

CMDR Monograph Series No. - 58

**IMPLEMENTATION OF D. M. NANJUNDAPPA
COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS FOR REDRESSAL
OF REGIONAL IMBALANCE**

**ABDUL AZIZ
&
SHIDDALINGASWAMI HANAGODIMATH**

Study Completed Under

Dr. D. M. Nanjundappa Chair



CENTRE FOR MULTI-DISCIPLINARY DEVELOPMENT RESEARCH

Dr. B. R. Ambedkar nagar, Near Yalakkishetter Colony, Dharwad-580 004
(Karnataka, India)

Phone : 0836-2460453, 2460472

Website : www.cmdr.ac.in

CMDR Monograph Series No-58

All rights reserved. This publication may be used with proper citation and due acknowledgement to the author(s) and the Centre For Multi-Disciplinary Development Research (CMDR), Dharwad

© Centre For Multi-Disciplinary Development Research (CMDR), Dharwad

First Published : December 2010

Abstract:

This study thoroughly analyses region wise (north-south), division wise, district wise and taluk wise implementation of Nanjundappa Committee Recommendations for the Redressal of Regional Imbalances. The major observations of the study are,

There is a lack of consistency between actual allocation and the recommended allocation in respect of the most backward, more backward and backward taluks. Since not so backward taluks got more resources than the recommended amount compared to the more and most backward taluks the following scenario may emerge. Within the group of 114 backward taluks the not so backward taluks may grow faster than the more backward and most backward taluks. Such a development may give rise to imbalances within this group of backward taluks.

Key Words: Nanjundappa Committee Recommendations, Regional Imbalances

JEL Classification: R58, R28 and H72

IMPLEMENTATION OF D. M. NANJUNDAPPA COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS FOR REDRESSAL OF REGIONAL IMBALANCE¹

ABDUL AZIZ AND SHIDDALINGASWAMI HANAGODIMATH²

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The Government of Karnataka is keen on implementing the recommendations of the High Power Committee for Redressal of Regional Imbalances, better Known as D. M. Nanjundappa Committee. As a follow-up, the government has appointed a High Power Committee under the Chairmanship of Shashil G. Namoshi with the objective of overseeing and monitoring the implementation of the D. M. Nanjundappa Committee recommendations. One of the major recommendations of the Nanjundappa Committee is formulation and implementation of the Eight-year Special Development Plan (SDP) for promoting development of the 114 taluks which were identified as graded backward taluks. The Government of Karnataka has been, in its budgets, allocating plan outlays for the special development plan beginning from the year 2007-08. These amounts are treated as additionalities meant to be spent for the development of the above mentioned 114 taluks. The budgets, however, have only indicated the total amount of allocation for the SDP leaving perhaps to the Planning Department to allocate the said amount to the identified taluks and to the various departments.

The High Power Committee for Monitoring the Implementation of the Special Development Plan in its various meetings held from November 2008 to March 2010, both at the secretariat level and district/taluk level had discussions with the Secretaries, Heads of Departments, District and Taluk Line Development Departments on the action plans prepared for the development of these taluks. One point that emerged from such meetings is that since some of the implementing personnel had missed the spirit of the Nanjundappa Committee recommendations, they needed some guidance in the process of preparing action plan under the SDP. Hence, it was felt that guidelines for fund allocation at the taluk and department levels for the benefit of the implementing authorities ought to be attempted. Secondly, for the

¹ We are grateful to Sri Shashil Namoshi, Chairman, the Committee for Implementation of D M Nanjundappa Committee Recommendations, and Sri Sanjeev Kumar, Secretary, Planning Dept. Govt. of Karnataka for permitting us to use the required information and to Smt. Sushma Godbole for providing the information. We are also grateful to Prof. P R Panchamukhi for his helpful comments on the earlier draft of this paper.

² Faculty D. M. Nanjundappa Chair, CMDR, Dharwad, Karnataka

last one and half years or so the Namoshi Committee has been monitoring the implementation of the SDP. It is appropriate at this point of time to critically examine to what extent the implementation of the SDP has been in tune with the spirit of the Nanjundappa Committee Recommendations. The purpose of this paper, therefore, is while critically looking at the implementation part of the SDP, it is also proposed to provide guidelines to the implementing authorities.

2.0 D. M. NANJUNDAPPA COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

It may be recalled that the Nanjundappa Committee identified 35 indicators of backwardness, collected taluk level data on these indicators and prepared a Comprehensive Composite Development Index (CCDI) with appropriate weights. Having taken the State average of development as the benchmark equal to one, all the 175³ taluks were classified into developed and backward taluks, and the latter into backward, more backward and most backward taluks on the basis of the distance along the development scale down the State average. For calculating the distance between the State average and the taluks falling below that average another measure was developed by the Committee, viz., Comprehensive Deprivation Index (CDI) which measured the distance between the place of a given taluk on the development scale and the average development level of the state. On the basis of such an exercise, the Committee identified 114 taluks as backward and brought them under north and south regions only to find that since north had 59 and south had 55 backward taluks, the north-south disparities were marginal. However, north was found to be much worse off as it had 26 most backward taluks against only 13 in south. Hence, when the Committee formulated the special development plan for redressing the regional imbalance, it gave a higher weight-age for north compared with south on the basis of CDI results. We shall return to the CDI results shortly.

