

2. Pradhan Mantri Gram Sadak Yojana (PMGSY)

1. Programme Objective:-

Pradhan Mantri Gram Sadak Yojana (PMGSY) was launched on 25th December, 2000 as a Centrally Sponsored Scheme to provide road connectivity in rural areas of the country. The programme envisages connecting all habitations with a population of 500 persons and above in plain areas and 250 persons and above in Hill States, Tribal (Schedule V) areas, the Desert Areas (as identified in Desert Development Programme) and in the 60 Left Wing Extremism affected / Integrated Action Plan districts as identified by the Ministry of Home Affairs/Planning Commission.

2. Connectivity targets under PMGSY :-

1,68,268 habitations were eligible for coverage under the programme, out of which 31,804 habitations had been reported either connected under other schemes or not feasible. Therefore, 1,36,464 habitations were targeted for providing road connectivity under PMGSY. The programme also has an 'Upgradation' component with a target to upgrade 3.75 lakh km. of existing rural roads (including 40% renewal of rural roads to be funded by the States) in order to ensure full farm to market connectivity. So the target for Government of India in upgradation *per se* is 2,24,906 km.

3. Bharat Nirman:-

The Government of India has identified 'rural roads' as one of the six components of 'Bharat Nirman' with a goal to provide connectivity to all habitations with a population of 1,000 persons and above (500 persons and above in the case of Hill States or Tribal (Schedule V) areas) with an all-weather road. The programme also has an 'Upgradation' component with a target to upgrade 1.94 lakh km of existing rural roads (including 40% renewal of rural roads to

be funded by the States) in order to ensure full farm to market connectivity. Based on ground verification by States, 54,648 habitations are targeted to be connected under Bharat Nirman.

4. Major Policy Decisions taken recently:-

The following are the major policy decisions have been taken under PMGSY recently;

- In order to ensure that the assets created under programme are properly maintained, release of funds by the department has been made contingent upon crediting of maintenance funds by State to SRRDAs.
- As decided by the Empowered Group Chaired by Member Secretary, Planning Commission, the population criterion has been relaxed for coverage of habitations in Left Wing Extremism affected districts/Integrated Action Plan districts under PMGSY. The habitations with a population of 250 and above (as per census 2001), whether in Schedule V areas or not, in such areas will be eligible for providing connectivity under PMGSY. The cost of bridges upto 75 m on the road constructed under PMGSY in these areas will be borne by the Government of India as against 50 m for other areas.
- In order to enhance transparency in tendering and to speed up the tendering process, e-procurement of bids under PMGSY is being made mandatory. Twenty four States have switched over to e-procurement mode.
- In order to strengthen the second tier of 3-tier quality monitoring arrangement prescribed under programme guidelines, uploading of gist of inspection reports carried out by State Quality Monitors (SQM) alongwith photographs on OMMAS is being made mandatory for release of funds to States.
- In order to ensure compliance to instructions regarding involvement of Public Representatives in implementation of the programme, instructions have been issued to communicate the Hon'ble MPs about the visits of NQMs/SQMs well in advance and also to take photographs/video clippings of the visits covering presence of Hon'ble MPs in the report.

- The States have been instructed to enclose a minimum of ten photographs taken during Transect Walk conducted to determine the most suitable alignment for the road to ensure participation of local communities and Hon'ble MPs while submitting fresh proposals under the programme.
- New proposals would be considered unless the following are appended;
 - (i) 10 digital photograph of Transect Walk.
 - (ii) Minutes of the Gram Sabha meeting held on culmination of Transect Walk and having recommendations of Gram Sabha about the proposed DPR.
 - (iii) Proof of consultation with concerned Hon'ble Member of Parliament.

ABSTRACT OF ACHIEVEMENTS UPTO July, 2011

P M G S Y

1. Habitation

a.	Cleared	1,09,036
b.	Connected	79,931

1.1 Length of road works

a.	Total length completed	3,29,460 km
b.	New connectivity	1,96,602 km
c.	Upgradation	1,32,857 km
d.	In addition 90,596 km of road length has been cleared.	

