors had been removed partially apart from complete removal in three sectors/sub-sectors viz., intake of students in Industrial Training Institute, Government polytechnic and nala bunding. However, in 11 sectors/sub sectors, the backlog was still pending as on 1st April, 2001.

Similarly, during the years 1984-94 in Marathwada region, the physical backlog had been cleared in 14 sectors/sub-sectors compared to partial clearance of backlog in 8, and complete liquidation in two, (intake of students in Government polytechnic and nala bunding) during 1994-2001. In 12 sectors/sub-sectors such as irrigation, road development, teachers in primary school, junior college, higher secondary school, backlog of students in Government aided polytechnic, urban water supply, command area development, contour bunding, horticultural development, beds in district

hospitals and number of beds per lakh population in rural hospital the backlog was still pending.

Table 4.2

Sector-wise remaining physical backlog as on 1.4.2001 of FFC report

Backlog Sector	Statutory Development Board		
	Vidarbha	Marathwada	Rest of Maharashtra
1. Irrigation (000 hect.)	114.72	106.24	82.04
2. Road (No.of Villages to be connected)	136	70	-
3. Primary Education (No. of Teachers)	280	339	736
4. Hr. Sec. Education (No.of Teachers)	145	269	-
5. Industrial Training Institutes (Nos)	-	-	913
6. Jr. College (No. of Teachers)	18	26	310
7. Government aided polytechnic (No. of Students)	160	50	-
8. Urban Water Supply (per day in liters)	58.59	8.04	39.00
9. Command Area Development (000 hect.)	14.32	77.88	139.94
10. Contour Bunding (Lakh hect.)	3.38	0.58	1.55
11. Terrace Bunding (lakh Hect)	-	-	0.37
12. Horticulture (Hect.)	-	36	-
13. Pumpset energized (Nos.)	3860	-	-
14. Beds in district hospital (Nos.)	100	200	-
15. Beds per lakh population (Nos)	-	427	-

Source: Bulletins, Planning Department, Government of Maharashtra, 1994-95 to 2000-01.

In the Rest of Maharashtra region, the progress in respect of backlog clearance was comparatively better. In 7 sectors/sub-sectors, backlog identified by Dandekar Committee had been completely removed between 1994-2001 in addition to 4 sectors/sub-sectors where substantial backlog had been removed. The Government was able to remove physical backlog in 15 sectors/sub-sectors before Development Boards came into existence. However, the backlog was still pending in 8 sectors/sub-sectors as on 1st April 2001.

4.3 Indicator and Backlog Committee Report and Regional Imbalances

After the formation of the Development Boards (April 1994), the Governor allocated funds for removal of backlog in the three regions based on the FFC report findings and population criteria. However, the backlog continued to increase in Vidarbha and Marathwada regions and these Boards voiced their concern over this. The Governor appointed the Indicators and Backlog Committee (IBC) – a joint Committee of the three Development Boards experts in 1995 to ascertain the relative levels of development and backlog with appropriate indicators and sectors in different areas and to suggest appropriate methods and course of action for balanced regional development of the three regions. The Committee

submitted its report to the Governor on 11 July 1997 with an estimated backlog of Rs.15355.77 crore in three regions. The views of the departments in the sectors relating to irrigation, higher and technical education, energisation of pump sets, land development, soil and water conservation were sought by the Governor and referred these comments back to the reconstituted IBC to finalise region-wise physical and financial backlog as on 1 April, 1994. The reconstituted IBC submitted its report (Volume-I) to the Governor on 27 September 2000 with a total financial backlog of Rs.14006.77 crore which amounts to 47.6% for Vidarbha, 28.77% for Marathwada and 23.63% for Rest of Maharashtra regions. The difference of estimation was mainly in irrigation sector in the estimation of net sown area and its conversion into standard rabi equivalent. The details of the physical and financial backlog is shown in Annexure 4.2 and Table 4.3. The IBC report (Volume I) covered all the 9 sectors covered by FFC. The FFC had covered services as a separate Chapter but, the IBC had excluded it, since the issue of representation in services was included in the special responsibilities of the Governor under Article 371(2) of the Constitution of India. The IBC had calculated the backlog as on 1st April, 1994 which includes the residual backlog of FFC left out due to non- coverage of developmental efforts.

Table 4.3

Statement Showing Region-wise and Sector wise Financial Backlog of the Re-constituted Indicators & Backlog Committee as on 31st March, 1994

(Rs. In Crore)

Sl. No.	Development Sector	Rest of Maharashtra	Marathwada	Vidarbha	Total	Sector (%) to total backlog
1.	Irrigation	934.00 (12.59%)	2401.00 (32.37%)	4083.00 (55.04%)	7418.00	52.96%
2.	Roads	776.08 (33.44%)	554.32 (23.88%)	990.76 (42.68%)	2321.16	16.57%
3.	General Education	101.33 (57.13%)	36.35 (20.55%)	39.58 (22.32%)	177.36	1.27%
4.	Technical Education & Vocational Training	325.77 (60.99%)	95.85 (17.95%)	112.49 (21.06%)	534.11	3.81%
5.	Health Services	650.40 (53.18%)	359.44 (29.39%)	213.16 (17.43%)	1223.00	8.73%
6.	Water Supply (Rural and Urban)	44.65 (14.11%)	98.79 (31.22%)	172.99 (54.67%)	316.43	2.26%
7.	Land Development, Soil & Water Conservation & Horticulture	318.90 (40.44%)	162.00 (20.54%)	307.65 (39.02%)	788.55	5.63%
8.	Veterinary Services	3.05 (56.07%)	1.04 (19.12%)	1.35 (24.81%)	5.44	0.04%
9.	Electrification of pumps	224.02 (18.32%)	295.66 (24.18%)	703.04 (57.5%)	1222.72	8.73%
	Total	3378.20 (24.12%)	4004.55 (28.77%)	6624.02 (47.60%)	14006.77 (100%)	100.00%

(Figures in bracket indicate percentage of sectoral backlog of the region to total sectoral backlog).

Source: IBC Report, 2000.

Table 4.4

Region wise backlog position in 1984, 1994 and 1st April, 2000

Region	1984 FFC Committee		1994 I&B Committee Report		1 st April, 2000 IBC Report		Backlog increase	Per Capita backlog	
	Amount	Share	Amount	Share	Amount	Share		By deflation 1981-82 =100 (WPI) 1994=256	1984
	(Rs. In crores (%))		Rs. In crores (%)		Rs. In crores (%)		(In Rupees)		(In Rupees)
RoM	1189.38	37.32	3378.20	23.63	2648.75	22.12	2347	327 (61%)	755 (39%)
Marathwada	750.86	23.56	4004.55	28.77	3547.06	29.62	1413	772 (143%)	3614 (186%)
Vidarbha	1246.55	39.12	6624.02	47.60	5778.63	48.26	2240	869 (161%)	4001 (206%)
Total	3186.79	100.00	14006.77	100.00	11974.44	100.00	10249 Cr. (Approx.)	540 (100)	1945 (100)

Source: FFC Report 1984, IBC Report, 2000, Governor's Order No. GS/DS/DB/-2001.

The index of disparity in Vidarbha and Marathwada increased by 28% and 29% respectively and in Rest of Maharashtra declined by 33%.

Methodological problems between two Committees: -

1. Roads Sector - Merged.
2. Higher education - University based
3. Recurring cost for one year only.
4. RoM has highest backlog for health, General education & Technical Education.
5. Planning Department has to update the backlog for health, medical and agricultural education.

Volume II of the report of the re-constituted IBC covered 15 other development sectors separately which were not covered in Volume I. These sectors are energy, agriculture, social welfare, women welfare, welfare of SC/ST, urban development, transport, anti poverty employment and public services, labour welfare, cooperation and credit, agro-industries including agricultural marketing, dairying, fisheries, forest and mining. The focus in these sectors was shifted from estimation of backlog to a deeper analysis of

respective policies and programmes and a search for modifications required to develop them for regional development.

4.4 Removal of Regional Imbalances

The Development Boards came into existence in 1994, but the backlog funds were being allocated to the three regions by the Governor based on the FFC report which was based as on 31st March, 1984. Though the IBC report was submitted in 1997 it was accepted only in November, 2000 by the State Government so the physical and financial backlog got accumulated to huge proportions (Table 4.4). Out of the 9 sectors backlog identified by the IBC, irrigation Sector backlog accounts for about 53% of the total financial backlog (Rs.7418 crore) as on April, 1994. Out of the physical backlog of 13,83,000 hectares, the share of Vidarbha was 57%, Marathwada 31% and the rest in Rest of Maharashtra (12%). During the last 6 years, about 47% in RoM and about 34% in Marathwada and 27% physical backlog in Vidarbha had been removed in irrigation sector. In the State as a whole, still 68% of the backlog in irrigation had to be removed as on 1st April, 2000. Of the total 26 sub sectors in about 20 sub sectors more than 50% backlog was still pending in the three regions (Table 4.6). In sectors like district and rural roads, urban water supply and veterinary services the backlog had been removed to a large extent. Though backlog can be seen in all the three regions, inter - regional analysis shows that, in RoM region more than 50% of the backlog had been removed in about 20 sectors and in the case of Marathwada and Vidarbha regions this proportion was considerably less (Table-4.5 and Annexure 4.2). The backlog position in many sectors as shown in Tables 4.5, 4.6 and Annexure 4.2 is disheartening as in some sectors the backlog is still 100% in the three regions (Non CADA, technical school, pharmacy diploma etc.). In about 10 to 12 sectors/sub sectors neither practically any thing or only 5% of the backlog had been removed in the three regions.

As irrigation and roads sectors together constitute about 70% of the total backlog they have been analysed in greater detail (Table 4.7 & 4.8). The physical backlog in irrigation as per the FFC report as on 2001 was 303 thousand hectares in the three regions which had escalated to 945.13 thousand hectares as on 1st April, 2000 of the IBC report (more than three fold increase). Though the State average for irrigation potential had increased and the residual backlog of FFC had been taken into account in the IBC report, the presence of 57% of the outstanding backlog in Vidarbha and 31% in Marathwada is an abnormal increase indicating disparity in regional development in this sector. This table also indicates that though the total physical backlog in irrigation for the three regions remained the same in FFC and IBC reports (1385 thousand hectares) in the beginning but proportionately it had increased by 18% in Vidarbha, 9% in Marathwada and declined by 27% in Rest of Maharashtra region from 1984 to 1994. In the roads sectors/sub-sectors the backlog removal was comparatively better though the overall backlog of number of villages to be connected by roads increased by 2327 in the IBC report but as in irrigation, Vidarbha had the

highest remaining backlog (67%) followed by Marathwada (22%) as on 1st April, 2000.

Table 4.5

Statement showing region-wise, sector wise remaining physical backlog of IBC report as on April 2000.

Sector	Units of Physical backlog	Remaining Physical Backlog as on 1 st April, 2000			
		Rest of Maharashtra	Marathwada	Vidarbha	Total
1.1 Irrigation	In 000 hecets.	89.69	284.7	570.74	945.13
2. Roads	Kms.				
2.1 Main Highway		20	458	357	835
2.2 State Highway	Kms.	425	100	384	909
2.3 Main distt. road	Kms.	641	570	795	2006
2.4 Other distt. roads	Kms.	422	0	418	840
2.5 Rural Roads	Kms.	1227	0	11	1238
2.6 Village connect.	Kms.	34	69	211	314
3. General Education					
3.1 Primary Education	No.	11938	2226	1652	15816
3.2 Secondary School Education	No.	3784	1053	2496	7333
3.3 H.S&Jr. Collg.T.	No.	1547	907	442	2896
4. Hg. & Technical Education					
4.1 Polytechnics	Student seat	1734	182	325	2241
4.2 Eng.Degree courses	Student seat	231	50	24	305
4.3 Technical School	Student seat	2503	1170	1628	5301
4.4 University Education	Student seat	NA	NA	NA	NA
4.5 Pharmacy Degree	Student seat	NA	47	48	95
4.6 Pharm.Diploma	Student seat	919	0	271	1190
5. Medical Education					
5.1 MBBS	Student seat	162	161	199	522
5.2 BDS	Student seat	NA	71	NA	71
5.3 Paramedical	Student seat	NA	0	NA	NA
5.4 Nur. & Midwifery	Student seat	401	189	259	849
5.5 OT&PT degree cr.	Student seat	NA	NA	19	19
5.6 BAMS	Student seat	10	NA	NA	10
6. Health					
6.1 PHC	No.	11	10	NA	21
6.2 Sub Centre	No.	460	108	55	623
6.3 Rural Hospital	No.of beds	48	13	NA	61
6.4 No. of bed per lakh	No.of beds	9050	5390	2537	16977
6.5 District Civil Hospital	No.of beds	100	200	100	400
7. Water Supply					
7.1 Urban Water supply	Million Liters	NA	11.74	11.49	23.23
8. L.D. Soil & W. cons					
8.1 CADA Part I	Hectares	116265	27146	20779	164190
8.2 Non CADA	Hectares	17948	16872	2562	37382
8.3 Soil conservation	Hectares	281709	27771	382059	691539
9. Veterinary Service					
9.1 Veterinary institute	No.	211	58	9	278
9.2 Energisation pumpsets	No.	53667	72113	161021	286801

Information was not compiled for the agricultural education sector by the Planning Department.

Source: IBC report 2000 & Governor 's Order No. GS/DS/DB/2001.

Table 4.6

Clearance of physical backlog of IBC Report in different Regions and Sectors upto 1st April, 2000.

Backlog removed (in %)	Region		
	Rest of Maharashtra	Marathwada	Vidarbha
	No. of Sectors	No. of Sectors	No. of Sectors
0 %	8	8	11
0.1 to 5%	3	2	1
5.1 to 20%	3	6	3
20.1 to 40%	5	4	5
40.1 to 60%	2	2	-
60.1 to 80	3	3	2
80.1 to 100%	2	4	4
Data not available	10	7	10
Total	36	36	36

Rest of Maharashtra

0% Main Highway, State Highway, Higher Secondary & JCT, Technical School, Ph. Diploma, Nurse & Midwifery, District Civil Hospital, Non CADA.

0.1 to 5% Pr. Education, Secondary Education, Energisation of Pumpsets.

5.1 to 20% Polytechnics, MBBS, No. of Beds per Lakh population.

20.1 to 40% Main District Road, Engineering Degree Courses, Sub Centre, CADA Part-I, Veterinary Institutions.

40.1 to 60% Irrigation, Rural Hospitals.

60.1 to 80% Other District Road, Rural Road, PHC.

80.1 to 100% Village Connectivity, BAMS.

Marathwada

0% Engineering Degree Courses, Tech School, Ph. Degree, Ph. Diploma, Nurse & Midwifery, District Civil Hospital, Non CADA, Energisation Pumpset.

0.1 to 5% Pr. Education, Higher Secondary & Jr. College Teacher.

5.1 to 20% No. of Bed per lakh, Main Highway, Main District Road, BDS, Sub Centre, CADA Part -I.

20.1 to 40% Irrigation, State Highway, MBBS, Veterinary Institutions.

40.1 to 60% Secondary School Education, Polytechnics.

60.1 to 80% PHC, Rural Hospital, Urban Water Supply.

80.1 to 100% Other District Road, Rural Road, Village Connectivity, Para Medical.

Vidarbha

0% Main Highway, Pr. Education, Engineering Degree Courses, Technical School, Ph. Degree, Ph. Diploma, MBBS, Nurse & Midwifery Courses, District Civil Hospital, Non CADA.

0.1 to 5% Higher Secondary & Junior College Teachers.

5.1 to 20% Energisation Pumpsets, Secondary School Education, Polytechnics.

20.1 to 40% Irrigation, State Highway, Main District Roads, Sub Centre, No. of Bed per lakh population.

40.1 to 60% Nil

60.1 to 80% Others District Roads, CADA Part-I.

80.1 to 100% Veterinary Institutions, Rural Roads, Village Connectivity, Urban Water Supply.

Table 4.7

Irrigation Sector Backlog Over the Period of time

Region	FFC Report (1984)				I&B Committee Report (1994)			
	Physical (000 hect.)	Financial (Rs. In Crore)	Physical backlog as on 1994 (000 hect.)	Physical backlog as on 2001 (000 hect.)	Physical (000 hect.)	Financial (Rs. In Crore)	Physical backlog as on 1st April, 2000 (000 hect.)	Financial backlog on 1st April 2000 (Rs. In Crore)
Vidarbha	527.30 (38.05)	527.31	303.09 (57.48)	114.72 (21.76)	784.71 (56.73)	4083	570.74 (72.73)	3956.5
Marathwada	316.71 (22.85)	316.71	195.92 (61.86)	106.24 (33.54)	430.64 (31.13)	2401	284.7 (66.11)	2173.96
Rest of Maharashtra	541.90 (39.10)	541.9	268.13 (49.48)	82.04 (15.13)	167.88 (12.14)	934	89.69 (53.43)	487.91
Total	1385.91 (100.00)	1385.92	767.14 (55.35)	303 (21.86)	1383.23 (100)	7418	945.13 (68.33)	6618.37

Source: FFC Report 1984, IBC Report, 2000, Governor's order No. GS/DS/DB/-2001.

Figures in Parenthesis indicate the percentages.

Table 4.8

Backlog of Roads Sector over the period of time

Region	FFC Report (1984)				I&B Committee Report (1994)			
	Physical (No. of villages to be connected)	Financial (Rs. In Crore)	Physical backlog as on 1.4.1994 (No. of villages to be connected)	Physical backlog as on 1.4.2001 (No. of villages to be connected)	Physical (No. of Villages to be connected)	Financial (Rs. In Crore)	Physical backlog as on 1.4.2000 (No. of villages to be connected)	Financial backlog as on 2001 (Rs. In Crore)
Vidarbha	2072 (64.65)	291.43	512 (24.71)	136 (66.02)	-	990.76	211	79.56
Marathwada	489 (15.26)	109.82	281 (57.46)	70 (14.31)	-	554.32	69	24.84
Rest of Maharashtra	644 (20.09)	199.04	105 (16.30)	(0.00)	-	776.08	34	12.24
Total	3205 (100.00)	600.29	898	206	5532	2321.16	314	116.64

Source: FFC Report 1984, IBC Report, 2000, Governor's order No. GS/DS/DB/-2001.

Figures in parenthesis indicate the percentages.

4.5 Increase in Regional Imbalances

The relative position of backwardness (backlog) in financial terms during different periods in the three regions was as follows:

Board/Region	1984	1994	April 2000
Vidarbha	39.12%	47.60%	48.26%
Marathwada	23.56%	28.77%	29.62%
Rest of Maharashtra	37.32%	23.63%	22.12%

During 1984 and 1994, the proportion of regional backlog in case of Marathwada had increased from 23.56% to 28.77% indicating a net rise of 5.2% points which had further reached to 29.62% in April, 2000. Similarly, in the case of Vidarbha, the net increase in the proportion of backlog was 8.5 percentage points which had further increased by 1 point in April, 2000. On the contrary, in the Rest of Maharashtra region, the proportion of backlog during the decade had sharply declined from 37.32% in 1984 to 23.63% in 1994 indicating a net decline of 13.7 percentage points in 1994 which had further reduced by 1.5% points in April, 2000.

4.6 Limitations of Methodology Adopted to Estimate Backlog

The methodology adopted by the two Committees (FFC and IBC) also point to the inherent occurrence of regional imbalances and its non-removable nature. The FFC and IBC determined the backlog in a sector/sub-sector in relation to the average level of achievement of a particular district/region compared to the average level of achievement of the State as a whole. Shortfall of any district/region from State average was the backlog of that district in that sector or sub sector. For all the districts/regions above State average, the backlog was considered nil. For region and divisions, the total backlog shown was the sum total of district wise backlog. These totals may not therefore tally with the backlog of the division or region estimated directly from the level of development for the division or region compared with the State average. When it is expressed in terms of development or service unit, it is called physical backlog. This physical backlog has been converted to financial terms by appropriating with the amount necessary per unit backlog at the prevailing prices of a cut-off date.

The methodology adopted by FFC and IBC reports had not taken into account private sector investment. It had taken into account only Government sector investments (including Govt. aided) and had ignored private sector completely, which is playing a leading role in development after the liberalization of policies. This approach had led to erroneous results in some sectors. For example, while estimating the backlog in public health sector, the committee used number of hospitals per lakh population as an indicator. By applying this indicator only for Government and Government-aided hospitals, Pune district was classified as backward (with 1.87 hospital) while Dhule (3.32), Ratnagiri (3.6), Amaravati (6.77) which were really backward districts were classified as advanced. Similarly, Mumbai was classified as backward in technical education due to same criteria. In the case of irrigation, some districts do not have enough water resources available even to catch up with the State average. For example, the State average was around 21% while the ultimate irrigation potential of many districts is below this average, i.e. Jalna 15.21%, Buldana 16.74%, Akola 11.01%, Osmanabad 11.3% etc. Hence, it is really not possible to estimate backlog of irrigation under such conditions. FFC Committee considered taluka as a unit for calculating Irrigation backlog in DPAP areas

but IBC had considered district as a unit as most of the DPAP areas were well above the State average in irrigation sector.

The districts with large area under forest may not need many roads, instead those districts may opt for more schools and hospitals. The next limitation is the State average. After catching up with the development, backward districts may equal the State average, but over a period of time, the State average itself moves up and the backward districts again remain below the State average. Besides this, there are other problems like calculation of actual physical backlog per district in a region for university education for the number of teachers and students. For certain sectors the cut off date of 1st April 1994 could not be applied strictly as in Veterinary services for want of data. The recurring expenditure adopted for calculating financial backlog also vary for different sectors and not realistic as only one or two years were taken into consideration.

4.7 Regional Imbalances in Technical Education and Vocational Training

Indicator and Backlog Committee did not go in detail about the opportunities and representation of the three regions in higher education, technical education, vocational training and employment in Government services as Governor was vested with special responsibility for equitable engagement for this as per the Statutory Development order. After the constitution of the Boards, Vidarbha and Marathwada Development Boards in their Board meetings and resolutions pointed to the glaring disparities and backwardness of their region in the technical and higher education sectors.

The Governor constituted a Joint Committee of the three Development Boards on Technical/Vocational Education in June 1995 to determine the indicators for equitable arrangements, a formula for region wise distribution of seats, new courses and expansion mechanism for technical education and vocational training. The Committee submitted its report in September, 1996 and estimated backlog of student seats in various technical courses of medicine, engineering, pharmacy and agriculture and also recommended measures for time bound backlog removal.