2.1 THE SPECIAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN (SDP)

Considering the CDI results, the Committee estimated that to bring-up the development level of these 114 taluks to that of the State level, an investment of Rs. 31,000 crore at 2002-03 prices should be undertaken during the eight-year period from 2002-03. As a follow-up, the Committee prepared an eight-year special development plan for the

³ Now there are 176 taluks- the new taluk been Krishnarajapuram of Bangalore Rural District

development of these taluks with an outlay of Rs. 31,000 crore. It pointed out that, of this amount, Rs. 15,000 crore would flow into these taluks in the normal course from the annual budgets. The balance of Rs. 16,000 crore was considered as an additional investment required⁴ and the annual budget should provide an amount of Rs. 2,000 crore per annum as an additionality. The implication of the fact that this amount is to be at 2002-03 prices is that it needs to be escalated every year by a factor of the extent of rise in prices during each year as measured by the wholesale price index numbers. That is, if we are planning for the first year i.e. 2002-03, there is no need to escalate the suggested amount of investment of the order of Rs. 2,000 crore. But since the SDP is formally prepared from 2007-08 there is need to escalate the suggested amount of investment from the year 2007-08. Table 1 presents this exercise dealing with escalation of the budgetary allocation, actual budgetary allocation and the gap thereof between the two. For the four year period the recommended outlay at 2002-03 prices is Rs. 8,000 crore which reaches the escalated level of Rs. 11, 280 crore. The actual allocation being Rs. 9277.67 crore gives rise to a gap of Rs. 2002.33 crore.

Table 1: SDP Recommendation and Budgetary Allocation

Year	WPI (Base year 2002-03)	Recommended at 2002-02 prices	To be Allocated at adjusted prices	Actual Budgetary Allocation	Gap (shortfall Absolute terms) (4-5)
1	2	3	4	5	6
2007-08	129	2000	2580	1571.50	1008.50
2008-09	140	2000	2800	2547.34	252.66
2009-10	145	2000	2900	2578.83	321.17
2010-11	150*	2000	3000	2580.00	420.00
Three years	..	8000	11280	9277.67	2002.33

* Assumed on the basis of past experience as WPI figure is not yet made available for this year

2.2 DIVISION-WISE COMPREHENSIVE DEPRIVATION INDEX

Coming back to the concept of CDI, Table 2 presents the CDI results as arrived at by the D. M. Nanjundappa Committee on the basis of its calculations. It can be seen from the Table that the CDI is the highest in the Gulbarga division at 8.06 followed by Bangalore (5.32), Belgaum (4.12) and Mysore (2.76) Divisions. This means that while allocating funds out of the budgetary provision for the SDP, weightage has to be accordingly given to these

⁴ There is some confusion among some people as to the actual outlay suggested for the Special Development Plan as an additionality viz., whether it is Rs. 31,000 crore or Rs. 16,000 crore. The fact is, it was Rs. 16,000 crore that was suggested by the committee as additional outlay.

divisions in the order of the CDI value. The calculations shown in the Table as per this consideration brings out the point that out of any given budgetary provision 40 per cent of the state outlay should go to Gulbarga division, 20 per cent to Belgaum division, 25 and 15 per cent respectively to Bangalore and Mysore divisions. Since the deprivation index value is higher in the northern divisions of Gulbarga and Belgaum (12.18) compared to that of the southern divisions of Bangalore and Mysore (8.08), the ratio of allocation between north and south Karnataka works out to 60:40.

Table 2: Division-wise Comprehensive Deprivation Index Values and the Corresponding Scheme of Resource Allocation

Name of the Division	CDI Value	Calculated Resource Allocation Pattern
Gulbarga Division	8.06	$8.06/20.26=40\%$
Belgaum Division	4.12	$4.12/20.26=20\%$
Bangalore Division	5.35	$5.35/20.26=25\%$
Mysore Division	2.76	$2.76/20.26=15\%$
Total	20.26	$2.76/20.26=100\%$

2.3 DIVISION WISE BUDGETARY OUTLAY, RELEASE AND EXPENDITURE 2007-08 TO 2009-2010:

We may now examine the actual allocation of outlay as against the outlay implied by the deprivation index. This exercise is done for 3 years, starting from 2007-08. From Table 3 it may be seen that the budgetary outlay for 2007-08 for the state as a whole in respect of SDP was Rs. 1,518 crore. This amount has been distributed by the planning department in the ratio of 62:38 for north and south Karnataka as against the recommended ratio of 60:40. Within the north Karnataka region Belgaum gets more (24%) than Gulbarga division (38%) as against the recommended proportion of 20 per cent and 40 per cent respectively. In south Karnataka, Bangalore gets its recommended share of 25 per cent but Mysore division gets only 13 per cent as against 15 per cent as recommended by the Committee. This calls for a field based inquiry as to why the actual plan allocation has been at variance with the recommended allocation. However, in respect of the amount released there is a problem in the sense that these amounts are in excess of the outlay provided for in the year 2007-08. This is because of the fact the planning department could not furnish data relating to certain proportion of the outlay by the divisions as also in respect of the released funds and spent funds.