1.2 No. of road works

a.	No. of road works cleared	1,06,431
b.	No. of road works completed	83,277

1.3 Financial Position

a.	Value of proposals cleared (Rs. in crore)	1,19,164
----	-------------------------------------------	----------

b.	Amount released (Rs. in crore)	88,863
c.	Total expenditure (Rs. in crore)	84,760

BHARAT NIRMAN

2 Habitation

D P R Target	54,648
D P R Cleared	53,570
Connected	40,935

2.1 Road Length (New Connectivity)

New Connectivity Target	1,46,185 km
New Connectivity achievement	1,30,109 km

2.2 Road length (Upgradation Component)

Upgradation Target (including Renewal)	1,94,131 km
Upgradation	1,16,478 km
Upgradation Cleared	1,18,409 km
Achievement	98,364 km
Upgradation/renewal achievement	2,25,562 km

Implementation of PMGSY in IAP districts:

Left-Wing Extremism (LWE) in the country is not just a law and order problem, instead, the socio-economic dimensions of LWE are crucial and there is an urgent need to appropriately address them.

The real objectives of the programme would be achieved only when one takes into account of the problems being faced by field functionaries in its implementations. The problems may be manifold. To name a few, it can be geography, terrain, border area problems, problems due to left wing extremism etc.

In order to ensure efficient implementation of PMGSY in 60 IAP districts in 9 States, several dispensations have been given. They are as follows:

A. Special Dispensation accorded to LWE Affected Areas/IAP Districts by Ministry of Rural development:

- a. All habitations in LWE Affected Areas/IAP Districts, whether in Schedule V areas or not, with a population of 250 and above (in 2001 Census) will be eligible for coverage under PMGSY. Notably, earlier habitations with population 500 and above only were eligible under PMGSY in non – Schedule V areas in LWE Affected Areas/IAP Districts.
- b. In IAP districts, cost of bridges up to 75 meters under PMGSY will be borne by Government of India as against 50 meters for other areas. For longer bridges, pro rata costs beyond 75 meters for other areas, if any, would be borne by the State Government. Cost of causeways, however, irrespective of their length, will be fully borne by the Government of India.
- c. In case of IAP districts, the minimum tender package amount has been reduced to Rs. 50 lakh to attract more response to bids.

- d. LWE Affected Areas/IAP Districts have been included in the categories of proposals which are presently mainly being considered for clearance under PMGSY (as per Advisory issued on 12th June 2009). The
- i. Residual new connectivity coverage envisaged under Phase – I of Bharat Nirman.
 - ii. Projects to be taken up with the assistance of WB/ADB
 - iii. **New habitation connectivity in identified LWE affected (now enlarged to 60 LWE affected/IAP) districts**
 - iv. Special road connectivity packages announced for the border areas

B. Special Dispensation accorded to LWE Affected Areas/IAP Districts by Ministry of Environment and Forest:

- a. General approval under Section 2 of Forest (Conservation) Act, 1980 for diversion of forest land up to 5 ha for selected public infrastructure projects in 60 IAP districts has been given and orders have been issued.

C. Key Observations:

- i. **Pace of implementation – Mixed response:**

The pace of implementation of PMGSY scheme has been mixed in these districts. The value of the projects cleared (upto June' 2011) in these 60 IAP districts is Rs. 17,646 crore. The expenditure incurred (upto June' 2011) is Rs. 11,663 crore. The average percentage of expenditure as per the value of projects sanctioned in these 60 LWE/IAP districts has been 66% (upto June' 2011). On one hand, districts like Adilabad (Andhra Pradesh), Kawardha, Korea (Chhatisgarh), Anupur, Dindori, Mandla, Singrauli, Umariya (Madhya Pradesh), Gondia (Maharashtra), Bolangir, Kalahandi, Mayurbhanj, Nuahapara, Sonepur

(Orissa), Sonbhadra (Uttar Pradesh) have shown expenditure more than 80%, whereas on the other hand, districts like Bijapur (4%), Narayanpur (11%)-Chhatisgarh, Lohardaga (22%), Gumla (26%) –Jharkhand, and Malkangiri (22%) – Orissa have shown very low expenditure trend.