Based on the report findings, the Governor gave directives for MBBS, BDS, Engineering, Pharmacy and Architecture courses admissions and the arrangements in other courses were found to be adequate. Governor's directive of pooling State's 70% seats in each discipline and allocating them region wise based on 1991 Census population criteria was challenged in the High Court on the ground of violative of Article 14 of the Constitution and it was upheld. Maharashtra Government had appealed in the Supreme Court against the High court order and the case is pending now. At present, 70% of the seats in Engineering, Architecture and Pharmacy Degree Courses are being allocated to the students of the respective University areas with due reservations for SC, ST, NT, OBC etc.

For Degree courses in Medicine and Dentistry common entrance exam is being conducted from 1998-99 by the State Government.

The State Government is also implementing other directives which were unaffected by Governor's order like (a) 30% seats in all other colleges other than Babasaheb Ambedkar Technological University (BATU), Raigad district and 85% seats in BATU on the basis of State level merit with due reservations for SC, ST, NT, OBC etc. (b) 15% seats for students of Sindhudurg, Ratnagiri, Raigad and Thane districts of the Konkan region (c) Due representation for SC, ST, NT, OBC etc. while filling up 70% of seats in the colleges.

Recently, Marathwada Development Board had brought to the notice of the Governor that not a single Post Graduate Medical Institute had been established in Marathwada whereas there are six in RoM region and a single one in Vidarbha region. They had highlighted the need for upgrading the existing undergraduate Medical Colleges for teaching and research in super specialty courses for the needs of the students and to maintain regional parity. They had also submitted their demands for post graduate level Engineering and Technology Institute at Aurangabad. Vidarbha Development Board had pointed to the region wise Medical Admissions for undergraduate courses on the lines of admissions in technical education to avoid hardships and financial burden to their region's students.

4.8 Employment in Services Controlled by the State Government in the three Regions

There was a growing concern in the regions of Vidarbha and Marathwada that there are regional disparities in the employment opportunities, recruitment policies and representativeness of the existing work force in Government controlled Departments. Rule 8(3) of the Development Boards states that the General Administration of the State Government shall prepare the statistical information on opportunities available in employment in services under the control of the State Government in the areas under the respective Boards. This rule also empowers the State Governor to issue directives regarding procedure to be followed in filling up these vacancies from the respective areas.

So the Governor constituted a Joint Committee of the Development Boards including the Principal Secretary of the General Administration and the Director of Economics and Statistics in October, 1996 to study the representation of the three regions in the services under the control of the State Government and to suggest measures to remove the shortfall in representation of a region. The Committee took into consideration the opportunities of the services available in public sector enterprises of the State Government, local autonomous bodies and Government aided co-operative Societies under the control of the State Government. The Committee submitted the report in October, 1998 and the findings indicated

that the present representation of employees in the three regions are fairly in proportion with the population of the respective Development Boards (Table 4.9). The Governor discussed the findings of the report with the Development Board members and the position was found to be satisfactory and no policy decision or intervention was required in the procedure of recruitment. However, the Governor pointed to the under representation of the Marathwada region in decision making posts (Under Secretary and above) at Mantralaya and the need for State level Offices in Marathwada for equitable distribution. It had been decided to review the situation after 5 years by a Committee of the Development Boards. The State Government had also been requested to communicate their views on this report.

Table 4.9

Table showing the Development Board's area-wise representation observed in employment under State Government, Local Bodies & main public undertaking institutions

(In percentages)					
Particulars	Type	Rest of Maharashtra	Marathwada	Vidarbha	Total
Population percentages	Total	61.74	16.22	22.04	100.00
Service of State Government	Total	55.69	17.04	27.27	100.00 (6,12,848)
	Grade -A	47.53	18.43	34.04	100.00 (5,165)
	Grade -B	43.54	16.67	36.79	100.00 (9,256)
	Grade -C	58.39	15.57	26.04	100.00 (3,80,200)
	Grade -D	55.37	18.28	26.35	100.00 (1,54,052)
	Work-charged	42.88	22.25	34.87	100.00 (64,175)
Zilla Parishad	Rural Population	54.24	20.66	25.10	100.00
	Total Employment	45.36	22.77	31.87	100 (3.47 lakhs)
MSRTC	Total Employment	63.68	17.21	19.11	100.00 (1.10 lakhs)
MSEB	Total Employment	53.64	17.12	29.24	100.00 (93,000)

Source : Bulletin, Rest of Maharashtra Board publication.

After the adoption of the Committee report, Vidarbha Development Board had submitted to the State Governor to exercise his powers conferred by the Development Boards Order, 1994 and instruct the General Administration to provide Statistics on the employment and vacancies position of the three regions in the Services of Government annually on a regular basis. Vidarbha Board had also brought to the Governor's notice the under representation of their region in the appointments made after the submission of the report and the need to ensure percentage of vacancies to be earmarked for candidates from Vidarbha and Marathwada in the overall available vacancies while making recruitment through Maharashtra Public Service Commission (MPSC).

4.9 Role of Development Boards in the Identification of Regional Backlog

Regional imbalances were in existence before the Development Boards were set up in 1994. The State Government was clearing the regional imbalances identified by the FFC since 1985. The greatest contribution of Development Boards was to identify their regions' backwardness in specific sectors and highlighting the need for a fresh look of their regions position vis-a vis to the state which has resulted in the setting – up three Joint Committees of the Development Boards.

- (1) Indicator and Backlog committee for identifying the three regions development position in 30 sectors/sub-sectors.
- (2) Joint Committee for higher/ technical education and training education for equitable arrangement and
- (3) Joint Committee on opportunities for employment in Government services in the three regions.

The Chairman and expert members of the three Development Boards actively contributed by highlighting their regions development and backwardness in these Committee reports which was accepted by the Governor and the State Government and are at various stages of implementation. Some of the important region specific suggestions/ resolutions submitted by the three Development Boards for the identification and clearance of backlog are highlighted below.

1. Rest of Maharashtra region had demanded that taluka may be taken as a unit in DPAP areas for calculation of backlog in irrigation sector. RoM region Board had also demanded that the indicator based on the ratio of developed potential to ultimate potential should be used for working out the backlog in irrigation sector. RoM region had been bringing to the notice of the Governor of the bigger geographical area, higher population size and more tribal and SC population in their region so the need for higher allocation for development.
2. Vidarbha and Marathwada Development Boards had brought to the notice of the Governor that the irremovable backlog in Irrigation sector of 181.07 thousand hectares in Vidarbha and 78.66 thousand hectares in Marathwada as identified by the irrigation department was untenable. They had pointed to the irrigation potentiality in these regions and the need for speedier administrative clearance of irrigation projects, provision of requisite resources, electricity and application of lift irrigation facilities for clearance of backlog.
3. Marathwada Development Board had pointed to the need for equitable distribution of water resources from Tapi valley project (9.135 TMC against the present 2 TMC of water) Marathwada Krishna project (60 TMC against

the allotted 24 TMC of water) and upper Godavari river basin water by augmenting the surplus water from Nar, Par and Damanganga rivers. Marathwada and Vidarbha Development Boards had also brought to the notice of the Governor on the lack of progress in clearing the backlog of energisation of pump sets and the present policy of MSEB in the electrification of agricultural pump sets which had allocated 71% of the work in the RoM region and 17% to Marathwada and 12% towards Vidarbha region under non-backlog targets which will create fresh backlogs in the three regions. Vidarbha Development Board had been demanding the revision of Forest clearance act for the clearance of irrigation projects and to the increasing backlog position in road sector under village connectivity, road length/ 100 Sq. Km and Built Operate and Transfer Programme of major roads.

4. Development Boards were also actively involved in assessing the physical and financial backlog position periodically and gave feed back to the Governor and Planning Department. Vidarbha and Marathwada Development boards had brought to the notice of the escalating backlog in their regions. The remaining physical and financial backlog as on 1st April, 2000 was finalized by the Governor after taking the views of the three Statutory Development Boards.

5. Besides highlighting the existing backlog position in higher education/vocational training sector and in employment opportunities in Government services, the Development Boards of Vidarbha and Marathwada had resolved in their meetings to update and undertake fresh backlog created after 1st April 1994. They have requested the Government and the Governor to give proper directives to the concerned departments to furnish the necessary information to the Development Boards for the preparation of report.

4.10 Summary

The issue of regional imbalances in development, as it has unfolded over the years, is concerned with socially unacceptable disparities in availability of some key economic and social infrastructure facilities. The first systematic attempt to articulate the nature and extent of such disparities was made by the Fact Finding Committee (FFC), 1984. The Committee, among other things, worked out the gaps in infrastructure development vis-à-vis the State average in 29 sub-sectors in the three regions and the funds required to eliminate the backlog. According to FFC, the total backlog amount at 1982-83 prices was Rs. 3187 crore and the regional shares were: 24% for Marathawada, 37% for Rest of Maharashtra and 39% for Vidarbha.

Though, the Government of Maharashtra did not officially accept the recommendations of FFC (1984), some plan funds were being allocated each year for removal of infrastructure backlogs, in keeping with its overall

findings. During 1985-1994, a sum of Rs. 3156 crore was spent. Taking into account rise in prices, this amount was too small for removal of the backlogs, and the issue of regional disparity remained alive. Socio-political imperatives led to the formation of Statutory Development Boards in 1994 to take a fresh look at the issue of regional disparities and suggest strategies for their removal in a time-bound manner.

Chapter IV, V and VI are concerned with assessing the performance of Development Boards with reference to different responsibilities assigned to them. While, the more substantive activities of the Boards are taken up later, this Chapter is confined to assessing the role played by the Boards in articulation of the issue of regional imbalance.

The Boards highlighted the methodological inadequacies in the approach adopted by the FFC (1984). According to them, the regional inequality in infrastructure development in some sectors is worse than what was brought out by FFC. This happened because of adoption of inappropriate methodology.

The Boards disputed the claim that the backlogs worked out by FFC had been nearly eliminated during 1985-94. According to them, substantial backlogs still existed in some sectors, like irrigation and roads.

The Indicator and Backlog Committee (2000) in which technical members of the Boards participated, reworked the inter-regional disparities in different sectors and the resources required to eliminate the backlogs as also the regional shares in the total fund. The findings vindicated their observations on regional imbalance and backlog removal, as shown below:

Regional Shares in Backlog (%)			
Region	As per FFC (1984) Report	As per IBC (1994) Report	Backlog position as on 1-4-2000
Marathawada	23.6	28.8	29.6
Rest of Maharashtra	37.3	23.6	22.1
Vidarbha	39.1	47.6	48.3
Total Backlog Fund (in Rs. Crore)	3187 (1982-3 prices)	14007 (1993-94 Prices)	11,974 (1993-94 Prices)

The IBC report also observed that while, in many sectors, the disparities were being gradually eliminated, the highly iniquitous allocation of resources in the irrigation and roads sectors has wiped out the good work in other sectors by further worsening the regional imbalance in these sectors. This has not only raised the requirement of resources for elimination of backlogs, but also the shares of Marathawada and Vidarbha in the 'backlog fund' significantly. This aspect is substantiated in Chapter 5 through an analysis of the data on plan allocation and expenditure.

In addition to bringing out the role of the Boards in articulating the issue of regional disparities, a critical look at the methodologies adopted by

both FFC and IBC was taken by Programme Evaluation Organisation (PEO). The following three deficiencies are worth noting:

In working out backlogs in infrastructure development across regions, both the Committees did not adopt the Region as one unit, but worked out backlogs for smaller administrative units (such as districts and talukas) with reference to the State level averages. This method kept all such districts/talukas which were above the State averages outside the purview of their analysis. As a result, a “region” which is “better off” than others (at the aggregate level) can, at least theoretically, claim a larger than justified share in the backlog fund because of the existence of some poor districts/talukas. While, intra-regional inequalities can not be kept outside the purview of any development strategy, this aspect can potentially dilute the significance of the issue of regional inequality.

It is also noted that in working out the extent of regional imbalance, the Committees confined themselves to computing the inter-regional disparities in infrastructure in the public sector, ignoring the development/facilities created in the private sector. While, there may be some justifications for this approach, it may have far reaching implications on development strategies in the era of liberalization as well as on the fiscal health of the State Government. The simple economic logic of viability and sustainability of public investment activities may also be lost sight of in this approach.

It was also noted that both the Committees used different “base-year” for different sectors for backlogs computation. Though this might have been done because of non-availability of up-to-date data bases, it may not reflect the real picture for sectors/activities where the gestation lag between spending and output creation is short.

Chapter V

Planning, Resource Allocation and Regional Imbalance– The Role of Development Boards

Balanced development and removal of regional backlog needs strategic planning, adequate and timely flow of funds, deployment of other resources and their proper utilization. The previous chapter revealed that, the physical backlog estimated by the Fact Finding Committee (FFC) in 1984 was not cleared in some of the sectors even in 2001. The Indicator and Backlog Committee (IBC) Report (1994) revealed that regional imbalances had further increased and the remaining physical backlog as on 1st April, 2000 indicate that in more than half of the selected 30 sectors/sub-sectors, only 50% backlog could be cleared. The physical backlog had been quantified financially by both the FFC and IBC Committees and had suggested its removal in a time bound manner with appropriate allocation. This chapter analyses the pattern of funding by the State Government and its utilization over the years for removal of regional imbalances in the three regions and the role played by the three principal institutions viz. Development Boards, Planning Department and Governor's office, in this process. An attempt will also be made to analyse in detail the reasons for the accumulation of backlog and financial performance in different sectors. The performance of the Development Boards is assessed indirectly through the part played by them in terms of their involvement in various committees, planning process and suggestions for allocation and expenditure for the removal of regional imbalances in different sectors.

5.1 Financial backlog of FFC Report

Regional imbalances and the physical backlog of the three regions in 9 sectors was estimated at Rs. 3186.78 crore by the FFC based on 1982-83 prices in 1984 (Table 4.1) and the Committee recommended its removal within a period of 5 to 7 years. This included sectors like roads (Rs. 600.29 crore), irrigation (Rs. 1385.92 crore), village electrification (Rs. 240.65 crore) general education (Rs. 91.55 crore), technical education (Rs. 83.40 crore), health services (Rs. 221.21 crore), water supply (Rs. 378.24 crore), veterinary services (Rs. 7.75 crore) and land development and soil conservation (Rs.177.77 crore). Region wise backlog was Rs.1246.55 crore (39.1%) for Vidarbha, Rs. 750.86 crore (23.6%) for Marathwada and Rs.1189.38 crore (37.3%) for Rest of Maharashtra. Dandekar Committee (FFC) had estimated a backlog of Rs. 9.71 crore (0.30%) for greater Mumbai and Rs. 295.62 crore (9.28%) for Konkan region in the total backlog.

Though the FFC report was not formally accepted by the Government, it was decided to clear the backlog in a time bound manner as an interim measure. Thus from Annual plan 1985-86 onwards, funds were allocated by

the State Government every year for the removal of identified backlog (Table 5.1). Backlog funds of Rs. 1650 crore were allocated in Seventh Plan (1985-90). Rs. 935 crore in Annual Plans 1990-92, Rs. 3095.82 crore in Eighth Plan (1992-97) and Rs. 8980 crore during the first three years of Ninth Plan 1997-2000 were allocated. During the Seventh Plan, 82.4% of the allocated (backlog) funds was utilized, while in Annual Plans 1990-92, 88.06% backlog funds was utilized. In the first three years of Ninth Plan, 93.8% funds was utilized for the clearance of backlog. Thus, a total of Rs. 8980.80 crore was allocated and the corresponding utilization was Rs. 8237.44 crore (91.7%) during the period. A perusal of the Table 5.1 indicate that not only the allocations were small but the allocated funds were also not fully utilized except during 1994-95 and 1995-96 years for the clearance of backlog.

5.2 Pattern of Allocation and Expenditure for Removal of FFC Backlog

In the beginning, small amounts ranging from Rs.200 crore in 1985-86 to Rs.500 crore in 1994-95 were allocated without any strategy (Table 5.1). During Eighth Plan, the strategy was changed to clearance of backlog in priority sectors such as irrigation and roads. After the formation of the Development Boards, the Governor started region wise general plan allocations as well. In the Annual plan 1995-96, the Governor for the first time made an equitable allocation of overall plan funds among the three Boards. Although there was no particular formula for allocation of funds among the three regions, the Governor took into account the factors such as population percentage of the three regions to the total population of the State as per 1991 Census and quantum of backlog identified by the FFC. Funds allocated to the Development Boards were made non-divertible from the area of one Development Board to another. To ensure this, it was made mandatory on the part of the State Government to reflect the funds allocated by the Governor in the annual financial statements placed before the State Legislature.

Table 5.1 reveals that, over the years there have been shortfalls in expenditure in the regions of Vidarbha and Marathwada during the period 1985-94. The Governor had taken into account this fact and it was made good by providing additional outlays to these two regions by applying correction due to escalation of cost norms @ 10%. Even though, the allocations were made accordingly even then there have been shortfalls in expenditure from 1995-96 to 1999-2000 for regions of Vidarbha and Marathwada compared to RoM region. Regarding sectoral expenditure, the sectors in which there have been shortfalls in Vidarbha and Marathwada were roads and irrigation. In these sectors the RoM had better performance in removal of sectoral backlog. However, there was no direct involvement of Development Boards in the expenditure out of these backlog funds as the concerned department and Planning Department were involved in the allocation and expenditure for the execution of the backlog works.

Table 5.1

Outlay provided & Actual Expenditure for removal of backlog from 1985-1986 to 2001-2002 in the three regions of State

(Rs. In crore)

Annual Plan	Rest of Maharashtra			Marathwada			Vidarbha			Total		
	Outlay	Expenditure	% of Utilization	Outlay	Expenditure	% of Utilization	Outlay	Expenditure	% of Utilization	Outlay	Expenditure	% of Utilization
1985-86	89.24	56.79	63.64	50.25	32.38	64.44	60.51	43.87	72.50	200.00	133.04	66.52
1986-87	119.20	74.99	62.91	61.04	48.00	78.64	69.76	57.95	83.07	250.00	184.89	73.96
1987-88	123.28	94.30	76.49	74.14	59.59	80.37	102.58	90.17	87.90	300.00	244.06	81.35
1988-89	167.47	145.26	86.74	96.02	79.15	82.43	136.51	141.00	103.29	400.00	365.41	91.35
1989-90	225.70	190.78	84.53	99.84	91.15	91.30	174.46	154.85	88.76	500.00	432.83	86.57
1990-91	193.48	174.82	90.36	84.49	77.10	91.25	172.04	161.00	93.58	450.01	412.92	91.76
1991-92	217.37	177.77	81.78	90.5	80.82	89.30	177.13	157.40	88.86	485.00	414.99	85.56
1992-93	200.79	181.52	90.40	110.17	108.65	98.62	187.03	190.35	101.78	497.99	480.52	96.49
1993-94	194.98	200.25	102.70	97.94	111.68	114.03	204.88	174.11	84.98	497.80	485.26	97.48
Sub total	1531.5	1296.5	84.65	764.39	688.52	90.07	1284.9	1170.7	91.11	3580.8	3153.92	88.08
1994-95	195.49	291.43	149.08	124.91	161.37	129.19	179.6	238.40	132.74	500.00	691.20	138.24
1995-96	202.00	251.11	124.31	191.00	175.3	91.78	307.00	305.23	99.42	700.00	731.64	104.52
1996-97	260.13	182.84	70.29	235.49	194.8	82.72	404.38	382.54	94.60	900.00	760.18	84.46
1997-98	284.13	445.54	156.81	311.59	248.69	79.81	504.28	379.32	75.22	1100.00	1073.55	97.60
1998-99	353.18	325.49	92.16	291.86	277.33	95.02	454.96	306.13	67.29	1100.00	908.95	82.63
1999-00	353.00	287.92	81.56	292.00	265.81	91.03	455.00	362.49	79.67	1100.00	916.22	83.29
2000-01	353.00	219.24	62.11	292.00	301.27	103.17	455.00	396.63	87.17	1100.00	917.14	83.38
2001-202	368.42	368.42	100.00	490.55	490.55	100.00	861.03	861.03	100.00	1720.00	1720.00	100.00
Sub Total	2369.4	2372	100.11	2229.4	2115.12	94.874	3621.3	3231.8	89.245	8220	7718.88	93.904
Grand Total	3900.9	3668.5	94.043	2993.8	2803.64	93.649	4906.2	4402.5	89.734	11801	10872.8	92.136

Source: Annual Plan Documents, Planning Department, Government of Maharashtra.

The backlog of Rs. 3186.78 crore worked out by the FFC was based on the cost norms of 1982-83 prices. The cost norms had since undergone considerable changes so backlog was quantified as per the norms prevailing at the end of Seventh Plan and it was estimated at Rs. 2924 crore for removal of remaining backlog. Out of this, Rs. 935 crore were provided in Annual plans 1990-92. Again due to steep rise in cost, the estimates were reworked again to Rs. 3261 crore for clearance of remaining backlog. Against this, Rs. 3095.80 crore were provided in the Eighth Plan.

5.3 Backlog Clearance of FFC

By the end of 1997, as a result of the efforts of the State Government, the backlog identified by the FFC like villages to be electrified, adult

education centers, technical schools/centres (Seats), + 2 vocational (seats), students in government and government aided higher secondary schools, primary health centres, rural hospitals, water supply (piped, dug/bore wells), veterinary institutes, artificial insemination centres was all cleared. The backlog, however, remained as on 1st April, 2001 in roads (villages to be connected), irrigation, energisation of agricultural pump sets, primary/secondary/junior college teachers seats in Government and Government aided polytechnics, urban water supply and soil conservation, beds in district hospital. The backlog identified by the FFC might have been almost cleared but for balanced regional development in a time bound manner with appropriate allocations as suggested by the FFC. Some districts had improved in some parameters while others did not thereby leading to a backlog in comparison to other districts. However, the reduction or widening of disparities cannot be attributed solely due to the work of Statutory Development Boards as the Development Boards came into existence only in 1994 and they do not have any direct role for the removal of backlog.

5.4 Financial Backlog of IBC Report

After the formation of the Statutory Development Boards and on the demands of the boards, the Governor constituted the Indicators and Backlog Committee (IBC) in 1995 for identifying the indicators of regional development, quantum of physical and financial backlog and the mechanism for its removal. The committee submitted its report (volume I) to the Governor on 11th July 1997. The Committee covered the same 9 major sectors dealt earlier by the FFC Committee for calculating region-wise and sector-wise backlog of Vidarbha, Marathwada and Rest of Maharashtra regions. The IBC estimated the backlog of Rs. 15335.77 crore as on 31st March, 1994 which includes the remaining residual backlog of FFC not cleared by that time. The various State Departments scrutinized the Volume-I report of IBC and their views were referred back to the reconstituted IBC. The reconstituted IBC reassessed the physical backlog and calculated the quantum of financial backlog of the same 9 sectors at Rs.14,006.77 crore as on 31st March, 1994 (Table 4.3). The backlog in irrigation sector reassessed by the reconstituted Indicators and Backlog Committee was reduced from Rs. 8767 crore to Rs. 7418 crore as on 31st March, 1994 on account of the reconciliation of data on basic irrigation potential in the three regions. The Governor and the Government accepted the IBC report in November 2000. Volume-II of the IBC report covered 15 other development sectors like service and welfare separately with a focus on deeper analysis of respective policies and programmes and necessary modifications for regional development instead of estimation of the quantum of physical and financial backlog.

The region wise and sector wise backlog identified by the IBC (Table 4.3) indicate a financial backlog of Rs. 6624.02 crore in Vidarbha region (47.29%), Rs. 4004.55 crore in Marathwada region (28.59%) and Rs. 3378.20 crore in Rest of Maharashtra region (24.12%) out of the total

Rs.14006.77 crore as on 31st March, 1994. sector wise, irrigation accounts for 52.96%, roads sector 16.57%, health services and electrification of pumps 8.7% each, followed by land development (5.63%), technical/vocational education (3.81%), water supply (2.26%), general education (1.27%) and veterinary services (0.04%) out of the total backlog. The IBC suggested the removal of the backlog in three to seven years period.

5.5 Increase in Regional Backlog

As discussed in the previous chapter, both physical and financial backlog had increased over the periods as indicated by the FFC and IBC. Vidarbha region's share had increased from 39.12% to 47.29%, Marathwada share from 23.56% to 28.59% and Rest of Maharashtra share reduced from 37.32% to 24.12% during 1984 to 1994. As the backlog identified by the FFC could not be cleared in a time bound manner and fresh backlog had also crept in from 1984 to 1994, there was increase in physical and financial backlog. A perusal of the tables 4.1 and 4.3 and Annexure 4.1 and 4.2 indicate that, mainly irrigation, health services, technical and vocational education, electrification sectors backlog could not be cleared completely and fresh backlog also got accumulated during the ten years period in these sectors.

5.6 Pattern of Allocation and Expenditure of Funds

The IBC was constituted in 1995 and the findings were based as on 31st March, 1994 but the report was accepted only in November, 2000. So a period of 6 years had elapsed for its acceptance and there was also a need for fresh assessment of the remaining physical and financial backlog. Planning Department with the help of other Government departments and Development Boards could finalise (except Agriculture Education Sector) the remaining physical and financial backlog of IBC as on 1st April, 2000 and Governor accepted this on 20th December, 2001.

After the formation of the Statutory Development Boards, Governor allocated backlog funds and made equitable allocation of overall annual plan funds among the three Board regions since 1995-96. While making the allocation of backlog funds among the three regions, the Governor followed the population percentage of the three regions in the total population of the State as per 1991 Census and quantum of backlog of three regions as identified by the FFC up to 2000-01. After the assessment of the remaining physical and financial backlog as on 1st April, 2000, the Governor gave detailed directives and guidelines to be followed for the clearance of backlog in December 2001.

Initially, the funds for removal of backlog and district level Schemes were kept in State pool and the programmes were formulated at State level. District planning and Development councils were associated with the process of removal of backlog from 1989-90 onwards. The Governor fixed the share of the respective Development Boards on the basis of: 1. District

level schemes finalized by the State Government based on the proposals of concerned DPDC. 2. Requirement of Sector/Sub-sector wise funds under State pool programmes under each Board. 3. Outlays for expenditure on non-divisible State level schemes whose benefits extend beyond the area of one board like Energy development, State Administration, Research etc.

For 1994-95, an outlay of Rs. 500 crore was kept for the backlog removal (Table 5.1) which was increased to Rs. 700 crore, and 900 crore during Annual plans 1995-96, 1996-97 respectively. For the next four annual plans, 1997-98 to 2000-01 an outlay of Rs. 1100 crore was allocated for clearance of backlog. During 2001-02, allocation had been increased to Rs. 1720 crore. However, backlog funds allocation to annual plan was only about 10% to 15% (Table 5.6). Except for the initial two years of the Boards formation, in all the subsequent years the funds were not utilized fully particularly so in Vidarbha region for various reasons. During the 7 years period (1994-95 to 2000-01) on an average only 89% of the allotted funds were utilized in Vidarbha, 94% in Marathwada, whereas in the rest of Maharashtra region it was utilized fully.

Table 5.2

Allocation and Expenditure pattern in the three regions for clearance of IBC backlog

(Rs. In Crore)

Sl. No	Particulars	Regions			Total
		Rest of Maharashtra	Marathwada	Vidarbha	
1.	Total financial backlog	3378.20 (24.12)	4004.55 (28.59)	6624.02 (47.29)	14006.77 (100.00)
2.	Total allocation since (1994-95 to 2000-2001)	2000.93 (30.78)	1738.85 (26.75)	2760.22 (42.47)	6500 (100.00)
3.	Total expenditure incurred from 1994-95 to 2000-2001	2027.46 (33.20)	1653.09 (27.08)	2425.33 (39.72)	6105.88 (100.00)
4.	Due share of allocation for the period of 1994-95 to 2000-01 as per IBC	1567.80 (24.12)	1858.35 (28.59)	3073.85 (47.29)	6500 (100.00)
5.	Due share of expenditure for the period of 1994-95 to 2000-01	1472.74 (24.12)	1745.67 (28.59)	2887.47 (47.29)	6105.88 (100.00)
6.	Region wise excess or less allocation Compared to due share of allocation	(+)433.13 (+6.66%)	(-)119.50 (-1.84%)	(-) 313.63 (-)4.82%)	-
7.	Region wise excess or less actual Expenditure compared to due share of expenditure	(+)554.74 (+9.08%)	(-)92.58 (-)1.51%)	(-) 462.16 (-)7.57%)	-

Figures in parenthesis indicate percentage.

Source: Publication, Marathwada Development Board.

Table 5.2 indicates that since 1994-95 to 2000-01 about Rs. 6500 crore had been allocated in the three regions out of which Rs. 6105.88 crore (94%) was utilized. The allocation and expenditure pattern indicate that not only the allocations were small but the allotted and spent amount was also not as per the backlog proportions identified by the IBC. Table 5.2 also

indicate that Rs.433.13 crore (6.66%) were allocated more to RoM region and there was a shortfall of Rs. 119.50 crore in Marathwada and Rs. 313.63 crore in Vidarbha region if IBC backlog proportions criteria were to be applied. Another interesting point evident from this table is that there was excess expenditure to the allotted amount in RoM by Rs. 27 crore whereas it was less by Rs.86 crore in Marathwada and Rs. 335 crore in Vidarbha region.

5.7 IBC Backlog Removal

Planning Department had calculated the remaining physical and financial backlog as on 1st April, 2000 taking the views of other Departments and Development Boards. It is seen in the previous chapter that in more than half of the 30 sector/sub-sectors even half of the physical backlog was yet to be removed (Annexure 4.1 and 4.2). Table 5.3 shows the region-wise, sectors-wise financial backlog in the three Board regions as on 1st April 2000 and also as on 1st April, 2002. It indicates that Rs. 4628 crore (33%) have been spent out of the total identified backlog of Rs.14006 crore in the three regions. Still 67% of the financial backlog (Rs. 9378 crore) remains to be covered for the liquidating of remaining physical backlog by 2005-06 as per as per the Governor's recent orders.

As irrigation, roads, health services and energisation of pump sets sectors accounts for 55%, 15%, 11% and 10% respectively of the remaining financial backlog it will be worthwhile to see the quantum of physical backlog removed out of the expenditure incurred so far as on 1st April, 2000. Comparative analysis of Table 5.3 and Annexure 4.2 shows that, in irrigation sector between 1994 and 2000, about 3.09% in Vidarbha, 9.46% in Marathwada and 47.8% of the RoM region's identified backlog funds were spent consequently physical backlog of 27% in Vidarbha, 34% in Marathwada and 47% in RoM region was removed. In the roads sector, 23% of the backlog funds were spent, (30% in Vidarbha, 21% in Marathwada and 15% in RoM) and still 2% of village roads, 27% of rural roads and 23% of district roads backlog had to be cleared. In Main High way, State High way and district roads more than 75% of the physical backlog still remains to be cleared. Electrification of pump sets is another sector where only 3.8% of the funds (Rs.47 crore) were spent consequently there was still 96% physical backlog (100% in Marathwada, 98% in RoM and 94% in Vidarbha region).

Table 5.3

Region-wise, sector-wise remaining financial backlog in the three Board regions as on 1st April, 2002

Sl. No.	Sector	Region									Total			
		Vidarbha			Marathwada			Rest of Maharashtra			Backlog as on 1 st April 2000	Expenditure for 2000-01 and outlay for 2001-2002	Remaining backlog as on 31 st March 2002	Sector % to total backlog
		Backlog as on 1 st April 2000	Expenditure for 2000-01 and outlay for 2001-2002	Remaining backlog as on 31 st March 2002	Backlog as on 1 st April 2000	Expenditure for 2000-01 and outlay for 2001-2002	Remaining backlog as on 31 st March 2002	Backlog as on 1 st April 2000	Expenditure for 2000-01 and outlay for 2001-2002	Remaining backlog as on 31 st March 2002				
1	Irrigation	3956.50	820.01	3136.49	2174	464.31	1709.65	487.91	165.34	322.57	6618.4	1449.7	5168.7	55.12
2	Roads	693.97	156.61	537.36	437.57	175.55	262.02	657.69	193.59	464.1	1789.2	525.75	1263.5	13.47
3	General Education	14.86	5.08	9.78	13.33	1.65	11.68	50.04	17.72	32.32	78.23	24.45	53.78	0.57
4	Technical@ Education	105.23	16.01	89.22	73.23	12.16	61.07	241.09	49.18	191.91	419.55	77.35	342.2	3.65
5	Health Services#	187.34	70.64	116.7	422.74	54.54	368.2	743.59	72.32	671.27	1353.7	197.50	1156.2	12.33
6	Water Supply	27.20	42.50	-15.30*	78.72	18.50	60.22	0.00	25.00	-25*	105.92	86.00	60.22^	0.64
7	Land Development Soil & Water Conservation & Horticulture	133.21	23.20	110.01	50.98	11.99	38.99	245.23	24.62	220.61	429.42	59.81	369.61	3.94
8	Veterinary Services	0.13	0.22	-0.09*	0.87	0.18	0.69	3.17	0.50	2.67	4.17	0.90	3.36^^	0.04
9	Electrification of Pumps	660.19	123.39	536.80	295.66	52.94	242.72	220.03	39.39	180.64	1175.9	215.72	960.16	10.24
	TOTAL	5778.6	1257.66	4536.36	3547.1	791.82	2755.24	2648.8	587.66	2086.09	11974	2637.1	9377.7	100

Source : Governor's directive GS/DS/DB/DIRECTIVES/2001/338.

Footnote :

- * Indicates excess expenditure in the sectors of water supply in RoM and Vidarbha.
- ^ Indicates excess expenditure of Rs. 25 crore in the sector of water supply in RoM and Rs. 15.30 crore in Vidarbha region has not been taken into account.
- ^^ Indicates excess expenditure of Rs.0.09 crore in the sector of veterinary services in Vidarbha region has not been included.
- @ Indicates that Planning Department has been asked to update information in the sector of Agriculture Education and update the backlog in the sector of Medical Education for under-graduate courses on the basis of region as a unit before arriving at backlog in this sector.
- # Indicates that Planning Department has been asked to update the information in the sector of Health Services before arriving at backlog in this sector.

5.8 Increase in Regional Backlog

It has been seen in the previous chapter that the physical backlog had not only increased but continuously getting added up over the years since 1984.

Table 5.4

Financial Backlog over the years in the three Board regions

Region	Year			
	1984	1994	2000	2002*
Vidarbha	39.12%	47.60%	48.26%	48.37%
Marathwada	23.56%	28.77%	29.62%	29.38%
Rest of Maharashtra	37.32%	23.63%	22.12%	22.25%

* 2001-02 allocation and not expenditure.

Table 5.4 shows the financial backlog position during different periods. It is apparent that in both Vidarbha and Marathwada regions the backlog proportion out of the total backlog had increased by 9 points and 6 points respectively but in RoM region it had decreased by 15 points during 1984 to 2002. Some of the reasons for this has been explained earlier like following FFC backlog instead of IBC, small amounts of allocation, non-involvement of Development Boards etc.

The analysis of the pattern of allocation and expenditure (Table 5.2) indicates that there had been inequitable allocation and expenditure in the two regions of Vidarbha and Marathwada. The methodology adopted for the allocation and clearance of backlog had utilized FFC backlog proportions up to 2000-01. As irrigation and roads account for 70% of regional imbalances it was probed in greater detail.

5.9 Backlog Accumulation in Irrigation and Roads Sector

It is apparent from Table 5.5 that the proportion of backlog in irrigation sector had continuously increased from 38% in 1984 to 61% in 2002 in Vidarbha region and 23% to 33% in Marathwada region during the same period. However, it had decreased from 39% to 6% in RoM region from the year 1984 to 2002. In the case of roads sector backlog proportions remained the same in Vidarbha, but declined by 3 points in Marathwada and increased by 3 points in RoM region. The quantum of allocation and expenditure distortions and consequently accumulation of backlog is more apparent in irrigation sector.

Table 5.5

Financial Backlog Position of Irrigation and Roads Sectors in the three Regions

Region	Sector	(In percentages)			
		Years			
		1984	1994	2000	2002
Vidarbha	Irrigation	38.05	55.04	59.78	60.68
	Roads	48.55	42.68	38.78	42.53
Marathwada	Irrigation	22.85	32.37	32.85	33.08
	Road	18.29	23.88	24.46	20.74
Rest of Maharashtra	Irrigation	39.10	12.59	7.43	6.24
	Roads	33.15	33.44	36.76	36.73

The analysis of Table 4.7 indicate that the State Government had spent Rs. 0.59 crore per thousand hectares for backlog clearance of irrigation Sector in Vidarbha region during 1994 to 2000. For the same period the expenditure incurred was Rs.1.56 crore in Marathwada and Rs.5.71 crore in RoM region for one thousand hectares backlog clearance in irrigation. This clearly indicates that there was unequal expenditure in the three regions for the clearance of irrigation backlog. While allocating the amount, IBC had assigned an amount of Rs. 5.36 crore per thousand hectare (on an average for all types of irrigation backlog) and it is now obvious from the clearance of backlog effected so far that about Rs. 1.83 crore had been spent to clear one thousand hectares backlog in three regions together. As per the IBC report, Vidarbha region requires 9.1 times and Marathwada region 3.4 times per thousand hectares of the allotted amount if the backlog in irrigation sector had to be liquidated completely. This analysis also indicate that, there is no relationship between the allocated amount by the IBC and the amount needed and the spent amount in the three Development Boards regions. No particular allocation principle had been followed for the allocation and clearance of irrigation and roads sector backlog. The irrigation department indicated that the allocations done during the period 1960 to 1994 broadly corresponds to the weightage of 50%, 25% and 25% for population, DPAP areas and net sown area respectively in the three regions. Table 5.6 shows that the percentage allocation for backlog removal in irrigation Sector to irrigation sector outlay was 15% to 30% during 1995-96 to 2001-02. This table also brings out two other important points; the percentage of backlog funds to annual plans which was only 10% during 1995-96 to 2000-01 had been increased recently to 15% in 2001-02 budgetary allocation. Irrigation sector had been allocated about 52% of the total backlog funds since 1995-96 and during 2000-01 about 73% of the funds went to irrigation sector but still only 31.7% of the physical backlog could be cleared up to 1st April, 2000.

Table 5.6

Allocation pattern for removal of backlog in Annual Plans

(Rs. In Crore)								
Sl. No.	Year	Annual Plan	Allocation for removal of backlog	% of backlog allocation to Annual Plan outlay	Irrigation sector outlay	Allocation for backlog removal in irrigation sector	% of allocation for backlog removal in Irrigation Sector to Irrigation sector Outlay	% of irrigation sector allocation to total backlog allocation
1.	1995-96	6995.84	700.00	10.01	1335.84	357.64	26.77	51.09
2.	1996-97	8284.00	900.00	10.86	1648.99	414.98	25.17	46.10
3.	1997-98	8325.00	1100.00	13.21	2357.62	550.97	23.37	50.09
4.	1998-99	11600.73	1100.00	9.48	2878.3	609.87	21.19	55.44
5.	1999-00	12161.66	1100.00	9.04	3644.04	540.00	14.82	49.09
6.	2000-01	12330.00	1100.00	8.92	3818.54	802.29	21.01	72.93
7.	2001-02	11720.56	1720.00	14.68	2476.67	755.35	30.50	43.92
Total		71417.79	7720.00	10.81	18160	4031.1	22.20	52.22

Source: Governor's directive GS/DS/DB/DIRECTIVES/2001/338.

5.10 Reasons for Accumulation of Backlog

The occurrence and accumulation of physical backlog in different sectors due to methodological problems besides non-adherence to a time schedule had been briefly dealt in the previous chapter. FFC report (1984) had suggested the removal of the identified backlog during Seventh Plan (1985-90) in 5 years. About 14.77% of the total plan outlay (Rs.4272 crore) during 1985-95 was allocated for the backlog removal of FFC. As the allocated funds were thinly spread over a long period of time backlog could not be completely removed.

IBC had also suggested the removal of the identified backlog within 3 to 7 years and suggested a detailed mechanism for its removal. The pattern of allocation and expenditure had played a major role in the accumulation of backlog. The inequitable allocation under non-backlog funds which constitute over 90% of the total Annual Plan had created distortions in the allocation of funds between the regions and is creating fresh backlog at a much rapid rate than the rate at which the existing backlog is being cleared. After the establishment of Development Boards, the Governor had been allocating Annual Plan funds equitably in the three regions besides the backlog and special funds as per the special responsibility entrusted to him. Vidarbha and Marathwada Development Boards had pointed out that since only divisible plan outlay was made available for distribution among the three regions, outlays for non-divisible outlays should be strictly for the State as a whole, where the benefits cannot be shown as divisible in the three regions. This distortion is apparent from Table 5.7 where the non-divisible plan outlay which was at 16.01% of the Annual Plan in 1995-96 rose to 57% in 1999-2000 Annual Plan and this had mainly benefited the Rest of Maharashtra region. The budgetable part of the non-divisible outlay had remained nearly the same but, non-divisible part of the non-budgetable outlay had increased substantially over the years. Huge amount of funds had been raised through bonds, loans etc. from the market which was

included in the non-budgetable non-divisible outlay. It is also apparent from Table 5.7 that disproportionate allocation of these non-divisible funds were spent in the Rest of Maharashtra region thus depriving the other less developed regions of Vidarbha and Marathwada.

Table 5.7

Region-wise break-up of Non-Budgetable Non-Divisible Outlay

Year	Development Board			Non-divisible (divisible parts)	Non-Divisible			Total Outlay
	Vidarbha	Marathwada	RoM		Budgetable	Non-Budgetable	Total	
1995-96	-	-	-	-	472.67	536.11	1008.78 (14.42%)	6995.84
1996-97	-	-	-	-	1084.59	524.00	1608.59 (19.42%)	8284.00
1997-98	-	-	1200.00 (100%)	1200.00 (100%)	1541.79	652.24	2194.03 (26.53%)	8325.00
1998-99	797.00 (18.30%)	349.00 (8.01%)	3209.00 (73.69)	4355.00 (100%)	1541.11	845.73	2386.84 (20.57%)	11600.73
1999-00	314.83 (7.48%)	304.85 (7.26%)	3580.78 (85.26%)	4200.06 (100%)	1454.98	1319.78	2774.76 (22.82%)	12161.66

Note:1. Figures in bracket in column (2), (3), (4) & (5) indicate percentage to divisible portion of Non-divisible Non-Budgetable outlay.

2. Figures in bracket in column (8) indicate percentage to total plan outlay.

Source: Governor's directive GS/DS/DB/DIRECTIVES/2001/338.

The main reason for the regional imbalances in irrigation sector is due to the inequitable allocation and expenditure of non-budgetable funds in the three regions. Table 5.8 explicitly brings out this position. Since 1996-97 RoM region had been getting comparatively higher amount (50% to 80%) of the total funds in the irrigation sector than the other two regions. Non-budgetable resources raised in the form of bonds and loan amount had largely gone to RoM region and the proportion of this to budgetable portion was 43 times during 1999-2000 and 58 times in 2000-01. Irrigation Development Corporations were set up in the three regions for raising resources for undertaking Irrigation projects. However, Krishna Valley Development Corporation in RoM region could attract more funds than the other two irrigation Development Corporations in Vidarbha and Marathwada and these non-budgetable funds were allocated mainly to RoM region. The Development Boards of Vidarbha and Marathwada voiced their concern over this and had demanded equitable distribution of all the non-budgetable funds raised in the market in the three regions as State Government is the guarantor for the amount.

Implementation and monitoring mechanism for backlog clearance was also weak. IBC had suggested a Cabinet sub-committee for monitoring the clearance of backlog. Planning Department was the nodal department identified to coordinate with other departments. As the IBC report was accepted very late, the quantum of physical and financial backlog could not be identified in time. Planning Department should update the backlog position every year as had been done in the case of FFC report. The

emphasis was more on the clearance of financial backlog rather than physical backlog. As the allocated funds were thinly spread and due to artificial separation between backlog and non-backlog funds it was difficult to ascertain the coverage of physical backlog out of the backlog funds alone. As projects in some sectors especially irrigation take 3 to 4 years for completion physical backlog clearance can not be related to backlog expenditure every year. So, project approach may be more appropriate in tackling the backlog issue rather than year wise expenditure. Irrigation Sector backlog analysis reveals that backlog clearance of the same sector in different regions of the State may require different allocations depending upon the geo-ecological condition. Development Boards need to be involved in identifying the projects and in the execution of backlog works.