ii. **Impact of implementation of PMGSY programme:**

- a. Enhancement of employment opportunity **(Studies by Planning Commission in IAP district of Aurangabad, Jehanabad and Arwal, Bihar)**
- b. better health and educational facilities **(Studies by Planning Commission in IAP district of Aurangabad, Jehanabad and Arwal, Bihar)**
- c. Easier for the farmers to move their agricultural products to the mandis/haats on bullock carts and even on tractors **(Studies by Planning Commission in IAP district of Aurangabad, Jehanabad and Arwal, Bihar)**
- d. Taxi services are being started on PMGSY roads that in-turn has made it possible for the villagers to visit the health centers in relatively short time thereby decreasing the health-related problems for the villagers **(Studies by Planning Commission in IAP district of Aurangabad, Jehanabad and Arwal, Bihar)**
- e. PMGSY roads have allowed them to send their children to the schools situated in other villages on the route of the new road **(Studies by Planning Commission in IAP district of Aurangabad, Jehanabad and Arwal, Bihar)**
- f. With increasing numbers of commuters on these roads, lots of road side shops and markets have also come up that have further opened up new employment opportunities to large number of villagers **(Studies by Planning Commission in IAP district of Aurangabad, Jehanabad and Arwal, Bihar)**
- g. Large numbers of people have gained employment in their native villages and this has in effect contributed towards stopping the problem of

migration of villagers in search of better opportunities **(Studies by Planning Commission in IAP district of Aurangabad, Jehanabad and Arwal, Bihar)**

- h.** The rural people of the sample villages have benefited in many ways, especially in terms of increased economic opportunities. **(Studies by Planning Commission in IAP district of Aurangabad, Jehanabad and Arwal, Bihar, Sonbhadra, UP)**
- i.** Due to increased availability of local transport, it has become less time consuming in reaching a health facility in case of medical emergencies. Undoubtedly the rural connectivity has had a positive impact upon the overall well-being of the rural people. **(Studies by Planning Commission in IAP district of Aurangabad, Jehanabad and Arwal, Bihar)**

Cumulative Physical and Financial Progress for the IAP Districts upto July 2011

State wise: Physical Progress

#	Name of State(s)	No. of IAP District	No. of eligible Habitations under PMGSY	No. of Habitations connected under other schemes, if any	Net Eligible Habitations	No. of Habitations cleared under PMGSY	No. of Habitations connected under PMGSY
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1	Andhra Pradesh	2	435	0	435	435	408
2	Bihar	6	2811	739	2072	1286	450
3	Chattisgarh	10	7669	730	6939	5685	3666
4	Jharkhand	14	5919	1029	4890	4264	1422
5	Madhya Pradesh	9	3701	0	3701	2564	2285
6	Maharashtra	2	139	43	96	96	66
7	Odisha	15	9786	136	9650	4674	3176
8	Uttar Pradesh	1	571	382	189	148	135
9	West Bengal	1	1098	0	1098	961	754
	Total:	60	32129	3059	29070	20113	12362

#	Name of State(s)	No. of IAP District	No. of roads sanctioned	No. of road works completed	Length of road works sanctioned (in km)	Length of roads completed (in km.)
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1	Andhra Pradesh	2	730	474	2770	2062
2	Bihar	6	1242	546	4849	2282
3	Chattisgarh	10	3072	2144	14965	9670
4	Jharkhand	14	2127	662	9310	3642
5	Madhya Pradesh	9	2507	2104	12429	10755
6	Maharashtra	2	468	340	1925	1243
7	Odisha	15	3960	2634	16906	10953
8	Uttar Pradesh	1	137	118	724	648
9	West Bengal	1	182	135	1249	869
	Total:	60	14425	9157	65126	42124

State-wise: Financial Progress

Sl. No.	Name of State (s)	No. of IAP District	Value of projects cleared (Rs. in lakhs)	Expenditure incurred (Rs. in lakhs)	% Expenditure
1	2	3	4	5	6
1	Andhra Pradesh	2	60391	34290	57%
2	Bihar	6	160673	95398	59%
3	Chattisgarh	10	394826	252928	64%
4	Jharkhand	14	246394	109400	44%
5	Madhya Pradesh	9	245001	235532	96%
6	Maharashtra	2	47607	26124	55%
7	Odisha	15	543361	375195	69%
8	Uttar Pradesh	1	18786	16328	87%
9	West Bengal	1	47261	31624	67%
Total:		60	1764300	1176819	67%