5.11 Role of Development Boards in Clearance of Backlog

Two important functions assigned to the Development Boards are (a) to ascertain the relative levels of development and (b) to suggest development expenditure for their area. Neither the Boards have infrastructure facilities to identify their regions development periodically on their own nor the financial powers to allocate requisite amount to clear the accumulated backlog. However, the Boards in their meetings, resolutions and annual reports submitted to the Governor and Planning Department highlighted their regions backwardness, backlog accumulation and regional disparities and suggested allocation and expenditure for its clearance

On the request of the Development Boards, Governor had set up the IBC Committee in 1995 which is a joint committee of experts of three Development Boards to examine regional development and backwardness as on 1st April, 1994. Due to Development Boards demand, the Governor had set up Joint Committee of Development Boards to study equitable arrangements for technical and vocational training and a Joint Committee on representation of three regions in employment services. Development Board expert members acted as committee members of IBC, Joint Committee on services and technical and vocational education. By the time IBC report was accepted in November 2000, the backlog of FFC report of 1984 was getting implemented.

The Development Boards have highlighted the accumulating physical and financial backlog in their annual reports and resolutions in the meetings and brought to the notice of the Governor. The Development Boards have also highlighted the anomalies and methodological issues involved in the calculation of backlog in various sectors especially in irrigation sector. Rest of Maharashtra Development Board had pointed out that the irrigation backlog calculated by the IBC was discriminatory towards RoM region and requested IBC and Governor to consider taluka as a unit for irrigation backlog calculation in DPAP areas. Development Board RoM region had also suggested a formula of 40% population, 30% cultivable area and 30% DPAP areas for clearance of backlog in irrigation sector. The irrigation backlog amount assigned to restoration of Ex-Malguzari tanks (Rs.

117 crore) by IBC had been suggested by RoM board to be taken as a routine work and not as a backlog work.

Table 5.8

Region-wise break-up of Budgetable and Non-Budgetable Expenditure/Allocation in Irrigation Sector in the Annual Plans

Year	Regions			Total
	Vidarbha	Marathwada	Rest of Maharashtra	
<u>1996-1997</u>				
Budgetable	281.03	203.87	310.62	795.52
Non-Budgetable	-	-	853.47	853.47
Total	281.03 (17.04%)	203.87 (12.36%)	1164.09 (70.60%)	1648.99 (100%)
<u>1997-1998</u>				
Budgetable	206.82	235.78	141.36	583.96
Non-Budgetable	180.74	-	1592.92	1773.66
Total	387.56 (16.44%)	235.78 (10.00%)	1734.28 (73.56%)	2357.62 (100%)
<u>1998-1999</u>				
Budgetable	275.79	198.29	108.22	582.30
Non-Budgetable	425.00	300.00	1571.00	2296.00
Total	700.79 (24.35%)	498.29 (17.31%)	1679.22 (58.34%)	2878.30 (100%)
<u>1999-2000</u>				
Budgetable	98.14	-	65.74	163.88
Non-Budgetable	353.91	286.11	2840.14	3480.16
Total	452.05 (12.40%)	286.11 (7.85%)	2905.88 (79.75%)	3644.04 (100%)
<u>2000-2001</u>				
Budgetable	87.97	-	37.56	125.53
Non-Budgetable	925.21	705.08	2062.72	3693.01
Total	1013.18 (26.53%)	705.08 (18.46%)	2100.28 (55.01%)	3818.54 (100%)
<u>2001-2002</u>				
Budgetable	63.81	10.49	41.90	116.20
Non-Budgetable	655.50	503.71	1201.26	2360.47
Total	719.31 (29.05%)	514.2 (20.73%)	1243.16 (50.22%)	2476.67 (100%)

Source: Governor's directive GS/DS/DB/DIRECTIVES/2001/338.

Vidarbha and Marathwada Development Boards had brought to the notice of the Governor of the inequitable allocation and expenditure of backlog funds between the three regions during 1994-95 to 2000-01 and the need for compensation for the two Development Boards due to excess expenditure incurred in RoM region (Table 5.2). As irrigation backlog is accumulating, Vidarbha and Marathwada Development Boards had also suggested a formula for distribution of funds with weightage to backlog, net sown area and rural population in the ratio of 50:25:25 respectively for its

clearance (Table 5.9). They had also requested for flexibility on spending the amount in adjoining districts if funds can not be spent in a particular district for any reason and the regional Boards should be given powers to decide the works in the district.

Table 5.9

Allocation of Plan Funds suggested by Development Boards

Vidarbha Development Board		Marathwada Development Board	
Sector	Proposed formula for allocation of plan funds	Sector	Proposed formula for allocation of plan funds
Irrigation	50% Backlog+25% Net sown Area+25% Rural Population	Irrigation	50% Backlog+25% Net Sown Area+25% Rural Population
Road Development	Geographical + 1981-2001 Road Development plan Backlog.	Road Development	50% Backlog +50 % Rural Population
		Health Services	
		Rural Water supply	
		Agricultural Education	
Education, Public Health & Drinking Water Supply	% Population of each region	General Education	50% Backlog +50 % Total Population
		Higher & Technical Education	
Electrification of Agriculture Pumps Sets	Sown Area + Un irrigated sown area of region.	Land Development & Water Conservation	50% Backlog +25% net Sown Area +25% Rural Population
		Electrification of Agriculture Pump sets	
For other Sectors	% Population of each region/District	Animal Husbandry	50% Backlog+50% Cattle Population
		Urban Water Supply	50% Backlog+50% Urban Population

Source: Bulletins, Vidarbha Development Board and Marathwada Development Board.

Vidarbha Development Board (VDB) had suggested allocation of 50% of the annual plan funds for the backlog works and 50% for non-backlog development works. VDB had also suggested 30% of plan funds to different districts on the basis of the approved Planning Department formula and the rest of 20% annual plan funds to State level non-divisible schemes. Vidarbha and Marathwada Development Boards had highlighted the need for taking up only such schemes/projects which benefit the whole state and not a particular region for non-divisible plan funds. They had also suggested non-budgetable funds raised in the market should be pooled together and distributed equitably among the three regions and had demanded compensation for the higher expenditure incurred so far in RoM region.

In roads sector, Vidarbha and Marathwada Development Boards had suggested backlog targets of 1981-2001 Road Development Plan, geographical area/rural population criteria as a basis for the allocation of

clearance of backlog. Vidarbha and Marathwada Development Boards have suggested 50% backlog and 50% population criteria as sector wise development expenditure for the clearance of backlog (Table 5.9) in other sectors. They had also pointed to the administrative delay, forest policy hurdles and power supply shortages in the clearance of backlog and requested remedial action.

As inequitable distribution of non-backlog allocations (which is over 90%) is increasing fresh backlog, the Governor directed that the distinction between backlog and non-backlog funds should be done away in irrigation sector. The concerned Departments have been directed to ensure that no fresh backlog is created with the launching of new schemes/projects. As more funds were being spent in only one region and due to Development Boards pressure of Vidarbha and Marathwada, the State Government is showing region wise share of divisible portion of the non-budgetable part of the total plan from 1997-98. The Governor gave detailed directives for the clearance of backlog by 2005-06 after considering the view points of the three Development Boards, Irrigation Department, Planning Department and other experts.

5.12 Governor's Directives and Compliance on Backlog Removal

In exercise of the powers conferred by the State of Maharashtra, the Governor of the State has special responsibility under Clause (2) of the article 371 of the Constitution (Annexure 1.4) for the proper functioning of the Development Boards. The important directions of the Governor's office executed for the balanced development and backlog removal are:

1. The Governor appointed a Committee of experts called Indicators and Backlog Committee in 1995 for identifying appropriate indicators for assessing relative levels of development in the three regions. The Committee's report was reviewed and the Governor had re-constituted Indicators and Backlog Committee (IBC) which re-assessed the financial backlog of Rs. 14006.77 crore for 9 major sectors as on 1st April, 1994 and submitted its report to the Governor on 27th September, 2000 which the Governor accepted.
2. The Governor constituted a Joint Committee of the Development Boards on technical education in June, 1995 which submitted its report in September, 1996. The Governor's directives on the implementation of this report was challenged in High Court and the case is pending. However, certain directives not affected by the High Court orders are being implemented for some courses in the institutions.
3. The Governor constituted a Joint Committee of the Development Boards in October 1996 to study representation of the three regions in the services of State Government and the State controlled

departments and the Committee found the present representation of employees in different regions was satisfactory.

4. Governor had been allocating backlog funds, Special Funds and Annual plan funds equitably based on backlog and population criteria since 1995-96. The Governor's office had written to the Planning Department to evolve suitable mechanism whereby alternate proposals are sent in time to the Finance Department in case some proposals are rejected so as to ensure that the sanctioned outlay for each Board is fully budgeted.
5. The Governor directed that, allocation of funds made to the three Development Boards should be reflected in the annual financial statement to be placed before the State Legislature which is being followed every year by the State Government.
6. The Governor's office had issued suitable instructions to Divisional Commissioners and all District Collectors that in the review meeting of District Planning Committees to include the item "follow-up and review of expenditure of outlay budgeted" out of special funds for removal of backlog as a permanent agenda item.
7. The Governor's office had written to the Planning Department that a senior officer of the State Government who has been given the responsibility to monitor the time bound programmes for development of Vidarbha and Marathwada should also be given additional responsibilities to follow-up and review the works undertaken out of special fund and funds for removal of backlog.
8. The Governor had directed that scheme wise outlay should be made by Planning Department based on consultations with the respective Development Board and the concerned District Planning Committee for district level, State pool and State level Schemes.
9. The Governor had directed that funds from backlog to non-backlog and from area of one Development Board to that of another shall not be diverted.
10. Based on the recommendations of the IBC report, allocation for backlog removal was first made in annual plan for the year 2001-02. The Governor directed that the remaining backlog as on 1st April 2001 should be liquidated in a period of 5 years starting from 2001-2002. The Governor also directed that, it should be ensured that no fresh backlog is created in any sector and a certificate to this effect was made mandatory from the concerned Secretary before starting a new Scheme/Project.
11. In December 2001, Governor finalised the physical and financial backlog and issued detailed directives to State Government regarding

sector wise allocation of the Annual Plan outlay. He emphasized the need for the clearance of physical backlog than the financial backlog.

12. The Governor directed that the artificial distinction between the backlog and non-backlog allocation should be removed in the irrigation sector and the divisible outlay in the overall allocation in the irrigation sector as a whole which includes both budgetable and non-budgetable outlays should be distributed amongst the three regions based on the Governor's directives.
13. The Governor prescribed a separate formula based on backlog, population and net sown area for irrigation sector backlog removal for the next 4 years period of 2002-06 so that backlog is cleared. However, the committed projects under construction were also not allowed to suffer for want of funds in RoM region.
14. The Governor directed that more autonomy and administrative power should be given to the Irrigation Development Corporations and the Regional Heads in the Irrigation Department for decision making and implementation of the projects for liquidations of backlog.
15. He also directed that Government should institutionalize formal participation of the Development Boards in the functioning of the Irrigation Development Corporations through structured consultations.
16. The Governor also directed that the remaining financial backlog of IBC Rs. 4209 crore in sectors other than irrigation should be utilized for the liquidation of backlog in those sectors in four years from 2002-03. The distribution of this allocation in the three regions and inter sectoral allocation within the region has to be done in proportion to the remaining backlog as on 1st April, 2002.
17. As non- divisible plan outlay rose from 16% in 1995-96 to 57% in 1999-2000 the State Governor directed the Planning Department and Finance Department to publish the break-up of the schemes under non-divisible development funds in the three regions. From 1997-98, Finance Department is publishing the break-up of schemes/projects in the three regions every year under non-divisible pool of funds.
18. The Governor advised the Development Boards to focus on one or two aspects of social development like literacy and health and concentrate on its development activities in their regions. He also advised the Boards to prepare perspective plans for three years for the three regions and to invite their regions MPs to have discussions with them occasionally so that the problems of their respective regions are highlighted and addressed properly in their regional plans.

19. The Governor advised the Development Boards to adopt one most backward taluka in their respective region and undertake all round development activities out of their special funds which is being followed by the three regional Boards.
20. The Governor directed that the funds from backlog to non-backlog and from one Development Board to that of another Board shall not be diverted.

5.13 Observations on Governor's Directives

The Governor of Maharashtra had been entrusted with the special responsibilities towards the Statutory Development Boards. The Governor constituted the Development Boards and gave detailed operational directives for their proper functioning from time to time. The Governor constituted Joint Committees of the Development Boards to determine the backlog- 1. Indicators and Backlog Committee, 2. Joint Committees on Technical and Vocation Education and 3. Joint Committee on Opportunities for Employment in State Services. The Governor accepted the reports of the three committees and these are at various stages of implementation. The Governor gave directives from time to time to Planning Department, State Government and Development Boards for removing backlog, balanced regional development and for proper functioning of the Development Boards. The Governor had also visited the Development Boards periodically, had taken review meetings of the Development Boards and his office brings out half yearly report on the development activities of the three Development Boards. The Governor had been allocating Annual Plan funds to the three regions equitably based on population and backlog criteria since 1995-96. The Governor had also allocated a special fund of 100 crore rupees every year to the three Development Boards since 1995-96 to undertake small and useful development programmes in the three Boards regions. The Governor had finalized the remaining physical and financial backlog of the three regions of IBC report as on 1st April, 2000 based on consultations with Development Boards, Planning Department and other concerned departments.

The Governor's orders and directives indicate that Governor's role was a balanced and supervisory in nature without any conflict with State Government. As the determination of backwardness was a tedious and contentious issue between the three regional Boards, it took a long time for the line departments, Planning Department and the Governor for the finalisation of the IBC report. The detailed directives of the Governor in December 2001 for the clearance of backlog of the IBC by the year 2005-06 were logical keeping the interests of three regions and regional balance perspective of the State. The directives on the clearance of the irrigation sector backlog by merging backlog and non-backlog funds, emphasizing the clearance of physical backlog rather than financial, ensuring that no fresh backlog will be created by the new schemes/projects, decentralization of powers to district level authorities, bringing in transparency of the schemes

under non-divisible development funds of the State and ensuring greater role to the Development Boards go a long way in the clearance of backlog. However, the implementing and monitoring agencies are the line departments and Planning Department so it has to be seen whether the identified backlog of IBC will be cleared by 2005-06.

5.14 Role of Planning Department

Planning Department has the specific responsibility for the planning and development process of the entire State and also acts as a nodal department for the Statutory Development Boards activities in terms of allocation of funds, approval of projects and monitoring its physical and financial progress. For the first time, State Planning Department quantified the level of development and backwardness in the districts of the State and highlighted the need for a detailed study which resulted in the set-up of the FFC. After the submission of the FFC report (1984), the Planning Department had been monitoring the physical and financial performance in the three regions for backlog removal. Even after the set-up of the Statutory Development Boards in April, 1994 and up to 2000-01, Planning Department had been monitoring the physical and financial progress of sectoral backlog in the three regions of the FFC report due to late acceptance of the IBC report.

The quantum of backlog and the reasons for its accumulation and non-clearance in many sectors especially in irrigation was brought to the notice of the Government and Governor's office by the Planning Department. Though the FFC and IBC reports indicated a time frame of 5 to 7 years for the removal of identified backlog, the Planning Department could not exert the pressure on the line departments for its compliance. As the IBC report was approved in November 2000 only, the allocations were being made based on FFC findings up to 2000-01. The remaining physical and financial backlog of IBC report was calculated in December 2001 by the Planning Department with the help of Development Boards and other line departments. Planning Department over the years is coordinating with concerned line departments for utilising the allocated funds for the clearance of physical backlog. Planning Department is also a nodal department and allocating funds to the Development Boards for special fund schemes.

The Chairman, State Planning Board is an ex-officio member of the three Development Boards and gives his expert opinion in the Board meetings. Planning Department had been entrusted with the task of approval of the projects exceeding Rs. 25,000 under special fund of the Development Boards. Planning Department had prepared guidelines in consultation with Governor's office for approval of the projects under special fund. Planning Department could not foresee the role played by the non-budgetable non-divisible funds in the accumulation of fresh backlog in Vidarbha and Marathwada board regions. On the advise of the Governor, Planning Department with the help of Finance Department is

publishing scheme/ project wise non-divisible and divisible pool of funds in the three regions since 1997-98. Planning Department should bring out year wise physical and financial progress of IBC report and should effectively coordinate with line departments to implement the Governor's directives for the removal of identified backlog by 2005-06.

5.15 Summary

The Development Boards were entrusted with: (a) making a fresh assessment of the relative levels of development of socio-economic infrastructure in the three regions; (b) analysing of the use of budgetary resources in eliminating the backlogs identified by FFC (1984); and (c) examining the adequacy of the strategy being adopted by the government to eliminate regional imbalances. This Chapter is concerned with the assessment of performance of the Boards with reference to these. The findings are summarized below.

- The Boards articulated the problem of regional imbalance and highlighted the relevant methodological issues that have a bearing on the assessment of the relative levels of development, computation of backlog funds and regional shares as also the limitation of the current development strategy in addressing the issue of regional imbalance in Maharashtra. Their initiative led to the formation of the Indicator and Backlog Committee (IBC) for re-examination of the relative levels of development in identified sectors, the current backlog position and the strategy being followed by the government for elimination of regional imbalance in infrastructure development.
- The IBC examined the flow of backlog funds (ref. FFC) to the three regions for the period 1985-1994 and observed the following:
 - The allocation and expenditure were not in accordance with the pattern implied in the FFC report (1984). The RoM got a larger share than their entitlement, while the other two regions got less.
 - The inappropriate methodology adopted by the FFC for computation of backlogs in "irrigation" had favoured the RoM region in terms of more resource allocation, while the other two regions suffered.
- A re-examination of the latest backlog positions (by IBC, 1994) revealed that the regional imbalance in the availability of socio-economic infrastructure in some sectors, particularly irrigation and roads, has worsened even though about Rs. 3156 crore was spent during 1985-1994.

- It was pointed out that even if the budgetary resources (as per FFC) were allocated properly for backlog removal, the regional imbalance would not have been eliminated because of the following reasons:
 - only about 10% of the annual budgetary (plan) resources was being used for backlog removal, while the allocation of the remaining 90% of budgetary resources was not governed by the principle of balanced regional development;
 - the extra budgetary resources which constituted about 26.6% of total plan resources during 1996 to 2001 were also not subject to the principle of balanced development across regions.
- The Boards articulated the basic contradiction in the planning process. They observed that while, on the one hand, iniquitous distribution of the greater part of the plan funds was (not flowing equitably across regions and) accentuating the problem of regional disparity, a negligible proportion (10% of only budgetary resources) was being used to address the infrastructure backlog (as per FFC, 1984) on the other. In other words, the root of regional imbalance lied in the planning process itself.

Thus, the Development Boards have been very effective in discharging the functions entrusted to them. In particular, the following achievements are worth mentioning:-

- Articulation of development issues and detecting inadequacies of the planning process;
- monitoring of flow of funds and regional imbalances and seeking the intervention of the office of the Governor for redressal;
- influencing the planning process to evolve appropriate and just principles of allocation of resources across regions.

All this tends to suggest that the performance of the Development Boards has been satisfactory. In fact, the changes that have taken place in the planning process in Maharashtra are unique and this model of addressing regional imbalances and the resultant socio-political tensions is worth emulating. This is not meant to suggest that all positive changes were due to the Boards alone, nor is it implied that all the actions of the Boards were always prudent and justified. The Governor's office and State Legislature also played a significant role in this process. In particular, the role of played by the office of the Governor as an arbiter and in directing the activities of the Boards toward constructive purposes has been the most critical input to this model. The divergence of interests across regions and resolution of disputes through democratic institutions have offered

important lessons to the planners, policy makers and the Development Boards themselves. The process has brought to fore the limitations of the methodology of balanced regional development through balanced infrastructure development in the public sector. This approach, if stretched too far, may defy the logic of economics of investment decisions.

Chapter VI

Routine Functions of the Development Boards -An Assessment

The Development Boards, Governor and the Planning Department were assigned specific responsibilities for removing regional imbalances and ensuring balanced regional development. Two important functions of the Development Boards regarding ascertaining the relative levels of development and the suggestions regarding the development expenditure were dealt in the previous two chapters. These functions were discharged either in response to special responsibilities assigned to them by the Governor, or in an indirect manner through suggestions, resolutions and memorandums in the meetings, and presentations to the Governor. Development Boards were also assigned other important regular functions like (i) assessing the impact of various development efforts in removing backlog and in achieving overall development, (ii) to prepare annual reports of their activities to be placed in the State Legislature (iii) special fund utilization for the development of their region and other activities for the planning and development of their region and State. This chapter deals in detail these functions and the role played by the Development Boards for the overall development of their region.

6.1 Special Fund

The Governor has been allocating Rs. 100 crore since 1995-96 among the three Development Boards for small but useful work of development nature. These allocations have been made in the same proportion as the funds for the removal of backlog in the three regions. The allocated funds of the particular Development Board can not be diverted from one Board to another. Region-wise allocation and expenditure of Special Fund is presented in Table 6.1. It is observed that, from 1995-96 up to 2000-01 the proportion of allocation remained the same and from 2001-02, this has been changed to the proportion of the remaining backlog of the respective regions as on 1st April, 2001.

In Vidarbha region, about 93-94% of the allocations have been budgeted during 1995-96 to 2000-01 and during the same period about 84% of the budgeted amount has been spent. For Marathwada, the allocation budgeted during the period from 1996-97 to 2000-01 varies from 97% to 100% and about 95 to 99% of the budgeted amount has been spent. For the Rest of Maharashtra region, the budgetary position during the years 1996-97 to 1998-99 and 2000-01 is quite good. However, for the year 1999-2000 about 88% of the allocations only has been budgeted. Expenditure of budgeted amount varies from 95% to 100%. As Special Funds have been proved very useful, Governor's office has repeatedly written to the Development Boards to ensure that the Special Funds are fully budgeted

and spent. However, Rs. 2 to 3 crore have lapsed in all the three regions every year.

Table 6.1

Statement showing Allocation, Budgeted and Expenditure incurred out of Special Funds in three Board Regions

(Rs. In lakh)

Year	Vidarbha			Marathwada			Rest of Maharashtra			Total		
	Allocation	Budgeted	Expenditure	Allocation	Budgeted	Expenditure	Allocation	Budgeted	Expenditure	Allocation	Budgeted	Expenditure
1995-96	4386	4055.32 (92.46)	3963.82 (97.74)	2728	1861.75 (68.25)	1861.75 (100)	2886	1712.38 (59.13)	1712.38 (100)	10000	7629.45 (76.30)	7537.95 (98.80)
1996-97	4386	4084.8 (93.13)	3434.14 (84.07)	2728	2728 (100)	2481.5 (90.96)	2886	2790.32 (96.68)	2790.32 (100)	10000	9603.12 (96.03)	8705.96 (90.66)
1997-98	4386	4385.72 (99.99)	4252.14 (96.95)	2728	2693.15 (98.72)	2674.19 (99.30)	2886	2845.34 (98.59)	2683.89 (94.33)	10000	9924.21 (99.24)	9610.22 (96.84)
1998-99	4386	4356 (99.32)	4356 (100)	2728	2727.98 (99.99)	2620.42 (96.06)	2886	2882.82 (99.89)	2817.82 (97.75)	10000	9966.8 (99.67)	9794.24 (98.27)
1999-2000	4386	4383.29 (99.94)	4026.87 (91.87)	2728	2581.26 (94.62)	2521.76 (97.69)	2886	2549.76 (88.35)	2311.47 (90.65)	10000	9514.31 (95.14)	8860.1 (93.12)
2000-2001	4386	4252.21 (96.95)	4240.11 (99.72)	2728	2660.67 (97.53)	2579.83 (96.96)	2886	2847.19 (98.66)	2688.23 (94.42)	10000	9760.07 (97.60)	9508.17 (97.42)
2001-2002	5006	-	4389.1	2852	-	2305.88	2142	-	1306.18	10000	-	8001.16

Note: Figures in brackets in Budgeted column indicate percentage of outlay budgeted to outlay allocated and Figures in brackets in expenditure column indicate percentage of expenditure to outlay budgeted.

Source: Annual Reports of three Boards.

The proposals submitted by the Development boards are first approved by the concerned department and then sent to the Planning Department for approval of outlay, after which the proposals are sent to Finance Department for budgeting. However, in case, Finance Department does not accept a proposal it does not convey its rejection to the Planning Department and consequently neither the concerned Administrative Department nor the Boards are aware till the end of the year about this. As a result, the amount remains non-budgeted. The Governor's office had written in October 2000 to the Finance Department and the Planning Department to evolve suitable mechanism whereby alternate proposals are sent in time to the Finance Department in case some proposals are rejected so as to ensure that the sanctioned outlay for each Board is fully budgeted.

In view of this, the Planning Department had prepared suitable guidelines for utilization and release of the Special Fund allocated to the Boards. The Planning Department has proposed en-bloc budgeting of

Special Fund to avoid a need for budgeting each and every work at Mantralaya level. In the proposed guidelines, it has been suggested that the power of issuing administrative sanction and release of the funds to the implementing agencies will be given to Divisional Commissioners for all works with estimate less than Rs. 25 lakh. It also covers broad guidelines about the work which may be considered under the Special Fund. The Governor's office has written to the planning Department that while preparing the proposed guidelines for giving administrative sanction to the works undertaken from the Special Fund the existing procedures should not be changed. The Governor's office has also asked the Planning Department to examine the feasibility of delegation of powers of giving administrative sanction to the Development Boards itself in case of the works costing less than Rs. 20 lakhs and submit its views.

On the advise of the Governor's office, the Planning Department had written in December, 2000 to Divisional Commissioners and all district Collectors that in the review meetings of District Planning Committees held by District Collectors to include the item of follow-up and review of expenditure of outlays budgeted out of Special Funds for the removal of backlog as a permanent agenda item. These review meetings would be useful in ensuring full spending of outlays budgeted out of Special Fund and outlays for removal of backlog. The Planning Department on the advise of the Governor has issued orders on 18th January 2001 assigning the responsibility of implementation and review of works under the Special Fund and funds for backlog removal to a senior level officer of the rank of Additional Chief Secretary/Principal Secretary. This will help in sorting out the difficulties experienced by the Boards in follow-up and implementation of works undertaken from Special Fund and funds for backlog removal.

6.1.1 District-wise Allocation of Special Fund

District wise allocation of funds shows that, in the case of Vidarbha Development Board, the districts of Gadchiroli (3.7%) and Wardha (5.7%) have received low share of special fund whereas Nagpur (25.3%) and Amravati (27.4%) have received a large share of Special Fund (Table 6.2). In the case of Marathwada region, Latur (8.6%) and Osmanabad (7.4%) have received low share of Special Fund whereas Parbhani (33.1%) has received a large share of Special Fund (Table 6.3). In the case of the Rest of Maharashtra, the districts of Sangli (4.41%) Ahmednagar (3.72%) and Dhule (2.96%) have received low share of Special Fund whereas Pune district has received 14.55% share of special fund (Table 6.4).

Table No: 6.2

**District - wise and year - wise break - up of budgeted outlays from Special Fund
in Vidarbha Development Board**

(Rs. In lakh)

Sl. No.	District	Year					Total
		1995-96	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99	1999-00	
1.	Nagpur	2341.75 (57.70)	731.11 (20.00)	540.07 (12.30)	657.56 (15.11)	972.71 (22.60)	5243.2 (25.30)
2.	Wardha	58.87 (1.50)	169.26 (4.60)	162.11 (3.70)	356.16 (8.20)	444.03 (10.30)	1190.43 (5.70)
3.	Bhandara	275.38 (6.80)	276.12 (7.60)	271.37 (6.20)	224.67 (5.20)	235 (5.50)	1282.54 (6.20)
4.	Chandrapur	194.09 (4.80)	215.26 (5.90)	228.52 (5.20)	390.51 (8.90)	225.38 (5.20)	1253.76 (6.00)
5.	Gadchiroli	128.99 (93.20)	89.65 (2.50)	207 (4.70)	172.26 (3.9)	165 (3.80)	762.9 (3.70)
6.	Amaravati	541.32 (13.30)	1049.75 (28.80)	1403.97 (32.00)	1260.55 (28.90)	1438.88 (33.40)	5694.47 (27.44)
7.	Akola & Washim	194.47 (4.80)	595.58 (16.30)	1005.27 (22.90)	557.9 (12.80)	467.74 (10.80)	2820.96 (13.60)
8.	Yavatmal	128.3 (3.20)	270.85 (7.40)	205.48 (4.70)	489.59 (11.20)	196.16 (4.60)	1290.38 (6.20)
9.	Buldhana	192.45 (4.70)	249.37 (6.80)	361.83 (8.30)	241.8 (5.60)	163.45 (3.80)	1208.9 (5.83)
Total		4055.62	3646.95	4385.62	4351	4308.35	20747.54

(Figures in bracket indicate percentage of outlay budgeted in each district to total outlay budgeted).

Source: Annual Reports, Vidarbha Development Board.

Table 6.3

**District -wise and year -wise break -up of budgeted outlays from Special Fund in Marathwada
Development Board**

(Rs. in lakh)

Sl. No.	District	Year					Total
		1995-96	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99	1999-00	
1	Aurangabad	486.82 (26.15)	248.58 (10.22)	477.19 (17.72)	431.01 (15.80)	334.94 (12.97)	1978.54 (16.09)
2	Jalana	105.37 (5.66)	568.26 (23.36)	292.55 (10.86)	207.08 (7.59)	280.73 (10.88)	1453.99 (11.82)
3	Beed	271.27 (14.57)	192.44 (7.91)	153.3 (5.77)	351.32 (12.88)	271.23 (10.50)	1241.56 (10.10)
4	Parbhani	269.37 (14.47)	800.42 (32.90)	1259.65 (46.77)	1118.45 (41.00)	718.02 (27.82)	4165.91 (33.88)
5	Nanded	374.94 (20.14)	361.15 (14.84)	195.9 (7.27)	239.74 (8.79)	262.86 (10.18)	1434.59 (11.67)
6	Osmanabad	142.87 (7.67)	62.6 (2.57)	128.16 (4.76)	193.39 (7.10)	405.55 (15.71)	932.57 (7.58)
7	Latur	211.11 (11.34)	199.55 (8.20)	184.4 (6.85)	186.99 (6.85)	307.93 (11.93)	1089.98 (8.86)
Total		1861.75	2433	2693.15	2727.98	2581.26	12297.14

(Figures in bracket indicate percentage of outlays budgeted in each district to total outlay budgeted).

Source: Annual Reports, Marathwada Development Board.

Table 6.4

District -wise and year -wise break -up of budgeted outlays from Special Fund in Rest of Maharashtra Development Board

(Rs. in lakh)

Sl. No.	District	Year					Total
		1995-96	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99	1999-00	
1.	Mumbai	0	5.42 (0.22)	136.64 (5.09)	53.88 (1.93)	69.2 (2.60)	265.14 (2.16)
2.	Thane	25.39 (1.48)	154.1 (6.3)	191.07 (7.12)	293.7 (10.49)	8.8 (0.33)	673.06 (5.49)
3.	Raigad	197.14 (11.50)	257.2 (10.60)	317.59 (11.83)	385.61 (13.78)	255 (9.60)	1412.54 (11.52)
4.	Ratnagiri	415.4 (24.26)	185.4 (7.6)	520.29 (19.38)	295.29 (10.55)	465 (17.50)	1881.38 (15.34)
5.	Sindhudurg	450 (26.28)	233.7 (9.7)	372.7 (13.88)	38.61 (1.38)	225 (8.47)	1320.01 (10.76)
6.	Nashik	30 (1.75)	295 (12.21)	25.3 (0.94)	65.7 (2.34)	23.8 (0.89)	439.8 (3.58)
7.	Dhule	11.3 (0.66)	122.3 (5.06)	33.27 (1.24)	59.01 (2.10)	137.36 (5.17)	363.24 (2.96)
8.	Nandurbar	0	0	0	0	23.8 (0.89)	23.8 (0.19)
9.	Jalgaon	104.3 (6.00)	180.9 (7.49)	238.33 (8.80)	138.07 (4.9)	73 (2.75)	734.6 (5.98)
10.	Ahmednagar	30 (1.75)	131.9 (5.46)	62.42 (2.32)	199.21 (7.10)	33 (1.24)	456.53 (3.72)
11.	Pune	215.1 (12.56)	253.54 (10.49)	115.57 (4.3)	647.34 (23.00)	553.8 (20.86)	1785.35 (14.55)
12.	Satara	75 (4.38)	259.76 (10.75)	254.29 (9.47)	149.25 (5.30)	178 (6.70)	916.3 (7.47)
13.	Sangli	134 (7.8)	16.8 (0.68)	183.29 (6.80)	111.49 (3.98)	15 (0.56)	540.58 (4.41)
14.	Solapur	0	100.1 (4.14)	53.8 (2.00)	125.51 (4.49)	360 (13.50)	639.41 (5.21)
15.	Kolhapur	24.75 (1.44)	139.2 (5.70)	179.46 (6.69)	235.11 (8.40)	234 (8.00)	812.52 (6.63)
	Total	1712.38	2415.32	2683.89	2797.78	2654.76	12264.13

(Figures in bracket indicate percentage of outlay budgeted in each district to total outlay budgeted).

Source: Annual Reports, Rest of Maharashtra Board.

The pattern of expenditure by the three Development Boards indicate that, a large chunk of the outlay is concentrated in one or two districts of the region and the outlays allocated to the other districts is abysmally low. In this regard, the Governor's office had written to the three Development Boards in September, 2000 that they should ensure that allocation of the

Special Fund is not concentrated in one or two districts alone in the region. The Governor's office has also asked the Development Boards to evolve some guidelines for utilization of special fund and communicate the same to his office.

6.1.2 Sector wise Utilization of Special Fund

The statement showing sector-wise utilization of Special Fund for the year 1995-96 to 1999-2000 by the three Development Boards are given in Tables 6.5, 6.6 and 6.7. Table 6.5 reveals that Vidarbha Development Board has been allocating substantial amount of Special Fund to the roads sector. Over the years, the percentage of allocation for roads sector has been increasing and is about 50% in 1999-2000. The sectors like water supply and sanitation, co-operation and textiles have been receiving priority in allocation. However, the social sectors like public health, social welfare and women and child welfare have received lower priority.

In the case of Marathwada Development Board, the sectors of water conservation and roads accounts for nearly 60% of the allocation of the Special Fund (Table 6.6). Grants to the Municipal Bodies had received higher priority. However, agriculture, public health and women and child welfare was given lower priority while allocating the Special Fund. The Development Board for the Rest of Maharashtra has been attaching highest priority to the roads sector during all the years. About 50% of the allocations have been given to the roads sector. Social welfare, school education and health sectors have been given lower priority. However, sectors like agriculture, medical education and irrigation have been given higher priority (Table 6.7).

Table 6.5

Statement showing sector wise budgeted outlay out of Special fund for the years
1995-96 to 1999-2000 for Vidarbha Development Board

(Rs. In lakh)						
Sl. No.	Department /Sector	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99	1999-00
1.	Agriculture, Animal Husbandry & Dairy Development	371 (9.15)	228.14 (5.59)	576.48 (13.14)	231.73 (5.32)	172.81 (4.02)
2.	Rural Development & Water Conservation	375 (9.25)	363 (8.89)	630 (14.36)	-	247.79 (5.76)
3.	Irrigation and Flood Control	550 (13.56)	1082.25 (26.49)	100 (2.28)	600 (13.77)	250 (5.82)
4.	Public Works (PWD)	1340 (33.04)	893.8 (21.88)	1218.36 (27.78)	1375.98 (31.59)	1844.16 (42.90)
5.	Higher & Technical Education	236 (5.82)	167 (4.09)	293.29 (6.69)	-	14.82 (0.34)
6.	Medical Education & Drugs	700 (17.26)	15.79 (0.39)	50 (1.14)	-	120 (2.79)
7.	Public Health	228 (5.62)	410.77 (10.06)	78 (1.78)	135 (3.10)	7.07 (0.16)
8.	Water Supply & Sanitation	5.32 (0.13)	320.5 (7.85)	-	15 (0.34)	415 (9.65)
9.	Urban Development	250 (6.16)	313.36 (7.67)	759.81 (17.32)	705 (16.18)	280.4 (6.52)
10.	School Education	-	270.99 (6.63)	180 (4.10)	650.79 (14.94)	-
11.	Social Welfare	-	-	10 (0.23)	5 (0.11)	2.25 (0.05)
12.	General Administration	-	-	9.78 (0.22)	-	61.4 (1.43)
13.	Home & Tourism	-	19.2 (0.47%)	30 (0.68)	42.5 (0.98)	-
14.	Co-operation & Textile	-	-	450 (10.26)	510 (11.70)	625 (14.54)
15.	Revenue & Forests	-	-	-	80 (1.84)	-
16.	Sports & Cultural Affairs	-	-	-	-	19.69 (0.46)
17.	Women & Child Welfare	-	-	-	-	-
18.	Trade & Commerce	-	-	-	5 (0.11)	238 (5.54)
19.	Tribal Development	-	-	-	-	-
Total		4055.32 (100.00)	4084.8 (100.00)	4385.72 (100.00)	4356 (100.00)	4298.39 (100.00)

(Figures in brackets indicate percentage to total)

Source : Annual Reports, Vidarbha Development Board.

Table 6.6

Statement showing sector wise budgeted outlay out of Special fund for the years
1995-96 to 1999-2000 for Marathwada Development Board

(Rs. In Lakh)

Sl. No.	Department	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99	1999-00
1.	Agriculture, Husbandry & Animal Dairy Development	288.03 (15.47%)	1.00 (0.04%)	390.46 (14.50%)	773.49 (28.35%)	32.76 (1.27%)
2.	Rural Development & Water Conservation	736.57 (39.56%)	155.00 (5.68%)	543.41 (20.18%)	768.78 (28.18%)	1350.85 (52.36%)
3.	Irrigation and Flood Control	-	901.92 (33.06%)	889.68 (33.03%)	300.00 (11%)	-
4.	Public Works (PWD)	280.15 (15.05%)	695.6 (25.49%)	132.00 (4.90%)	50.00 (1.83%)	285.25 (11.05%)
5.	Higher & Technical Education	169.00 (9.08%)	110.55 (4.05%)	112.85 (4.19%)	120.00 (4.40%)	95.93 (3.72%)
6.	Medical Education & Drugs	300.00 (16.11%)	-	74.81 (2.77%)	74.27 (2.72%)	43.42 (1.68%)
7.	Public Health	-	-	-	78.00 (2.86%)	-
8.	Water Supply & Sanitation	-	385.40 (14.13%)	-	146.00 (5.35%)	-
9.	Urban Development	-	189.22 (6.94%)	257.16 (9.55%)	-	409.65 (15.87%)
10.	School Education	-	219.90 (8.06%)	175.50 (6.52%)	220.86 (8.09%)	252.00 (9.76%)
11.	General Administration	-	51.00 (1.87%)	59.98 (2.23%)	105.00 (3.85%)	90.00 (3.49%)
12.	Home & Tourism	-	-	-	-	-
13.	Co-operation & Textile	-	-	-	41.58 (1.52%)	19.30 (0.75%)
14.	Revenue & Forests	-	-	50.00 (1.86%)	50.00 (1.83%)	2.50 (0.10%)
15.	Industry, Energy & Labour	88.00 (4.73%)	18.41 (0.67%)	7.30 (0.27%)	-	-
	TOTAL:	1861.75 (100%)	2728.00 (100%)	2693.15 (100%)	2727.98 (100%)	2581.66 (100%)

(Figures in brackets indicate percentage of allocation of the sector to the total budgeted allocation.)

Source: Annual Reports, Marathwada Development Board.

Table: 6.7

Statement showing sector-wise budgeted outlay out of Special Fund for the years 1995-96 to 1999-2000 for Rest of Maharashtra Development Board

(Rs. in Lakh)						
S.No.	Department/Sector	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99	1999-00
1.	Agriculture, Animal Husbandry & Dairy Development	-	-	147.00 (5.23%)	312.36 (11.56%)	349.00 (13.66%)
2.	Rural Development & Water Conservation	-	-	155.65 (5.53)	127.00 (4.69%)	65.80 (2.58%)
3.	Irrigation and Flood Control	715.46 (41.79%)	-	-	-	335.00 (13.11%)
4.	Public Works (PWD)	941.00 (54.95%)	1250.00 (53.77%)	1912.00 (67.98%)	844.00 (31.22%)	1221.00 (47.79%)
5.	Higher & Technical Education	9.48 (0.55%)	320.00 (13.77%)	320.84 (11.41%)	317.86 (11.76%)	20.00 (0.78%)
6.	Medical Education & Drugs	-	105.42 (4.54%)	23.51 (0.84%)	127.51 (4.72%)	369.13 (14.45%)
7.	Public Health	46.44 (2.71%)	147.00 (6.32%)	135.8 (4.83%)	45.00 (1.66%)	-
8.	Water Supply & Sanitation	-	-	-	153.98 (5.70%)	-
9.	Urban Development	-	-	52.00 (1.85%)	133.26 (4.93%)	-
10.	School Education	-	502.00 (21.60%)	65.60 (2.33%)	306.03 (11.32%)	-
11.	General Administration	-	-	-	205.00 (7.58%)	-
12.	Home & Tourism	-	-	-	46.00 (1.70%)	109.63 (4.29%)
13.	Co-operation & Textile	-	-	-	-	-
14.	Revenue & Forests	-	-	-	-	-
15.	Sports & Cultural Affairs	-	-	-	39.80 (1.47%)	50.00 (1.96%)
16.	Women & Child Welfare	-	-	-	45.69 (1.69%)	-
17.	Tribal Development	-	-	-	-	35.20 (1.38%)
	TOTAL:	1712.38 (100%)	2324.42 (100%)	2812.40 (100%)	2703.09 (100%)	2554.76 (100%)

(Figures in brackets indicate percentage of allocation of the sector to the total budgeted allocation.)

Source : Annual Reports, Rest of Maharashtra Board.

The Vidarbha Development Board has helped to set-up the Super Specially Hospital at Nagpur as well as the Orange Processing Plant at Morshi and Katol. The Board had also utilized the money on projects which though considered important by the Government had not received adequate funding over the years. These include the Ambanala development work in Amravati, soil and water conservation works in the Melghat region and

construction of school rooms. Besides, some innovative schemes like setting up of Agro Poly Clinics and the desalination programme in the villages of the Puma Valley have also been taken up. The Vidarbha Development Board has given substantial financial assistance to the literacy programme of the government.

The Marathwada Development Board has taken up construction of school rooms on a very large scale. Looking at the meager funds (Rs.10.07 crore) allocated by the government in 1998-99 the Marathwada Development Board supplemented this effort by assigning Rs.590.40 lakhs towards construction of school rooms. The Marathwada Development Board has also successfully intervened in the Dairy Development Programme. From 1995-96 to 1998-99 it has provided Rs.414.02 lakhs for establishment and/ or expansion of chilling centers at Kada, Latur, Bhoom, Aurangabad, Osmanabad, Vijaopur, Nilanga, Nanded and Beed. It has also helped in starting the Government Milk Scheme at Latur. Per day milk collection in Marathwada is 4,40,000 liters whereas the chilling plants can handle only 1,84,000 litres per day. Intervention by the Board will help bridge this gap. The Marathwada Development Board has also fruitfully utilized the money in strengthening the medical infrastructure of the region. The CT Scan provided to the Government Medical College at the cost of Rs. 300 lakhs will help the poor patients immensely as the CT Scan rates have been fixed at Rs.500 to Rs.700 only. Besides these, irrigation projects, road and conservation, literacy programme, etc. has been taken up.

The Rest of Maharashtra Development Board has identified education and agriculture as its priority area and has since 1995-96 financed construction of school rooms. It has installed computers in various educational institutes. It has helped set up the Banana Tissue Culture Centre in the North Maharashtra University at Jalgaon. In the agriculture sector the Board has helped set up Agro Information Centres at Shirdi and Pandharpur, Agro Poly Clinics and Floriculture unit at Pune and Tissue Culture Center at Rahuri. The Board has consistently supported projects which preserve and protect the cultural heritage of the people, e.g. Rankala Talao at Kolhapur and Raigad Fort. In the infrastructure sector the Board has extensively taken up roads and causeway bridges in Konkan area. The Board with the help of Bhartiya Vidya Bhawan started a mobile exhibition showing a series of 100 odd scientific experiments to be shown to school children in rural and especially the tribal areas.