Sl. No.	Name of State (s)	No. of IAP District	Expenditure incurred during the year 2011-12 (upto July, 2011) (Rs. In Lakh)
1	2	3	4
1	Andhra Pradesh	2	2277
2	Bihar	6	6772
3	Chattisgarh	10	5750
4	Jharkhand	14	7566
5	Madhya Pradesh	9	4626
6	Maharashtra	2	1739
7	Odisha	15	22467
8	Uttar Pradesh	1	1919
9	West Bengal	1	1037
Total:		60	54152

District-wise: Physical Progress

Sl. No.	Name of State(s)	Name of IAP District	No. of eligible Habitations under PMGSY	No. of Habitations cleared under PMGSY	No. of Habitations connected under PMGSY	No. of Habitations connected under other schemes, if any
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1	Andhra Pradesh	Khammam (NC)	68	68	41	
2		Adilabad (NC)	367	367	367	
		Total:	435	435	408	
3	Bihar	Aurangabad	514	205	86	136
4		Gaya	859	343	75	272
5 & 6		Jahanabad & Arwal	424	168	71	79
7		Jamui	420	237	157	124
8		Rohtas	594	333	61	128
		Total:	2811	1286	450	739
9	Chhattisgarh	Bastar	1473	1161	675	152
10		Narayanpur	130	23	0	0
11		Bizapur	353	63	1	40
12		Dantewada	595	376	149	66
13		Jashpur	782	450	354	65
14		Kanker	615	376	270	76
15		Kawardha	524	392	365	55
16		Korea	389	294	285	25
17		Rajnandgaon	904	782	640	122
18		Surguja	1904	1768	927	129
		Total:	7669	5685	3666	730
19	Jharkhand*	Bokaro	408	292	222	76
20		Chatra	209	152	34	58
21		E.Singhbhum	901	771	202	64
22		Garhwa	507	242	67	198
23		Gumla	664	479	73	36
24		Hazaribagh	716	334	114	385
25		Ramgarh	118	121	57	
26		Latehar	206	191	43	30
27		Lohardaga	163	145	43	40
28		Palamau	453	375	124	81
29		W.Singhbhum	492	482	184	19
30		Koderma	118	66	83	29
31		Seraikela	491	273	100	0
32		Simdega	473	341	76	13
	Total:	5919	4264	1422	1029	

Sl. No.	Name of State(s)	Name of IAP District	No. of eligible Habitations under PMGSY	No. of Habitations cleared under PMGSY	No. of Habitations connected under PMGSY	No. of Habitations connected under other schemes, if any
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
33	Madhya Pradesh	Anuppur	294	201	199	
34		Balaghat	442	437	301	
35		Dindori	489	349	340	
36		Mandla	539	388	355	
37		Seoni	778	425	397	
38		Shahdol	405	290	261	
39		Sidhi	235	152	145	
40		Singrauli	249	181	155	
41		Umaria	270	141	132	
		Total:	3701	2564	2285	
42		Maharashtra	GADCHIROLI	108	71	41
43	GONDIA		31	25	25	6
	Total:		139	96	66	43
44	Odisha**	Deogarh	179	86	43	0
45		Gajapati	385	144	96	10
46		Malkangiri	465	223	35	13
47		Rayagada	636	289	225	28
48		Sambalpur	593	260	175	1
49		Bolangir	1130	291	288	0
50		Kalahandi	955	376	357	3
51		Keonjhar	763	510	321	17
52		Koraput	771	351	215	1
53		Mayurbhanj	1057	712	521	9
54		Nowarangpur	547	361	237	5
55		Nuapada	341	155	143	0
56		Kandhamal	361	149	88	11
57		Sonepur	369	156	155	2
58		Sundargarh	1234	611	277	36
	Total:	9786	4674	3176	136	
59	Uttar Pradesh	Sonebhadra	571	148	135	382
		Total:	571	148	135	382
60	West Bengal	Paschim Medinipur	1098	961	754	Not Known
		Total:	1098	961	754	Not Known
Grand Total:			32129	20113	12362	3059

District-wise: Physical Progress

Sl. No.	Name of State(s)	District	No. of roads sanctioned	No. of road works completed	Length of road works sanctioned (in km)	Length of roads completed (in km.)
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1	Andhra Pradesh	Khammam (NC)	61	37	243.26	161.90
		Khammam (UG)	303	121	1058.80	432.10
		Total:	364	158	1302.06	594
2		Adilabad (NC)	225	225	976.44	976.44
		Adilabad (UG)	141	91	491.89	491.89
		Total:	366	316	1468.33	1468.33
3	Bihar (RWD)	Aurangabad	128	43	473.460	142.82
4		Gaya	196	38	630.835	122.15
5 & 6		Jahanabad & Arwal	103	63	221.77	131.86
7		Jamui	113	78	385.26	247.20
8		Rohtas	264	59	769.060	123.53
		Total:	804	281	2480.385	767.57
	Bihar (NEAs)	Aurangabad	96	56	458.960	316.86
		Gaya	88	51	483.800	331.90
		Jahanabad & Arwal	48	36	231.7	173.96
		Jamui	62	53	381.72	359.69
		Rohtas	144	69	812.150	332.36
		Total:	438	265	2368.330	1514.77
9	Chhattisgarh	Bastar	546	350	2545.43	1492.46
10		Narayanpur	19	0	58.00	0.00
11		Bizapur	34	1	217.64	27.30
12		Dantewada	185	61	1218.09	432.74
13		Jashpur	201	172	1189.30	969.10
14		Kanker	272	209	1031.45	715.15
15		Kawardha	216	204	1072.40	938.68
16		Korea	179	174	1001.80	923.46
17		Rajnandgaon	513	421	1994.06	1549.64
18		Surguja	907	552	4636.48	2621.91
		Total:	3072	2144	14964.65	9670.44

Sl. No.	Name of State(s)	District	No. of roads sanctioned	No. of road works completed	Length of road works sanctioned (in km)	Length of roads completed (in km.)
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
19	Jharkhand	Bokaro	196	108	833.69	524.29
20		Chatra	94	18	496.03	149.55
21		Garhwa	126	33	634.42	227.67
22		Gumla	245	25	1162.63	205.40
23		Hazaribagh	180	72	1050.28	409.08
24		Ramgarh	83	39	82.10	184.94
25		Latehar	110	21	602.85	164.97
26		Lohardaga	90	18	395.81	73.59
27		East Singhbhum	367	92	1254.58	482.43
28		Palamau	212	61	830.17	311.03
29		West Singhbhum	205	85	959.14	442.32
30		Koderma (IAP)	39	28	203.83	170.79
31		Saraikela (IAP)	62	50	258.30	191.46
32		Simdega (IAP)	118	12	546.48	104.41
		Total:	2127	662	9310.28	3641.93
33	Madhya Pradesh	Anuppur	191	188	875.00	866.00
34		Balaghat	489	342	2053.90	1544
35		Dindori	290	270	1244.1	1202.00
36		Mandla	336	284	1374.10	1220.00
37		Seoni	461	411	2120.6	1928.00
38		Shahdol	262	233	1275.06	1177.00
39		Sidhi	189	134	1522.00	1228.00
40		Singrauli	168	140	1248.00	995.00
41		Umaria	121	102	716	595.00
			Total:	2507	2104	12428.76
42	Maharashtra	GADCHIROLI	226	102	1072.00	449.68
43		GONDIA	242	238	853.00	793.00
		Total:	468	340	1925.00	1242.68

Sl. No.	Name of State(s)	District	No. of roads sanctioned	No. of road works completed	Length of road works sanctioned (in km)	Length of roads completed (in km.)	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
44	Odisha	Deogarh	71	39	391.5	217.46	
45		Gajapati	158	84	590.06	228.07	
46		Malkangiri	151	28	841.75	137.27	
47		Rayagada	222	149	1219.55	652.7	
48		Sambalpur	256	176	1013.9	703.34	
49		Bolangir	288	278	1166.3	1098.91	
50		Kalahandi	272	252	1302.61	1145	
51		Keonjhar	449	280	1877.8	1161.62	
52		Koraput	299	169	1393.62	800.86	
53		Mayurbhanj	595	402	2028.31	1507.3	
54		Nowarangpur	321	211	1431.55	938.97	
55		Nuapada	103	95	583.54	529.95	
56		Kandhamal	164	88	653.4	303.73	
57		Sonepur	149	147	656.73	621.25	
58		Sundargarh	462	236	1754.99	906.17	
			Total:	3960	2634	16905.61	10952.6
59		Uttar Pradesh	Sonebhadra	137	118	724	648
			Total	137	118	724	648
60	West Bengal	Paschim Medinipur	182	135	1248.67	869.04	
		Total:	182	135	1248.67	869.04	