A review of the schemes recommended by the Development Boards as culled out from their respective Annual Reports also reveals that the Special Funds are being provided for some non-backlog or non-developmental schemes also like (i) Creation of Chair in the name of Pt. Bhimsen Joshi (Rest of Maharashtra). (ii) Modernisation of Prison facilities/Administration (Vidarbha, Marathwada and Rest of Maharashtra). Further, the schemes are being recommended without any prioritization of sectors for clearance of regional backlog out of the Special Fund. There are several schemes, recommended by the Development Boards, which appear developmental and

related to clearance of backlog but not approved by the Planning Department. Some of these schemes are: Minor Project – (District Thane), Konkan (Rest of Maharashtra, 1995-96), Major project (District Nashik, Rest of Maharashtra 1995-96), expansion of Water Supply scheme of Idapur Municipal Council (Rest of Maharashtra, 1996-97), Higher & Technical Education (RoM 1996-97)

It has been seen that there are also schemes, which have been recommended by the Planning Department and not by the Development Boards. For instance, the Minor Project-New Mandan, District Ratnagiri in Rest of Maharashtra in 1995-96. Details in respect of most schemes with respect to Planning Department or outlays budgeted by the Finance Department have been shown as not available in the Annual Reports of the Development Boards.

6.1.3. Perspective Plan for Utilization of Special Fund

In the meeting of Governor with the Chairman of three Development Boards held at Raj Bhavan on 8 February, 2000, the Development Boards were asked to prepare a perspective plan for utilization of Special Fund for the next 3 years with emphasis on social sectors like health, education, women and child welfare where the benefits directly reach the people in their region.

For the year 2000-2001, the Vidarbha Development Board had sent proposals of Rs. 10.56 crore to the Government for the schemes under the sectors of education, health, social welfare out of the Special Fund of Rs. 48.86 crore available with the Board. The Vidarbha Development Board has proposed Rs.10 crore each for the years 2001-2002 and 2002-2003 for sectors of education, health and social welfare. The Board has communicated to various regional offices to suggest the schemes in these sectors to be undertaken under special fund. However, the Member Secretary has mentioned that there is no active response from the concerned administrative departments.

The Marathwada Development Board has proposed to allocate about Rs. 9.40 crore to social sectors like women and child development, agriculture, animal husbandry, public health and education out of special fund of Rs. 27.28 crore. Rs. 3 crore has been proposed to be allocated for construction of roads. The Rest of Maharashtra Development Board has decided to allocate Rs. 11.30 crore out of their Special Fund every year in the plan 2001-04, for fisheries (2 crore), tribal development (1 crore) women and child development (2 crore) agriculture and animal husbandry (1 crore), public health (2 crore) and general education (3.30 crore).

6.1.4 Procedure Followed for the Works Under Special Fund

The Development Board for the Rest of Maharashtra has brought to the notice of the Governor's office that in 2000-01 there was a scheme for fisheries development in Konkan region which was budgeted out of Special Fund allocated to the Development Board for the Rest of Maharashtra at the instance of the Fisheries Department without having recommendations from the Board.

The Vidarbha Development Board has pointed out that the Cabinet in its meeting dated 18.9.2000 took decision to give Rs. 5 crore every year (Rs. 25 crore in next five years) out of the Special Fund to implement the integrated road development programme for Nagpur city and the Development Board has neither agreed nor was consulted before the decision was taken. The Development Board has communicated to the Government its inability to provide such fund for integrated road development programme for Nagpur city. All the Boards are working towards identifying the schemes to be undertaken under Special Fund in consultation with the concerned departments. The Governor's office has written to the Planning Department that the correct procedure to be followed is that schemes to be financed from the Special Fund should be strictly those approved and recommended by the Development Boards.

In the meeting of the Governor with the Chairman of the three Development Boards on February 8, 2000 the Chairman, Development Board for the Rest of Maharashtra pointed that the information regarding progress of various works undertaken by implementing agencies is not made available to the Development Boards. It was also suggested that the implementing departments should submit completion certificates of the works undertaken from Special Funds after the works are completed so that the Boards know the progress of projects suggested by them from the Special Fund. Governor's office had written to the Planning Department in February 2000 to issue suitable instructions to administrative departments to provide information to the Development Boards on physical progress and expenditure incurred on the works undertaken out of Special Fund.

The Vidarbha Development Board has raised the issue that out of Special Fund, several works are undertaken and executed by the Public Works Department. These works include construction of plan roads, bridges etc. Since 1995-96 to 2000-01 about Rs. 98 crore have been given to the PWD for roads, bridges etc. These are regular departmental works for which provision is being made by the department itself. This provision being less, the Vidarbha Development Board supplemented the provision for early completion of works. On the amount supplemented by the board, centage charges @ 15% are being charged. The Vidarbha Development Board has submitted that the department should be directed not to charge the centage charges for the works taken up from Special Fund.

6.2 Assessing Impact of Various Development Efforts

One of the important function of the Development Boards is to undertake studies for assessing the impact of the various development efforts in removing backlog and achieving overall development within a Board's area, The Governor had directed the Development Boards to identify two or three major areas of importance in their regions and form study groups of experts to come up with report on the impact of the schemes in selected areas of study. Such reports provide a basis for future planning exercise and would also provide useful input to the government for making budget allocations in future. These reports also help to know the exact nature of shortcomings in the implementation of particular programmes/ schemes. The Development Boards have completed/ undertaken the following assessment studies.

6.2.1. Vidarbha Development Board

1. Status and usefulness of urban water supply schemes.
2. Poor performance of students in Nagpur and Amravati region at the HSC exams: reasons and remedial measures.
3. Energisation of agricultural pump sets.
4. Soya-bean cultivation in Melghat –Exploitation of tribal cultivators.
5. Infant mortality in tribal areas: reasons and remedial measures.
6. Industrial backwardness of Vidarbha: reasons and remedial measures.
7. Employment of local persons in industrial sector.
8. Problems of Co-operative Spinning Mills in Vidarbha and measures suggested thereon.

6.2.2. Marathwada Development Board

1. Impact of social forestry programme in Aurangabad district during the decade (1985-95) and strategies for future.
2. Impact of anti-poverty programmes especially IRDP on Parbhani district.
3. Women's self help groups and their role in rural development and female literacy in Osmanabad and Latur districts.
4. Working of Primary Health Centres in Marathwada region.
5. Kolhapur type weirs in Osmanabad district.

6. Watershed Development Programme in Aurangabad district.
7. Problems in Secondary and Higher Secondary Education in Marathwada region.

6.2.3 Rest of Maharashtra Development Board

1. Training programmes of newly elected women members in Panchayats and Municipal Councils.
2. Functions of Ashram shalas.
3. Minor lift irrigation schemes.
4. Training programmes of Dais in ante natal and post natal care.
5. Horticulture Development Programme in the State of Maharashtra with special reference to dry land horticulture.
6. Comparative study of backward talukas in Rest of Maharashtra.

The completed study reports have been forwarded to the concerned administrative departments for appropriate action. Most of these studies have been given to the outside agencies like ORG, Research Institutes and some have been entrusted to the expert members of the Development Board. A perusal of the above studies indicates that, many studies have suggested for taking up the corrective steps in the implementation of the scheme. Such schemes are 1. Soya bean cultivation in Vidarbha 2. Functioning of Ashram Shalas, 3. Minor Lift Irrigation schemes, 4. Training Programmes for Dais in ANC and PNC and 5. Impact of IRDP programme in Parbhani district. While such studies on individual schemes can give the causes for their success and failure but they do not indicate the extent to which the region has improved, the very purpose for which the Development Boards were set up. Instead, the Development Boards may identify certain thrust areas on the basis of evaluations by taking/ assessing the development indicators and give an improved thrust to the planning process. In the meeting of the Governor with the Chairman of the three Development Boards held at Raj Bhawan on February 8, 2000 the Governor advised the Chairmen of the Boards to take up area specific schemes for the new impact assessment studies in consultation with the Secretaries of the respective departments as this will help in providing proper feedback and in effective implementation of the plan scheme.

6.3 Annual Reports and other Development Activities

The Development Boards are required to prepare an annual report on its working at the end of every financial year and send it to the Governor for placing before the State Legislature. So far the Development Boards have

submitted their annual reports for 1995-96 to 2001- 2002 every year promptly. These reports highlighted the number of meetings conducted by the Boards, the projects sanctioned out of Special Fund outlays and budget in this regard, and the suggestions regarding the physical and financial backlog clearance in their regions The reports have been placed before both the Houses of the State Legislature.

In addition the Development Boards are actively involving themselves in.

6.3.1 Awareness Programmes

Organization of awareness generation camps with the help of NGOs and Government agencies at the village /taluka levels. These camps are used to disseminate knowledge on important subjects such as ante and post natal care, nutrition, health and sanitation, literacy, environment etc. in co-operation with the concerned department and elected representatives of the people.

6.3.2 Physical and Financial Backlog Clearance

The Development Boards submit their recommendations indicating the requirement of outlays on the schemes included in the annual plan in the form of a statement to the Governor. The Boards also indicate their priorities in respect of schemes for the removal of backlog which has been dealt earlier in the preceding Chapters.

6.3.3 News Letters

In order to keep people's representatives and the general public informed about the activities, programmes and achievements of the Boards, the Development Boards have started publishing newsletters on a quarterly basis. The Governor's office also publishes a bi-annual newsletter from the Governor's Secretariat highlighting the activities of the Development Boards titled "Vikas Mandal Vritant".

6.3.4 State Planning Process

The involvement of the Development Boards in the State's planning process has been institutionalized. They are involved in the formulation of district plan, State Plan, Special Component Plan and Tribal sub-plan. Members of the Development Boards are being made members of the District Planning Committees of each district. The Chairman of each Development Board have been appointed on the State Planning Board as ex-officio members.

6.3.5 State Literacy Programme

The Development Boards are also actively involved in the State Literacy Programme. The Minister for School Education has welcomed the Governor's suggestion to associate the Boards actively with the literacy campaign. The Boards have provided a useful input to the programme by supplementing the works being done by the State Literacy Council. The State Education Department has made an order appointing Member Secretaries of the three Development Boards as Member of the District Literacy Committee (Zilla Saksharta Samitee).

The Vidarbha Development Board is allocating funds for setting up of literacy at every post-literacy center to provide books and other reading material for neo-literates of their region. It has also prepared the literacy manual in Madiya and Gondia languages which is commonly spoken by the tribals of Gadchiroli district. It has also introduced an incentive scheme for construction of libraries and purchase of books and furniture in 3 villages from each of the 10 districts of Vidarbha for their contribution in Adult literacy. In the next 3 years about 100 libraries are planned to be set up in the villages of Gadchiroli, Washim and Gondia. The Marathwada Development Board is allocating funds for development works in villages (as an incentive) which have actively participated in the literacy programme. The Marathwada Development Board is also setting up library at 200 post literacy centers in Marathwada region. The Development Board for the Rest of Maharashtra is preparing a literacy manual for distribution among the neo-literates and has proposed a price scheme (as an incentive) for the most outstanding village in each taluka/district/division and in the region.

6.3.6 Perspective Plan for the Most Backward Taluka in each Region

In the meeting of the Governor with the Chairman and Members of the three Development Boards held at Raj Bhavan on July 8, 1999 it was decided that the Development Boards should identify and adopt the most backward taluka in their region and work towards its all round development on the lines of the Adarsh Gaon Yojana. The three Development Boards have submitted the Perspective Plans for the Development of the most backward talukas.

The perspective plan for the development of most backward taluka had been prepared in consultation with the District Planning Committee and got approved from the District Planning Committee. The perspective plan was fully integrated into the regular district Plan. Review of the implementation of Perspective Plan for the most backward talukas should also be included as a regular agenda point in the review meetings of District Planning Committees. Accordingly, the Development Board for the Rest of Maharashtra has selected three talukas: Jawahar (Thane district), Akrani (Nadurbar district) and Welhe (Pune district) in the three divisions. The

Marathwada Development Board has selected Jafrabad taluka (Jalna district). The Vidarbha Development Board selected Bhamragad taluka in Gadchiroli district for integrated development.

6.3.7 Involvement in Planning and Monitoring

The Marathwada Development Board has made a suggestion to involve the Development Boards in the draft annual plan of State level schemes of the region which is as follows: "The district planning committees have been entrusted with the role of formulation of plan, review and monitoring of district level plan schemes. Similarly, the draft plan of the State level schemes at the regional level should be submitted to the Government through the Board".

There is no concept of planning at the regional level. It is suggested that the regional officers may also be called at the meeting of the development Boards. It will be a good idea if regional heads of departments are called in the Boards meeting when the exercise of submitting the plan to the State Government is under preparation. By inviting and discussing with the regional heads of departments the priorities of the regions, the regional heads may be impressed upon to consider these priorities while preparing plan of State level schemes by the Boards before the same is submitted to the State Government.

The district level plan schemes are reviewed and monitored by the District Planning Committees. Similarly, the Development Boards should be entrusted with the role of reviewing and monitoring the State level plan schemes. The Planning Department and the Advocate General were of the opinion that the Development Boards could not be entrusted with the role of monitoring and executing the State level plan schemes. In the opinion of the Advocate General, it is the executive government who initiates the schemes has to monitor and execute the same.

The Marathwada Development Board and the Development Board for Rest of Maharashtra have suggested that the planning of all the development schemes should be made at the block/taluka level. This would be a need based plan with fixed priorities. The Development Board for Rest of Maharashtra has suggested that the administrative Departments should prepare the annual plans of the backlog outlays with the concurrence of the development Boards. However, the Planning Department has stated that once the region-wise allocations are made by the Governor, the sector-wise allocations are made by the Planning Department taking into account the remaining backlog in that sector as identified and quantified by the IBC. As the schemes under backlog are fixed there is no scope for consultation with the Development Boards.

6.3.8 Involvement of Development Boards in Sanctioning the Works Under Backlog Removal

A large number of works are sanctioned by concerned administrative departments with due approval from Planning and Finance Departments under the funds for backlog removal. However, the Boards are not consulted and are kept out of the picture while selecting the works. The Development Board for Rest of Maharashtra has submitted that the Boards do not get information as to whether the works selected are from the districts having backlog. As the concerned administrative departments have also not prepared a list of the works under the backlog removal, there is no way for the Boards to ascertain whether works selected are genuinely from the district/area having backlog. Therefore, the process of giving approval to the work under backlog removal should be modified to involve the Department Boards in selection of the work. The concerned administrative departments should submit the list of the works proposed under the backlog removal to the Development Boards. The Development Boards will verify whether the works so selected are genuinely from the districts/area having backlog. This will bring more transparency in selection of the work under backlog removal and also involve the Development Boards.

6.3.9 Setting up of a Separate Department for Backlog Removal

The Vidarbha Development Board has suggested setting up of a separate department for monitoring the backlog removal with the head quarters at Nagpur. However, the Planning Department has mentioned that the present arrangement in the Planning Department for this purpose is sufficient and therefore there is no need for creating a separate department for monitoring the backlog removal process. The Development Boards and the Governor's office may continue to monitor this as in the past and take remedial action when found necessary.

6.3.10 Powers of Administrative Approval for Irrigation Projects

The Vidarbha Development Board has demanded that the Vidarbha Irrigation Development Corporation should be given the powers to give administrative sanction to Irrigation projects on the similar lines of Maharashtra Krishna Valley Development Corporation and Tapi Irrigation Development Corporation. The Governor's office had obtained the views of the Irrigation Department in the matter. The Irrigation Department has submitted that with a view to bringing about parity of administration in the planning and utilization of water, it has been decided by the Cabinet on November 15, 2000 that the power of giving administrative sanction be vested with the State Government instead of the Irrigation Development Corporations. The State Government has therefore amended the Acts by promulgating the Ordinance to this effect.

6.3.11 Constitution of New Indicators and Backlog Committee

The Vidarbha Development Board has suggested that the Indicators and Backlog Committee was constituted in 1995 and submitted its final report in 2000 on relative levels of development of the three regions. The backlog of the three regions in the identified sectors should be re-assessed every five years. The Vidarbha Development Board has suggested constitution of new Indicators and Backlog Committee for re-assessing the backlog as on 2001.

6.3.12 Study on Backlog Seats in Medical Education

Vidarbha Development Board undertook a study to find out the backlog of seats in Under Graduate, Post Graduate Medical Courses and Super Specialty Courses in Medical Education in Vidarbha region. A series of measures for improving the status of Medical Sciences Education in Vidarbha have been recommended in the report.

Governor's office has forwarded a copy of this report to the Medical Education Department in April 2000 to send its views on the report. The Governor has also asked the Marathwada Development Board to consider undertaking a similar study of Medical Sciences Education in Marathwada region which was complied.

Summary

Chapters IV and V were concerned with assessing the role of the Development Boards in planning and policy-making processes. In addition to these substantive responsibilities, the Boards were assigned certain routine functions by the Governor. These are:

- Monitoring the results/outcome of development efforts of the Government on development of regions and on the relative backlog situation. They are also required to suggest priority areas for regional development.
- Preparation of annual reports of their activities to be placed in State Legislature.
- Proper utilization of the "Special Fund" allocated to them for development of respective regions.

This Chapter makes an attempt to assess the performance of the Board with reference to these routine functions. Analysis of available information reveals the following:

- As per Governor's advice, the Boards have identified areas of developmental concern, formed study groups of experts to assess the impact/results of various development initiatives taken up by

the State Government for balanced regional development and suggested measures for improvement/mid-course corrective actions. The Boards have also been periodically bringing out feasibility studies of projects of regional importance.

Till 2001, the Boards brought out 21 reports, consisting of impact assessment studies, opinion survey reports and feasibility studies. They used the services of research institutes to get these studies done. The reports have been forwarded by the office of Governor to the line departments for necessary follow-up actions. Some of the studies have provided useful inputs for mid-course corrections in implementation. However, a participatory approach, as suggested by the Governor is required for identification of areas of research so as to ensure usefulness of research results.

- The Boards have been submitting their annual reports regularly. These reports contain the number of Board meetings held, development projects undertaken out of Special Fund, progress reports on backlog clearance and the like. They are also bringing out newsletters reflecting on various development activities and initiatives of the Boards.
- Each year, allocation to each Board is made out of a Special Fund of Rs. 100 crore proportionately based on their backlog. The Boards are using this Fund for undertaking small development projects in their respective regions. An analysis of the flow of funds across districts within a region reveals that a large part of the fund is being spent in one/two district(s). Each region has identified its priority areas and is spending the fund mostly in those areas/sectors (6.1). Complaints regarding inappropriate use and unequal spatial spread of this fund have surfaced.
- The Boards have taken initiative to conduct awareness generation in the areas of education and health, to fund neo-literates, libraries and studies. The Chairpersons and Members for the Boards have participated in the planning process as members of planning agencies at the State and district levels.

The projects undertaken by the Boards could have been undertaken under normal plan activities or under MPLAD or MLA(LAD) schemes. Thus, it is necessary to issue suitable guidelines for using this Fund by the Boards. Perhaps, it would be appropriate for the Boards to confine the use of this Fund to strengthening their M&E system, undertaking exploratory studies in some areas of socio-economic concern and capacity building of the Boards and District Committees in matters relating to planning and monitoring/ evaluation.

Chapter VII

Performance of the Development Boards –Putting It All Together

The performance of the Development Boards with reference to their assigned responsibilities has been evaluated in Chapters IV through VI. It was noted that the Boards have made substantive contribution to the planning process by highlighting the problems of regional imbalances in the State and suggesting measures for addressing the relevant issues. It was also noted that the Boards were effective in influencing the planning process and in evolving mutually/acceptable principles of resource allocation. The performance of the Boards with reference to their routine functions (Chapter VI) is also found to be satisfactory, though rooms for improvement exist.

It must be borne in mind that these good performances of the Boards with reference to their assigned responsibilities may not necessarily translate into the intended results. The impact of the role played by them will have to be judged eventually on the basis of the changes on the development indicators in the relevant areas of social and economic concern. Have their activities and outputs led to reduction of inter-regional inequality in the indicators of well being, such as: per capita income, literacy and good health?

To answer this question the movement of socio-economic indicators in the relevant areas of concern will have to be studied. However, there are several caveats. First, the Boards are only advisory bodies and the actual decisions about planning, clearance and implementation of projects are taken by the planning and line departments. Thus, their advices and suggestions may not always have been translated into action. Second, the issue of regional imbalance in Maharashtra is concerned primarily with inequality in availability of socio-economic infrastructure facilities, particularly in irrigation and roads. The impact of development of infrastructure in these areas may be felt only in the long-run. The Boards started playing an active role in the planning process since 2000-01, i.e. after the acceptance of the IBC report. Thus, it is too early to expect any perceptible impact on development indicators or well being. Perhaps, one can assess the impact of the activities of the Boards on some intermediate or output indicators, such as road-length, area brought under irrigation, number of institutions and facilities created etc. Third, with the adoption of new development paradigm, the Non-Government Organisations are playing a major role in development activities. The Boards, on the other hand, were confined to removal of inequalities in infrastructure through government investment only. Thus, even if some changes in development indicators are observed, it may not be possible to establish a cause-effect relationship and attribute such observed changes to the Boards.

These caveats notwithstanding, the analysis of available information in chapters IV through VI tends to suggest that the Boards have indeed played a major role in bringing about substantive changes in the planning process. It will be naïve not to expect any impact of such changes on the quality of life of people in the relatively deprived regions of Maharashtra. Thus, the impact of the activities of the Boards will have to be eventually assessed to decide on their continuance and future roles and responsibilities.

In this report it has not been possible to carry out an impact analysis of the activities/functions of the Development Boards for two reasons:

- (a) Many socio-economic and demographic parameters are not subject to major changes in the very short-run. Development indicators in areas of education and health, for example, are slow to respond to policy changes. Thus, impact assessment of Boards' activities should be undertaken, perhaps, after ten years from the date of adoption/implementation of the recommendations of the IBC (say by 2010).
- (b) Though, in principle, the impact of the activities of the Boards can be approximated through some process/outcome indicators, such as enrollment/dropout rates, the proportion of functioning health centers, changes in agricultural productivities, road length per square kilometer etc., this was not done for lack of up to date statistics on these parameters at the region/district level.

In what follows an attempt has been made to put together the contributions of the Boards in one place to enable one to take a holistic view of the performance of the Boards and to decide on the role the Boards should play in the development process of Maharashtra in the future.

7.1 Role of Development Boards

7.1.1 Identification of Regional Disparities by Development Boards

The pre-requisite to developing a suitable development strategy for reducing regional disparities is the assessment of the levels of development of the regions with reference to the relevant socio-economic indicators and identification of the problems to be addressed.

As discussed in the previous three chapters, regional disparities were in existence since a long time before the formation of the three Development Boards in June, 1994. FFC identified the indicators and sectors of development and quantified the regional disparities (physical and financial backlog) in the three Board regions in 1984. However, the contribution of

the Boards goes far beyond the academic exercise of measuring disparities.