Grand Total:

14425

9157

65126

42124

District-wise : Financial Progress

Sl. No.	Name of State (s)	District	Value of projects cleared (Rs. in lakhs)	Expenditure incurred (Rs. in lakhs)	% Expenditure
1	2	3	4	5	6
1	Andhra Pradesh	Khammam (NC)	4753.77	1888	40%
		Khammam (UG)	28429.25	10042.73	35%
		Total:	33183.02	11930.73	36%
2		Adilabad (NC)	13740.42	10486.5	76%
		Adilabad (UG)	13467.86	11872.64	88%
		Total:	27208.28	22359.14	82%
3	Bihar (RWD)	Aurangabad	15852.668	9673.222	61%
4		Gaya	17940.080	5893.543	33%
5&6		Jahanabad & Arwal	6516.142	4662.832	72%
7		Jamui	13384.060	10407.260	78%
8		Rohtas	24000.960	10474.773	44%
		Total:	77693.910	41111.630	53%
	Bihar (NEAs)	Aurangabad	17289.9	14472.91	84%
		Gaya	15290.79	11375.65	74%
		Jahanabad & Arwal	8576.51	5517.28	64%
		Jamui	13242.15	10221.46	77%
		Rohtas	28579.32	12698.86	44%
		Total:	82978.67	54286.16	65%
9	Chhattisgarh	Bastar	74162.60	48515.13	65%
10		Narayanpur	1905.22	310.00	16%
11		Bizapur	9289.07	383.00	4%
12		Dantewada	30786.20	11864.17	39%
13		Jashpur	30268.83	24155.24	80%
14		Kanker	25912.48	17810.49	69%
15		Kawardha	26116.11	23205.20	89%
16		Korea	24253.01	20970.24	86%
17		Rajnandgaon	50451.26	34785.02	69%
18		Surguja	121681.05	70929.78	58%
		Total:	394825.83	252928.27	64%

Sl. No.	Name of State (s)	District	Value of projects cleared (Rs. in lakhs)	Expenditure incurred (Rs. in lakhs)	% Expenditure
1	2	3	4	5	6
19	Jharkhand	Bokaro	23467.19	14954.00	64%
20		Chatra	13219.82	5566.00	42%
21		East Singhbhum	34220.17	17127.00	50%
22		Garhwa	15763.15	6570.00	42%
23		Gumla	28638.08	7585.00	26%
24		Hazaribagh	20628.58	9374.00	45%
25		Ramgarh	10488.09	5113.00	49%
26		Latehar	15727.02	5856.00	37%
27		Lohardaga	10165.76	2224.00	22%
28		Palamau	21090.00	11104.00	53%
29		West Singhbhum	25470.17	10909.00	43%
30		Koderma (IAP)	4803.00	3598.00	75%
31		Saraikela (IAP)	7660.00	4495.00	59%
32		Simdega (IAP)	15053.00	4925.00	33%
		Total:	246394.01	109400.00	44%
33	Madhya Pradesh	Anuppur	19764	18823.5	95%
34		Balaghat	48848	38158.0	78%
35		Dindori	29629	26511.0	89%
36		Mandla	30013	24811.0	83%
37		Seoni	517.46	39763.0	77%
38		Shahdol	31299	22242.0	71%
39		Sidhi	39972	27937.0	70%
40		Singrauli	28801	24241.0	84%
41		Umariya	16158	13045.0	81%
			Total:	245001.46	235531.52
42	Maharashtra	GADCHIROLI	30899.00	10756.00	35%
43		GONDIA	16708.00	15368.00	92%
		Total:	47607.00	26124.00	55%