- The development issues articulated and highlighted by the Development Boards led to the formation of the IBC in 1995 with experts drawn from the three Development Boards for updating on the relative positions of the three regions, evaluating the escalating disparities between the regions and suggesting remedial action. Nine core development sectors (29 sub sectors) of irrigation, roads, land development, health, energisation of pumsets and others were identified and quantified (physically and financially) and remedial measures were suggested (IBC report, 2000).
- The IBC report Vol.II also dealt with the service and social welfare sectors suggesting policy changes.
- Development Boards were also instrumental in highlighting the increase in disparities, particularly in irrigation sector which constituted the greater part (5.3%) of the backlog amount during the period, 1984- 2002.
- The three Development Board experts were also involved in two other Committees; Higher/Technical and vocational education and Opportunities for employment in services set-up by the Governor for identification of regional imbalances and suggestions for course of action.
- These committees have submitted their reports in 1996 and 1998 respectively and it was found that the situation in employment in Government services is satisfactory between the regions but there are regional imbalances in higher/technical education sectors and there is a need for rectification.
- Even after the submission of the Committee reports, periodically, the three Development Boards have pointed to the Governor and the Planning Department about the mounting regional disparities in specific sectors/sub sectors which needed intervention and remedial measures.
- Though they do not have the requisite administrative machinery, the Boards have monitored the physical and financial clearance of backlog in their regions periodically.

7.1.2 Suggestions by Development Boards for Removal of Regional Disparities

Development Boards were instrumental in identifying the physical and financial regional imbalances between the regions. Methodological problems associated with this were highlighted through their involvement in specific committees and by way of their studies and surveys. They have pointed out

the reasons for the accumulation of regional imbalances in various sectors and suggested appropriate distribution of funds in various sectors due to their vigil and constant monitoring.

- Following the formation of Development Boards, plan funds were being allocated equitably among the three regions by the State Government since 1995-96.
- Vidarbha and Marathwada Development Boards have pointed out that, non-divisible pool of funds (both budgetable and non-budgetable) are being spent mainly in the RoM region so now more transparency has been effected by the Government and all the schemes/projects covered under this account are being published every year by the Finance Department.
- Due to the efforts of VDB and MDB the artificial distinction between backlog and non- backlog funds under irrigation sector has been removed for clearance of Irrigation backlog projects.
- Due to the mounting irrigation backlog pointed out by the Development Boards it is now made mandatory on the Irrigation Department to certify that no fresh backlog will be created by starting a new project or scheme.
- The periodical resolutions and annual reports of the Development Boards have highlighted the inequitable distribution of backlog funds particularly in the irrigation sector and due to their pressure the Governor gave the detailed directives now for the clearance of remaining backlog by 2005- 2006 in all the sectors.

7.1.3 Impact of Special Fund on Regional Development

Special Fund of Rs. 100 crore is being allocated to the three Development Boards every year since 1995 -96 for small and useful work of Development in nature. These funds are allotted in proportion to their shares in backlog and population (43.86% in Vidarbha, 27.28% in Marathwada and 28.86% in RoM) and were utilized by the three boards to a large extent for strengthening social infrastructure facilities in education and health institutions, road development, social welfare and irrigation facilities. As discussed in greater detail in the previous chapter, some weaknesses notwithstanding, these funds have helped in bringing in direct development change and the resultant impact is perceptible in many areas of education, health and social welfare sectors.

- Special Fund money has been spent mostly for the infrastructure development of the educational institutions, hospitals, roads, irrigation, sanitation and public utility services.
- Out of Special Fund, 5 most backward *talukas* have been adopted by the three Development Boards (Jawahar -Thane district, Akrani- Nandurbar

district, Welhe- Pune district, Bhamragad- Gadchiroli district and Jafrabad- Jalna district). About Rs. 2 crore is being spent every year for each *taluka* for an integrated development on several projects as approved by the Planning Department?

- The three Development Boards have also played a catalytic role in generating awareness among the people in their region on literacy, sanitation, health and governance. Special funds have also been utilized in undertaking several impact assessment studies (about 21) by all the three Boards. These studies covered areas of concern in their region on the problems relating to education, health, social welfare, irrigation and industry. These studies have been sent to the concerned line department for remedial action and intervention.
- The three Development Boards are publishing quarterly newsletters in regional language highlighting the activities of the boards and generating awareness among the people.
- The Development Boards members and the Chairpersons of the three Development Boards are ex-officio members of the DPDCs and State Planning Board for the finalisation of the district level and State levels plan schemes.
- The activities of the Boards and the resultant impact since their formation has not been fully felt. However, the constitution of the Development Boards has helped in bringing in awareness and changes in the planning and allocative processes.

7.2 Development Impact on Major Sectors

Development impact of an institution, mechanism or a policy/ project/ scheme can be evaluated based on the premise of cause and effect phenomena of the development interventions and policies. This can be assessed either directly or indirectly through perceived impact on the outcome indicators of the socio-economic infrastructure/profile of the population. The Development Boards came into existence in June 1994 and had specific functions in their advisory role and under- took small developmental works which were evaluated and commented on earlier. The indirect impact due to the Development Boards at least partially can be attributed to the changes in the socio-economic profile of the population. Though other programmes, schemes and governmental agencies and NGOs were also instrumental in bringing about these changes an overview of the pre Development Board position in the region and post Development Board position will reveal the trend of change in the region. However, to assess the direct or indirect impact in the region and on the people of the region, sufficient time period should have elapsed and time series data should be available across the districts of the State. As discussed in the beginning of the chapter, neither of this is the case, so no attempt has been made at

present to assess the impact of the functioning of the three Development Boards on important parameters of progress in various sectors.

However, it is suggested that in the medium-to-long run, it will be a worthwhile effort to assess the impact on demographic (variables like, population increase, density, sex-ratio, urbanization), education (variables like literacy- rural and urban, enrollment and dropout rates, teacher- pupil ratio), health (variables like IMR, MMR, CBR, CDR, number of health centers and institutions, coverage per lakh population, bed strength) and economic variables (like per capita income, agricultural productivity, percentage of land irrigated, cropping pattern and roads length per unit area. This will give an overview of the development impact across the regions, though the issue of attribution (causality) will be hard to resolve.

× × × × ×

ANNEXURES

Nagpur Agreement

1. Now that a high power Commission is being appointed to report on the question of reorganizing and regrouping of the State in India, we, the people residing in the various parts of the Marathi Speaking area, have reached the following conclusions as a basis for the formation of a single State comprising all such areas.
2. This State should be formed of the contiguous Marathi speaking areas of the present Bombay, Madhya Pradesh and the Hyderabad States. There should be no enclaves within the limits and boundaries of this State. It shall be called Maharashtra or Marathi Pradesh and the city of Bombay shall be its capital.
3. The State will comprise of the three units of Maha-Vidarbha, Marathwada and the Rest of the State for the purposes of all types of development and administration.
4. Subject to the requirements of a single Governor the allocation of funds for expenditure over the different units will be in proportion to their population but in view of the undeveloped conditions of Marathwada special attention shall be given to promote the all sided development of that area. A report in this behalf shall be placed before the State Assembly every year.
5. The composition of the Government shall reflect the proportion of the population of the units.
6. Fair and adequate facilities in proportion to that population of these units shall be assured for admission to all educational institutions having training facilities in vocational and scientific professions or other specialized training.
7. The High Court of the new State will have its principle seat at Bombay and a second at Nagpur. The Bench at Nagpur will ordinarily function for the Mahavidarbha area. While making recommendations of High Court Judges it shall be seen that the Mahavidarbha area gets adequate representation in respect of appointments for the services and the bar. This paragraph will also apply to Marathwada area Mutatis Bhutandis.
8. In the matter of services under Government or Government-controlled enterprises- of all grades- recruitment will be in proportion to the population of the respective units.
9. We believe in decentralization as an effective means of better associating the people of the different units with the administration.
10. We realize the long association of the people of Mahavidarbha with Nagpur as a capital of their State and the various advantages consequently derived by them from it. We are anxious that subject to the efficient conduct of administration of a single State these

advantages should be preserved to the extent possible. All steps necessary to implement, this clause will be taken on the advice of experts. The government shall officially shift to Nagpur for a definite period and at least, one session of the State Legislature shall be held every year in Nagpur.

11. The district boundaries shall be adjusted on the basis of latest Census, with village as the unit so as to include all the contiguous Marathi-speaking areas in the New State.

Nagpur

Dated 28.9.53

Sd/-
R.K. Patil

P.K. Deshmukh
Bhau Saheb Hiray
Devikanandan
Yeshwantrao Chavan
Laxmanrao Bhatkar
Pandharinath Patil

Sd/-
Ramrao Deshmukh
Gopalrao Khedkar,
Sheshrao Wankhede
Nana Kunte

371. Special provision with respect to the States of Maharashtra and Gujarat.

- (2) Notwithstanding anything in this Constitution, the President may by order made with respect to (the State of Maharashtra or Gujarat), provide for any special responsibility of the Governor for—
- (a) the establishment of separate Development Boards for Vidarbha, Marathwada and the rest of Maharashtra or, as the case may be, Saurashtra, Kutch and the rest of Gujarat with the provision that a report on the working of each of these boards will be placed each year before the State Legislative Assembly.
 - (b) the equitable allocation of funds for developmental expenditure over the said areas, subject to the requirements of the State as a whole; and

An equitable arrangement providing adequate facilities for technical education and vocational training, and adequate opportunities for employment in services under the control of the State Government, in respect of all the said areas, subject to the requirements of the State as a whole.

Copy of the Notification issued by the Government of India
Government of India
Ministry of Home Affairs
(Gruh Mantralaya)

New Delhi, dated the 9th March, 1994

G.S.R.E. 310 (E) on the March 9th of 1994. The following order made by the President of India is published for general information.

O R D E R

WHEREAS both Houses of the Maharashtra State Legislature passed unanimous resolutions on the 26th July, 1984 requesting the President of India to make an Order in exercise of the powers conferred by Clause (2) of Article 371 of the Constitution of India, for establishment of separate Development Boards for Vidarbha, Marathwada and the Rest of Maharashtra.

AND WHEREAS it is expedient to give effect to the resolution passed by the Maharashtra State Legislature as aforesaid;

NOW THEREFORE, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (2) of Article 371 of the Constitution of India, the President of India hereby makes, with respect to the State of Maharashtra, the following order:-

(1) Short title, commencement and duration:

- (1) This order may be called the State of Maharashtra (Special Responsibility of Governor for Vidarbha, Marathwada and the Rest of Maharashtra) Order, 1994.
 - (2) It shall come into force on the day appointed by the President on this behalf.
 - (3) It shall remain in force for the period of five years from the date it comes into force or upto such date as the President may, by order in this behalf, specify.
- (2) Special Responsibility of Governor:

The Governor of Maharashtra shall have special responsibility for the establishment of separate Development Boards for Vidarbha, Marathwada and the Rest of Maharashtra and for matters specified in sub-clauses (b) and (c) of clause (2) of Article 371 of the Constitution in respect of the area of each such Development Board.

Sd/-
S.D. Sharma
President of India

New Delhi,
Dated the 9th March 1994.
(F.No. 20012/4/90-SR)

Sd/-
(N.V. VOHRA)
Home Secretary

New Delhi,
Dated the 9th March 1994.

Office of the Secretary to the Governor of Maharashtra
Raj Bhavan, Bombay 400 035, dated the 30th April 1994.

O r d e r

No. GS/G/94/DB/432. In exercise of the powers conferred by the State of Maharashtra (Special Responsibility of Governor for Vidarbha, Marathwada and the Rest of Maharashtra) Order, 1994 issued by the President of India under Article 371 of the Constitution, I, P.C. Alexander, Governor of Maharashtra, hereby make the following order, namely: -

Short title and commencement. -

- (1) This order may be called the Development Boards for Vidarbha, Marathwada and the Rest of Maharashtra Order, 1994.
- (2) It shall come into force on such date as the Governor may, by an order in the Official Gazette, appoint.
- (3) It shall remain in force upto and inclusive of such date as the State of Maharashtra (Special Responsibility of Governor for Vidarbha, Marathwada and the Rest of Maharashtra) Order, 1994 remains in force.

2. Establishment of Development Boards- The Governor of Maharashtra shall by order made in this behalf, constitute a separate Development Board, one each for Vidarbha, Marathwada and the Rest of Maharashtra area in the State of Maharashtra. These Boards shall be known respectively, as—

- (a) The Vidarbha Development Board;
- (b) The Marathwada Development Board;
- (c) The Development Board for the Rest of Maharashtra.

3. Areas of Development Boards- The area of the respective Development Boards shall be as specified hereunder:

- (a) The Vidarbha Development Board shall cover the areas of the Nagpur and Amravati Revenue Divisions;
- (b) The Marathwada Development Board shall cover the areas of the Aurangabad Revenue Division;
- (c) The Development Board for the Rest of Maharashtra shall cover the areas of the Konkan, Pune and Nashik Revenue Divisions.

4. Composition of Development Boards-

(1) Each Development Board shall consist of the following members* including the Chairman all of whom shall be appointed by the Governor.

- (a) Two members* of the Maharashtra State Legislature from the area of the respective Development Board;
- (b) One member of local authority from the area of the respective Development Board;
- (c) Five experts* from amongst, who :-
 - (i) have special knowledge of the planning process, finances and accounts of Government; or
 - (ii) have had a wide experience in financial matters and administration; or
 - (iii) have special knowledge in different fields like irrigation, public health, public works, industries, agriculture, education or employment;
- (d) All Commissioners* of Revenue Divisions from the area of respective Development Board;
- (e) An Officer of the State Government not below the rank of an Additional Commissioner of a Revenue Division from the respective Development Board.
- (f) Executive Chairman of the State Planning Board shall be an ex-officio member of all the three Development Boards (amendment made by order No. GS/DS/DB/2001/74 dated 27 March, 2001)

(2) The Officer referred to in sub-clause (e) of clause (1) shall be Member-Secretary of each respective Development Board.

5. The term of office of and allowances payable to Chairman and Members. —

- (1) The term of office of the Chairman and the members shall be such as the Governor may specify while appointing them. Governor may terminate the appointment of any member including the Chairman or reconstitute the Board before the expiry of the term of the member or as the case may be of the Board.
- (2) The members including the Chairman, other than the members referred to in paragraph (c) of sub-clause (1) of clause 4 shall be members, and shall cease to be a member or, as the case may be, the Chairman, as soon as he ceases to belong to the category from which he is appointed as member.
- (3) Any member including the Chairman other than the members referred to in paragraph (d) and (e) of sub-clause (1) of clause 4 may, at any time resign his office by writing under his hand addressed to the Governor and on the

* Amendment made by order No. GS/SS/DB/98/60 dated 29 January, 1998.

date on which his resignation is accepted by the Governor he shall be deemed to have vacated his office.

- (4) The Chairman and members shall be paid such fees and allowances for attending the meetings of the Development Board and for performing any other functions of the Development Board and the members referred to in paragraph (e) of sub-clause (1) of clause 4 shall be paid in addition, such honorarium, as the Governor from time to time, fix.

6. Functions of the Development Board – The Development Board shall, from time to time:

- (a) Ascertain relative levels of development in different sectors in relation to its area on the basis of appropriate indicators, having regard to the levels of development in the State as a whole;
- (b) assess the impact of various development efforts in removing backlog and in achieving over all development within its area;
- (c) suggest the levels of development expenditure over the area of the Development board during a plan period including the annual plan; and
- (d) prepare an annual report on its working and send it, as far as practicable within three months after the end of every financial year, to the Governor for placing it before the Maharashtra State Legislature.

7. Allocation of funds for development expenditure – The Governor of Maharashtra shall ensure equitable allocation of funds for development expenditure over the areas of Development Board, subject to the requirements of the State as a whole.

(2) In ensuring equitable allocation of funds, the Governor may –

- (a) take into consideration the recommendations, if any, made by the Development Board, and
- (b) where he considers it necessary and appropriate, seek advice from any person or body of persons in the matter of the allocation of funds.

8. Allocation of funds to be reflected in annual financial statement - The allocation of funds or outlays made by the Governor shall be reflected in the Annual Financial Statement to be placed before the State Legislature and the development activities with regard to the outlays as aforesaid, shall be carried out or caused to be carried out by the State Government and the funds so allocated shall be non divertible from the area of one Board to that of another Board:

Provided that-

- (a) re-appropriation may be made in conformity with the budgetary rules and procedure on the development activities undertaken as aforesaid within the area of a Board.

- (b) in the implementation of the development activities, the prevailing norms shall be adhered to, and
- (c) the respective administrative departments shall continue to implement and exercise administrative and technical supervision and control over the developmental activities.

9. Directions by the Governor -The Governor may, by order, from time to time give directions to a Development Board in the matter of its functioning.

10. Suitable arrangement for education, training and employment- The Governor shall ensure equitable arrangement providing adequate facilities for technical education and vocational training and for adequate opportunities for employment in services under the control of the State Government in respect as a whole, and for that purpose the Governor shall give suitable directions to the State Government from time to time; and while doing so, the Governor may, where he considers it necessary and appropriate, seek advice from any person or body of persons.

11. Rules -The Governor may, by order, from time to time make such rules; including the rules for the proper transaction of the business in relation to his function under clause (2) of the article 371 of the Constitution and for the effective implementation of the provisions of this order, as he considers necessary.

Raj Bhavan, Malabar Hill,
Bombay -400035

Sd/-
P.C.ALEXANDER,
Governor of Maharashtra

Office of the Secretary to the Governor of Maharashtra
Raj Bhavan, Bombay 400 035, dated the 5th August, 1994

No. GSA/DB/94/990 – In exercise of the powers conferred by clause 11 of the Development Boards for Vidarbha, Marathwada and the Rest of Maharashtra Order, 1994, the Governor of Maharashtra is hereby pleased to make the following rules namely:-

1. Short title – These rules may be called the Development Boards for Vidarbha, Marathwada and the rest of Maharashtra Rules, 1994.
2. Definition - In the rules, under the context otherwise requires-
 - (1) “Area” means the area of the respective Development Boards as specified in clause 3 of the Order;
 - (2) “Board” means the Boards constituted by the Governor under clause 2 of the Order;
 - (3) “Chairman” means Chairman appointed by the Governor on the respective Board;
 - (4) “Governor” means the Governor of Maharashtra State;
 - (5) “Member” means members appointed by the Governor on the Boards;
 - (6) “Order” means the Development Boards for Vidarbha, Marathwada and the Rest of Maharashtra Order, 1994.
3. Headquarters of the Board -The Headquarters of each Board shall be as follows:-

Board	Headquarter
(a) The Vidarbha Development Board	Nagpur
(b) The Marathwada Development Board	Aurangabad
(c)The Development Board for Rest of Maharashtra	Bombay

4. Functions of a Board, Chairman and Member-Secretary.
 - (1) The Chairman shall convene, approve the agenda for, preside over and authenticate the proceedings of all meetings of a Board.
 - (2) The Chairman of a Board may invite any officer (not below the rank of a District Level Officer) of the State Government or Local Authority if deemed necessary, for any of the meetings of the Board or the Committees of the Board.
 - (3) A Board may appoint a Special Subject Committee consisting of any one or more Members to consider and deliberate on any special sector of economic development and such a committee may include subject matter Specialists

or Experts in the subject on which the Committee is appointed. The total Membership of any such Special Committee shall not exceed Five. The Chairman of the Board shall be the Chairman of all such Special committees.

- (4) Tours and travels by the Members of the Board or any Officer of the Board for the purposes of the Board shall be undertaken only with the prior permission of the Chairman of the Board. Provision to sub-rule (4) reads as follows: "Provided that, all tours and travels by the Member-Secretary of the Board, in the capacity as Additional Commissioner shall be undertaken with the prior permission of the concerned Divisional Commissioner, and the expenses thereof shall be debited to the Budget-Head of the Divisional Commissioner's Office" (Provision made by order No GS/DS/DB/2001/39 dated January 23 2001).
- (5) All deliberations, orders, resolutions, recommendations and letters shall be issued under the seal and signature of the Member-Secretary on behalf of the Board.
- (6) The Member-Secretary shall prepare the agenda for the meetings of the Board and will place it before the Board in their meetings with the prior approval of the Chairman.
- (7) The Member-Secretary shall write the minutes of the Board and record the recommendations made and decisions taken by the Board. These records shall be authenticated by the Chairman of a Board in a subsequent meeting.
- (8) The Member-Secretary of the Board shall be responsible for the conduct and maintenance of all correspondence of a Board.
- (9) All Officers and staff of a Board shall work under the control, supervision and guidance of the Member-Secretary.
- (10) The Member-Secretary shall prepare periodical reports including the annual report and annual accounts on the working of the Board and submit the same to the Governor. Such reports may include the items of work that the Board has accomplished, the recommendations made and also the issues included on agenda which were not considered or decisions regarding which were not taken.
- (11) The Member-Secretary of a Board may call for the required information from any Department of the State Government or any officer working under any Department or any Local Authority for the purpose and the use of the Board.

5. Meetings of a Board-

- (1) There shall be an Agenda for each meeting of a Board as approved by the Chairman of the Board.
- (2) The meetings of a Board shall, as far as possible be held at the Head Quarter of the Board and the period of not more than 60 days shall lapse between the two consecutive meetings of the Board. Notice of the meeting of

a Board shall be given by the Member-Secretary to the member not less than 10 days in advance.

- (3) Presence of quorum not less than three members, excluding the Chairman, shall constitute Quorum for each meeting of the Board. For want of Quorum the meeting shall be adjourned and held again without requiring Quorum after an interval of 10 minutes.
- (4) Every meeting of a Board shall be presided over by the Chairman of the Board. In the absence of the Chairman, a Member to be elected by the Members present by consensus shall act as the Chairman in such a meeting.
- (5) Proceedings of the meetings of a Board shall be duly recorded in the permanent register to be maintained by the Member-Secretary.

6. Decisions in the meeting –

- (1) Decisions in the meeting shall be taken by the consensus of the members present and not by taking a vote. In case of any dispute about the consensus decision, the Chairman's decision shall be final.
- (2) The decisions of the Board shall be registered in the form of recommendations and submitted by the Member-Secretary to the Governor with a forwarding letter.
- (3) The Member-Secretary of the Board shall maintain a permanent register of recommendations adopted and submitted to the Governor in chronological order giving serial number to each of the recommendations.