Sl. No.	Name of State (s)	District	Value of projects cleared (Rs. in lakhs)	Expenditure incurred (Rs. in lakhs)	% Expenditure
1	2	3	4	5	6
44	Odisha***	Deogarh	15115.9	7151.12	47%
45		Gajapati	23664.97	10961.67	46%
46		Malkangiri	25098.37	5626.73	22%
47		Rayagada	37327.08	23947.3	64%
48		Sambalpur	31470.07	20463.86	65%
49		Bolangir	33155.89	29011.75	88%
50		Kalahandi	41014.21	37637.46	92%
51		Keonjhar	62889.82	45246.98	72%
52		Koraput	52378.73	34587.62	66%
53		Mayurbhanj	64451.92	53734.45	83%
54		Nowarangpur	43338.78	33383.33	77%
55		Nuapada	18500.11	15329.05	83%
56		Kandhamal	19244.25	10387.45	54%
57		Sonepur	18361.8	16672.88	91%
58		Sundargarh	57349.1	31053.79	54%
		Total:	543361.00	375195.44	69%
59	Uttar Pradesh	Sonebhadra	18786	16328.29	87%
		Total:	18786	16328.29	87%
60	West Bengal	Paschim Medinipur	47261.31	31623.62	67%
		Total:	47261.31	31623.62	67%

Grand Total:

1764300.5

1176818.8

67%

State-wise : Expenditure Status (upto July 2011)

Sl. No.	Name of State (s)	District	Expenditure incurred during the year 2011-12 (upto July, 2011) (Rs. In Lakh)
1	2	3	4
1	Andhra Pradesh	Khammam	1667.82
2		Adilabad	608.94
		Total:	2276.76
3	Bihar (RWD)	Aurangabad	1309.395
4		Gaya	2036.943
5&6		Jahanabad & Arwal	596.657
7		Jamui	187.212
8		Rohtas	594.095
		Total:	4724.302
		Bihar (NEAs)	Aurangabad
	Gaya		150.59
	Jahanabad & Arwal		33.35
	Jamui		42.01
	Rohtas		921.64
	Total:		2047.70
9	Chhattisgarh	Bastar	1691.06
10		Narayanpur	105.00
11		Bizapur	0.00
12		Dantewada	260.16
13		Jashpur	847.38
14		Kanker	324.71
15		Kawardha	224.16
16		Korea	0.00
17		Rajnandgaon	529.5
18		Surguja	1767.67
		Total:	5749.64

Sl. No.	Name of State (s)	District	Expenditure incurred during the year 2011-12 (upto July, 2011) (Rs. In Lakh)
1	2	3	4
19	Jharkhand	Bokaro	747.889
20		Chatra	364.480
21		East Singhbhum	1575.394
22		Garhwa	493.246
23		Gumla	492.508
24		Hazaribagh	570.286
25		Ramgarh	71.059
26		Latehar	268.142
27		Lohardaga	12.640
28		Palamau	1087.527
29		West Singhbhum	685.421
30		Koderma (IAP)	34.140
31		Saraikela (IAP)	166.190
32		Simdega (IAP)	997.152
		Total:	7566.074
33	Madhya Pradesh	Anuppur	0
34		Balaghat	1642.95
35		Dindori	581.14
36		Mandla	249.08
37		Seoni	505.29
38		Shahdol	380.49
39		Sidhi	665.07
40		Singrauli	341.31
41		Umaria	261
			Total:
42	Maharashtra	GADCHIROLI	208.39
43		GONDIA	1530.18
		Total:	1738.57

Sl. No.	Name of State (s)	District	Expenditure incurred during the year 2011-12 (upto July, 2011) (Rs. In Lakh)	
1	2	3	4	
44	Odisha	Deogarh	60.31	
45		Gajapati	1048.26	
46		Malkangiri	517.69	
47		Rayagada	1433.4	
48		Sambalpur	766.81	
49		Bolangir	459.73	
50		Kalahandi	945.75	
51		Keonjhar	4163.81	
52		Koraput	1402.36	
53		Mayurbhanj	4839.54	
54		Nowarangpur	2322.54	
55		Nuapada	300.48	
56		Kandhamal	849.41	
57		Sonepur	207.2	
58		Sundargarh	3149.33	
			Total:	22466.62
59		Uttar Pradesh	Sonebhadra	1919.21
		Total:	1919.21	
60	West Bengal	Paschim Medinipur	1037	
		Total:	1037	

Grand Total:

54152.21

* (i) The figures shown above in the table are as per original eligibility criteria (500+ habitation & 250+ habitation in Schedule V area)

(2) As per revised guidelines all habitations of 250+ population have become eligible in IAP district. The no. of corresponding eligible habitations will be known only after Core Network (CNCPL) is revised accordingly. The state has prepared revised CN which is under

** The proposal in respect of recently sanctioned projects of 5 LWE districts has been included.

***Do not include projects for connecting additional 250-499 habitations