7. Issue of directives and allocation of funds by the Governor –

- (1) In furtherance of and to comply with the functions assigned to a Board in the Order, the Governor may issue directives from time to time. Any such directive issued by the Governor shall be compiled with by a Board.
- (2) The State Government shall submit to the Governor the schedule of preparation of Plans and Budget in advance for his information.
- (3) The Governor shall allocate funds amongst the Boards, after taking into consideration the requirement of the State as a whole and the recommendations of the Board.
- (4) The Planning Department shall indicate to the Governor the approximate amount of total resources likely to be available to the State Government within a month after the end of the Budget Session of the Legislature for the development expenditure during the subsequent year.
- (5) While working out the likely amount for development expenditure for the subsequent year, due consideration shall be given to the

amount required by the State Government for the following items of expenditure which shall be set aside-

- (i) Charged expenditure,
 - (ii) Non-plan expenditure,
 - (iii) Outlay on Centrally Aided Programmes,
 - (iv) Outlay on Centrally Assisted Programmes,
 - (v) Programmes and Projects which benefit the areas extending beyond one Board or the entire State and wherein the investment is indivisible,
 - (vi) Expenditure related to programmes and projects related to investment by either domestic or international private sectors,
 - (vii) Expenditure related to implementation of Inter-State Agreements or Inter-State Awards and Court Decisions.
 - (viii) The funds to be allocated to local bodies in pursuance of Government decisions on the recommendations of the State Finance Commission constituted by the Governor in pursuance to clause (1) of Article 243-I of the Constitution.
 - (ix) Any other item of expenditure which may be deemed fit as requirement of the State as a whole by the Governor.
- (6) If and when there is an occasion to revise the amount of development expenditure as communicated to the Governor, such change shall be intimated to the Governor immediately after the State Government decides on such a revision.
- (7) The Governor may issue directives to the State Government allocating funds to various areas under the different Boards and, further, such directives of the Governor may indicate allocations to each sector or sub-sector as deemed fit by the Governor in sub-rule 7(5) the words "which shall be set aside" have deleted by order No. GS/DS/DB/98/264 dated 5 June, 1998.
- (8) Equitable arrangement for Education, Training and Employment.
- (1) The Technical Education Department shall conduct a bench mark survey and prepare the statistical information on available opportunities in Technical Education and Vocational Training in the areas under each Board. The Governor may then take a view on the levels of development in this sector and also determine the backlog, if any, with reference to average indicators of such opportunities in the State as a whole.

- (2) While considering these opportunities of Technical Education, all the Government Institutions and Government Aided Institutions in the areas shall be taken into consideration.
- (3) The General Administration Department shall prepare the statistical information on opportunities available in employment in service under the control of State Government in the areas under the respective Board. Such information, once prepared on the basis of a predetermined date, shall be revised annually. The information would include posts available for recruitment on account of new posts created or the posts falling vacant due to retirement etc. in that year.
- (4) The Governor may issue directives regarding procedure to be followed and percentage of vacancies to be earmarked for suitable persons from the respective areas against these vacancies.
- (5) While recruiting the candidates as per directives of the Governor the prescribed normal procedure shall be followed by the appointing authorities. Any post available for recruitment thereafter will be filled in by following the normal procedure applicable to such posts under the State Government.

P.C.ALEXANDER
Governor of Maharashtra

Raj Bhavan, Malabar Hill,
Bombay - 400 035.
Dated the 5th August, 1994.

By Order and in the name of the Governor of Maharashtra,

SATISH TRIPATH
Secretary to the Governor

Annexure 3.1

List of the Chairman and Members of Maharashtra Statutory Development Boards for the year 2002-2004

Marathwada Board

1.	Shri Madhukarrao Chavan, M.L.A	Chairman
2.	Dr. Ratnakar Mahajan, Executive Chairman, State Planning Board	Ex-Officio Member
3.	Shri Vinayakrao K.Jadhav, Hon.Minister for State	Member
4.	Shri Sayyad Salim, M.L.A.	Member
5.	Shri Rajkishore Modi	Member
6.	Dr. Shivraj B.Nakade	Expert Member
7.	Shri S.L.Warudkar	Expert Member
8.	Dr. R.P. Kurulkar	Expert Member
9.	Dr. G.G. Nandapurkar	Expert Member
10.	Shri V. Ramani, I.A.S. Divisional Commissioner, Aurangabad	Ex-officio Member
11.	Shri R.D. Jahagirdar	Member Secretary

Vidarbha Board

1.	Shri Harshvardhan Deshmukh, M.L.A	Chairman
2.	Dr. Ratnakar Mahajan Executive Chairman, State Planning Board	Ex-officio Member
3.	Shri Dhrupadrao Sawale	Member (Legislative Assembly)
4.	Shri Nanabhau Patole	Member (Legislative Assembly)
5.	Prof. Tukaram Bidkar	Member (Zilla Parishad)
6.	Adv.Madhukarrao Kimmatkar	Expert Member
7.	Dr. Shrinivas Lokre,	Expert Member
8.	Dr. B.G.Bathkal	Expert Member
9.	Dr. Rani Bang,	Expert Member
10.	Shri J.S. Sahariya, I.A.S Divisional Commissioner	Ex-officio Member
11.	Shri Sumit Mallik, I.A.S. Divisional Commissioner, Amravati	Ex-officio Member
12.	Dr. S.G.Kinkar, I.A.S.	Member-Secretary

Rest of Maharashtra

- | | | |
|-----|---|--------------------|
| 1. | Shri Ulhas Pawar, M.L.A | Chairman |
| 2. | Dr. Ratnakar Mahajan
Executive Chairman, State Planning Board | Ex-officio Member |
| 3. | Shri Hasan Miyalal Mushrif,
M.L.A | Member |
| 4. | Shri Sadashiv Kisan Lokhande,
M.L.A. | Member |
| 5. | Shri Ramesh Kadam, Member,
Municipal Council, Chiplun, | Member |
| 6. | Dr. S.K. Dorge, | Expert Member |
| 7. | Prof. Smt. Rajani Paranjape | Expert Member |
| 8. | Prof. Smt. Suvarna Shinde | Expert Member |
| 9. | Shri S.T.Deokule | Expert Member |
| 10. | Shri V.P.Kshirsagar | Expert Member |
| 11. | Shri D.N.Vaidya I.A.S.
Divisional Commissioner, Konkan | Ex. Officio Member |
| 12. | Shri Vijay Mathankar, I.A.S.
Divisional Commissioner, Nashik | Ex. Officio Member |
| 13. | Shri Umeshchandra Saranjge, I.A.S.
Divisional Commissioner, Pune | Ex. Officio Member |
| 14. | Shri Prakash Sabde, I.A.S. | Member Secretary |

Annexure 4.1

Period wise liquidation of FFC Report Physical backlog in three Development Boards

Backlog Sector/Sub-Sector	Physical Backlog											
	Vidarbha				Marathwada				Rest of Maharashtra			
	1984	1984-94	1994-01	Remaining	1984	1984-94	1994-01	Remaining	1984	1984-94	1994-01	Remaining
Irrigation (000 Hect Rabi Equivalent)	527.3	224.21	188.37	114.72	316.71	120.79	89.68	106.24	541.9	273.77	168.09	82.04
Road development No. of Village connected)	2072	1560	376	136	489	208	211	70	644	539	105	-
Primary Education (No. of teachers)	3615	3115	220	280	6198	5308	551	339	3040	2239	65	736
Higher Secondary (No. of teachers)	2246	1656	445	145	2843	1433	1141	269	1822	1773	49	-
Jr. College (No. of teachers)	1098	1057	23	18	294	138	130	26	872	562	-	310
Adult Education (No. of Institutions)	511	511	-	-	163	163	-	-	1340	1340	-	-
Industrial training (No. of students)	777	775	2	-	731	731	-	-	2931	2002	16	913
Government and Government Aided High School (No. of Students)	4846	4846	-	-	2059	2059	-	-	2249	2249	-	-
Government and Government Aided Higher Secondary School (No. of Students)	1200	1200	-	-	548	548	-	-	1063	1063	-	-
+2 Vocational Education (No. of Institutions)	603	603	-	-	495	495	-	-	3246	3246	-	-
Government Polytechnic (No. of Students)	900	600	300	-	770	530	240	-	1100	710	390	-
Government Aided Polytechnic (No. of students)	300	-	140	160	330	240	40	50	390	120	170	-
No. of bore/drug well (rural)	20	20	-	-	-	-	-	-	732	732	-	-
Piped Water (Per 000 Population)	1274.9	1274.86	-	-	166.56	166.56	-	-	195.98	195.98	-	-
Urban Water Supply (Requirement per day in litre)	273.20	174.53	40.08	58.59	168.22	122.81	37.37	8.04	275.46	165.06	71.40	39.00

Backlog Sector/Sub-Sector	Physical Backlog											
	Vidarbha				Marathwada				Rest of Maharashtra			
	1984	1984-94	1994-01	Remaining	1984	1984-94	1994-01	Remaining	1984	1984-94	1994-01	Remaining
Common Area Development (000 Hectare)	56.75	42.43	-	14.32	131.82	53.94	-	77.88	223.10	83.16	-	139.94
Contour bunding (Lakh Hect.)	6.13	1.83	0.92	3.38	1.76	0.61	0.57	0.58	1.82	0.27	-	1.55
Terrace bunding (lakh hectare)	0.24	0.24	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.39	0.02	-	0.37
Nala bunding (Number)	2247	2244	3	-	2403	1962	711	-	215	215	-	-
Horticulture (Hectare)	34	345	-	-	36	-	-	36	8165	6169	1996	-
Pumpset Energised (Number)	57981	43386	10735	3860	52502	52502	-	-	32402	30856	1546	-
Villages Electrified(Nos.)	1829	1829	-	-	234	234	-	-	987	987	-	-
Health Sub-Centre (Nos)	30	30	-	-	24	24	-	-	201	201	-	-
Primary Health Centre (Nos.)	1	1	-	-	4	4	-	-	35	35	-	-
Rural/Cottage Hospital (Nos.)	19	19	-	-	11	11	-	-	29	29	-	-
Beds in District Hospitals (Nos)	323	323	-	100	420	220	-	200	407	233	174	-
Bed per lakh Population (No)	1473	1473	-	-	2709	2282	-	427	3378	3378	-	-
Veterinary Institute manned by Para Veterinary Staff (Nos)	89	89	-	-	88	88	-	-	82	82	-	-
Veterinary Institute Manned by Veterinary Surgeon (Nos)	16	16	-	-	51	51	-	-	49	49	-	-
Insemination Centre (Nos)	238	238	-	-	103	103	-	-	84	84	-	-

Source: Booklets on removal of Backlog 1994-95 to 2000-01, Planning Department, Government of Maharashtra.

Annexure 4.2

Statement showing region wise, sector wise physical backlog as on 1st April 94, backlog removed from 1994 to 2000 and remaining physical backlog as on 1st April, 2000 of the IBC.

Sector	Units of physical backlog	Rest of Maharashtra			Marathwada			Vidarbha			Total		
		Physical Backlog as on April, 1994	Backlog removed from April, 1994 April, 2000	Remaining backlog as on April, 2000	Physical Backlog as on April, 1994	Backlog removed from April 94 to April, 2000	Remaining backlog as on April, 2000	Physical Backlog as on April, 1994	Backlog removed from April 94 to April, 2000	Remaining backlog as on April, 2000	Physical Backlog as on April 1994	Backlog removed From April 94 to April, 2000	Remaining backlog as on April, 2000
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
1.1 Irrigation	In 000 hect's	167.88	78.19	89.69	430.9	146.2	284.7	784.71	213.97	570.74	1383.49	438.36	945.13
			(46.57)	(53.43)		(33.93)	(66.07)		(27.27)	(72.73)		(31.69)	(68.31)
2. Roads													
2.1 Main Highway	Kms.	20	0	20	519	61	458	357	0	357	896	61	835
			(0.00)	(100.00)		(11.75)	(88.25)		(0.00)	(100.00)		(6.81)	(93.19)
2.2 State Highway	Kms.	425	0	425	133	33	100	624	240	384	1182	273	909
			(0.00)	(100.00)		(24.81)	(75.19)		(38.46)	(61.54)		(23.1)	(76.9)
2.3 Main District Road	Kms.	805	164	641	643	73	570	1181	386	795	2629	623	2006
			(20.37)	(79.63)		(11.35)	(88.65)		(32.68)	(67.32)		(23.7)	(76.3)
2.4 Others District Roads	Kms.	1465	1043	422	281	281	0	1841	1423	418	3587	2747	840
			(71.19)	(28.81)		(100.00)	(0.00)		(77.29)	(22.71)		(76.58)	(23.42)
2.5 Rural Roads	Kms.	3357	2130	1227	387	387	0	781	770	11	4525	3287	1238
			(63.45)	(36.55)		(100.00)	(0.00)		(98.59)	(1.41)		(72.64)	(27.36)
2.6 Village Connects.	Kms.	-	-	34	-	-	69	-	-	211	5532	5218	314

Annexure 4.2 (Cont'd.)

Sector	Units of Physical backlog	Rest of Maharashtra			Marathwada			Vidarbha			Total		
		Physical backlog as on April, 1994	Backlog removed from April, 1994 to April, 2000	Remaining backlog as on April, 2000	Physical backlog as on April, 1994	Backlog removed from April, 1994 to April, 2000	Remaining backlog as on April, 2000	Physical backlog as on April, 1994	Backlog removed from April, 1994 to April, 2000	Remaining backlog as on April, 2000	Physical backlog as on April, 1994	Backlog removed from April, 1994 to April, 2000	Remaining backlog as on April, 2000
3. General Education													
3.1 Primary Education	No.	12003	65 (0.54)	11938 (99.46)	2292	66 (2.88)	2226 (97.12)	1652	0 (0.00)	1652 (100.00)	15947	131 (0.82)	15816 (99.18)
3.2 Secondary School Education	No.	3833	49 (1.28)	3784 (98.72)	2252	1199 (53.24)	1053 (46.76)	2967	471 (15.87)	2496 (84.13)	9052	1719 (18.99)	7333 (81.01)
3.3 Higher Secondary & Junior Collage Training	No.	1547	0 (0.00)	1547 (100.00)	933	26 (2.79)	907 (97.21)	460	18 (3.91)	442 (96.09)	2940	44 (1.5)	2896 (98.5)
4. Higher & Technical Education													
4.1 Polytechnics	Student seat	1994	260 (13.04)	1734 (86.96)	419	237 (56.56)	182 (43.44)	405	80 (19.75)	325 (80.25)	2818	577 (20.48)	2241 (79.52)
4.2 Eng. Degree course	Student seat	302	71 (23.51)	231 (76.49)	50	0 (0.00)	50 (100.00)	24	0 (0.00)	24 (100.00)	376	71 (18.88)	305 (81.12)
4.3 Technical Education	Student seat	2503	0 (0.00)	2503 (100.00)	1170	0 (0.00)	1170 (100.00)	1628	0 (0.00)	1628 (100.00)	5301	0 (0.00)	5301 (100.00)
4.4 University Education	Student seat	1183	NA	NA	477	NA	NA	435	NA	NA	2095	NA	NA
4.5 Pharmacy Degree	Student seat	NA	NA	NA	47	0 (0.00)	47 (100.00)	48	0 (0.00)	48 (100.00)	95	0 (0.00)	95 (100.00)
4.6 Pharm. Diploma	Student seat	919	0 (0.00)	919 (100.00)	54	54 (100.00)	0 (100.00)	271	0 (0.00)	271 (100.00)	1190	0 (0.00)	1190 (100.00)

Annexure 4.2 (Cont'd.)

Sector	Units of Physical backlog	Rest of Maharashtra			Marathwada			Vidarbha			Total		
		Physical backlog as on April, 1994	Backlog removed from April, 1994 to April, 2000	Remaining backlog as on April, 2000	Physical backlog as on April, 1994	Backlog removed from April, 1994 to April, 2000	Remaining backlog as on April, 2000	Physical backlog as on April, 1994	Backlog removed from April, 1994 to April, 2000	Remaining backlog as on April, 2000	Physical backlog as on April, 1994	Backlog removed from April, 1994 to April, 2000	Remaining backlog as on April, 2000
5. Medical Education													
5.1 MBBS	Student Seat	192	30	162	211	50	161	199	0	199	602	80	522
			(15.63)	(84.38)		(23.7)	(6.3)		(0.00)	(100.00)		(13.29)	(86.71)
5.2 BDS	Student Seat	192	NA	NA	81	10	71	16	NA	NA	289	218	71
			-			(12.35)	(87.65)					(75.43)	(24.57)
5.3 Paramedical	Student Seat	118	NA	NA	23	NA	0	32	NA	NA	173	NA	NA
			-				(0.00)						
5.4 Nur. & Midwifery	Student Seat	401	0	401	189	0	189	259	0	259	849	0	849
			(0.00)	(100.00)		(0.00)	(100.00)		(0.00)	(100.00)		(0.00)	(100.00)
5.5 OT & PT degree Cr.	Student Seat	112	NA	NA	29	NA	NA	19	0	19	160	141	19
									(0.00)	(100.00)		(88.13)	(11.88)
5.6 BAMS	Student Seat	235	225	10	144	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	379	369	10
			(95.74)	(4.26)								(97.36)	(2.64)
6. Agricultural Education													
6.1 Graduate Course	Student Seat	NA	NA	NA									
6.2 PG Course	Student Seat	NA	NA	NA									
6.3 Para agro Course	Student Seat	NA	NA	NA									
7. Health													
7.1 PHC	No.	49	38	11	27	17	10	9	NA	NA	85	64	21
			(77.55)	(22.45)		(62.96)	(37.04)					(75.29)	(24.71)
7.2 Sub Centre	No.	600	140	460	128	20	108	83	28	55	811	188	623
			(23.33)	(76.67)		(15.63)	(84.38)		(33.73)	(66.27)		(23.18)	(76.82)
7.3 Rural Hospital	No. of beds	84	36	48	33	20	13	29	NA	NA	146	85	61
			(42.86)	(57.14)		(60.61)	(39.39)					(58.22)	(41.78)
7.4 No. of beds per lakh	No. of beds	10156	1106	9050	5968	578	5390	3381	844	2537	19505	2528	16977
			(10.89)	(89.11)		(9.68)	(90.32)		(24.96)	(75.04)		(12.96)	(87.04)
7.5 District Civil Hospital	No. of beds	100	0	100	200	0	200	100	0	100	400	0	400
			(0.00)	(100.00)		(0.00)	(100.00)		(0.00)	(100.00)		(0.00)	(100.00)

Sector	Units of Physical backlog	Rest of Maharashtra			Marathwada			Vidarbha			Total		
		Physical backlog as on April, 1994	Backlog removed from April, 1994 to April, 2000	Remaining backlog as on April, 2000	Physical backlog as on April, 1994	Backlog removed from April, 1994 to April, 2000	Remaining backlog as on April, 2000	Physical backlog as on April, 1994	Backlog removed from April, 1994 to April, 2000	Remaining backlog as on April, 2000	Physical backlog as on April, 1994	Backlog removed from April, 1994 to April, 2000	Remaining backlog as on April, 2000
8. Water Supply													
8.1 Urban Water supply	Million Liters	NA	NA	NA	50.17	38.43	11.74	149.27	137.78	11.49	199.44	17621	23.23
						(76.6)	(23.4)		(92.3)	(7.7)		(88.35)	(11.65)
9. L.D. Soil & Water Conservation													
9.1 CADA Part I	Hectares	158175	41910	116265	31343	4197	27146	63029	42250	20779	252547	88357	164190
			(26.50)	(73.5)		(13.39)	(86.61)		(67.03)	(32.97)		(34.99)	(65.01)
9.2 Non CADA	Hectares	17948	0	17948	16872	0	16872	2562	0	2562	37382	0	37382
			(0.00)	(100.00)		(0.00)	(100.00)		(0.00)	(100.00)		(0.00)	(100.00)
9.3 Soil conservation	Hectares	NA	NA	281709	NA	NA	27771	NA	NA	382059	1161993	470454	691539
												(40.49)	(59.51)
10. Veterinary Services													
10.1 Veterinary Institutes	No.	338	127	211	73	15	58	53	44	9	464	186	278
			(37.57)	(62.43)		(20.55)	(79.45)		(83.02)	(16.98)		(40.09)	(59.91)
10.2 Energisation of Pumps Sets	No.	54640	973	53667	72113	0	72113	171472	10451	161021	298225	11424	286801
			(1.78)	(98.22)		(0.00)	(100.00)		(6.09)	(93.91)		(3.83)	(96.17)

Source: IBC Report 2000 & Governor Order No. GS/DS/DB/2001.

Figures parenthesis indicate percentages.

PROJECT TEAM

Project Director : **Dr. S.M. Sirajuddin**
Deputy Adviser

Headquarters

Technical Team

- | | | |
|----|---------------------|------------------|
| 1. | Shri B.L. Rangroo | E.I. Gr. I |
| 2. | Shri V.K. Sharma | E.I. Gr. I |
| 3. | Shri Bhuwan Chander | Tabulation Clerk |
| 4. | Shri D.S.Sajwan | Tabulation Clerk |
| 5. | Shri Dinesh Kumar | Computer |

Stenographic and Computer Assistance

- | | | |
|----|-------------------|----|
| 1. | Smt. Rita Popli | PA |
| 2. | Shri Ramesh Datta | PA |

Coordination Assistance

- | | | |
|----|--------------------|-----------------------|
| 1. | Shri F.U. Khan | Sr. Research Officer |
| 2. | Shri A.R. Tripathi | E.I. Gr. II |
| 3. | Shri H.S. Bunker | S.L. & I.A. (PEO Lib) |

NIC Unit, Yojana Bhavan

- | | |
|----|-----------------------------|
| 1. | Ms. Madhu Chanda Samantaray |
| 2. | Shri C.Ravindranatha Reddy |

Field Team-PEO Field Units

I. Regional Evaluation Office, Mumbai

- | | | |
|----|------------------------|------------------|
| 1. | Mrs. Nutan Raj | Director |
| 2. | Mrs. Sushma Monga | Research Officer |
| 3. | Shri D.K. Bangar | E.I. Gr. I |
| 4. | Ms. Deepa N. Mothghare | E.I. Gr. I |
| 5. | Shri P.G. Kulkarni | E.I. Gr. I |

II. Regional Evaluation Office, Jaipur

- | | | |
|----|------------------|------------|
| 1. | Shri B.R. Gawali | E.I. GR. I |
|----|------------------|------------|

Project Evaluation Office, Bhopal

- | | | |
|----|---------------------|------------|
| 1. | Shri Virendra Singh | E.I. Gr. I |
|----|---------------------|------------|