Table 3: Year wise and division wise budgetary outlay, amount released and amount spent, 2007-08 to 2009-10

Division	2007-08				2008-09				2009-10				Three years			
	Annual Outlay	Released	Expenditure		Annual Outlay	Released	Expenditure		Annual Outlay	Released	Expenditure		Annual Outlay	Released	Expenditure	
	% to all divisions	% to outlay	% to outlay	% to Released	% to all divisions	% to outlay	% to outlay	% to Released	% to all divisions	% to outlay	% to outlay	% to Released	% to all divisions	% to outlay	% to outlay	% to Released
Belgaum	133	198		196	467	346		353	570	201		244	1170	745		793
	-24	-149	-147	-99	-21	-74	-76	-102	-74	-35	-43	-122	-22	-64	-68	-106
Gulbarga	211	228		218	909	661		654	1090	300		272	2210	1189		1144
	-38	-108	-103	-96	-41	-73	-72	-99	-44	-27	-25	-91	-42	-54	-52	-96
North	344	426		414	1376	1007		1007	1660	501		516	3380	1934		1937
	-62	-124	-120	-97	-63	-73	-73	-100	-66	-30	-31	-103	-64	-57	-57	-100
Bangalore	138	238		233	497	380		423	521	178		202	1156	796		858
	-25	-172	-168	-98	-23	-76	-85	-111	-21	-34	-39	-114	-22	-69	-74	-108
Mysore	74	113		111	323	277		263	319	86		67	716	476		441
	-13	-153	-151	-98	-15	-86	-81	-95	-13	-27	-21	-78	-14	-66	-62	-93
South	212	351		344	820	657		686	840	264		269	1872	1272		1299
	-38	-165	-162	-98	-37	-80	-84	-104	-34	-31	-32	-102	-36	-68	-69	-102
Total	556	777		758	2196	1664		1693	2500	765		785	5252	3206		3236
	-100	-140	-134	-97	-100	-76	-77	-102	-100	-31	-31	-103	-100	-61	-62	-101
Not furnished	962	429		429	962	429		429
Grand Total	1518	1206		1187	2196	1664		1693	2500	764		785	6214	3634		3665

Note: outlay given in this table does not tally with the one given in table 1 because sources of data used are different

Coming to the year 2008-09, the annual budgetary outlay for this year was Rs. 2,196 crore which is distributed across north and south in the ratio of 63:37. Even here the allocation favours north Karnataka. It may be noted that the released amount is grossly lower at Rs. 1,664 crore out of the total outlay of Rs. 2,196 crore.

In regard to 2009-10, for which latest data are available, the budgetary outlay is Rs. 2,300 crore. From Table 3 it can be seen that the outlay distributed between north and south is in the ratio of 66:34. But unfortunately the amount released till the end of December is only Rs. 764 crore out of the total outlay of Rs. 2,500 crore, which works out to 30.6% of the allocated amount. And that is some what worrisome.

If the three year period starting from 2007-08 is considered the total outlay provided in the budgets is Rs. 6,214 crore including Rs. 962 crore for which the department has not furnished division wise allocation figures for the year 2007-08. However, the division wise allocation furnished by the department is Rs. 5,252 crore and in this paper we take this figure as the base for calculation of the division wise allocation ratios. Thus out of this amount of Rs. 5,252 crore the north and south allocation is 64:36. Till the end of December 2009 the amount released is reported to be only Rs. 3,206 crore, which is only 61 per cent of the budgetary allocation for the three year period.

As a complement to the above Table an attempt is made in Table 4 to examine division wise distribution of annual outlay in relation to the recommended outlay at current prices and the gap that arises there from. From Table 4 it may be seen that the gap for the three year period between 2007-08 and 2009-10 in respect of north Karnataka is wider (Rs. 1,588 crore) than south Karnataka (Rs. 1,440 crore). In north Karnataka the gap in respect of Gulbarga is far greater (Rs. 1,102) compared to Belgaum, Bangalore and Mysore divisions. Bangalore division carries a gap of Rs. 914 crore. Over all gap for all the divisions is of the order of Rs. 3028 crore. If we consider the 2007-08 unfurnished information relating to Rs. 962 crore the overall gap gets reduced to Rs. 2,066 crore.

Table 4: Division wise recommended budgetary allocation at constant and current prices, and actual outlay and the gap

Division	Recommended outlay at 2002-03 constant prices				Recommended outlay at current prices				Annual Outlay				Gap			
	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	Three years	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	Three years	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	Three years	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	Three years
Belgaum	400	400	400	1200	516	560	580	1656	133	467	570	1170	383	93	10	486
Gulbarga	800	800	800	2400	1032	1120	1160	3312	211	909	1090	2210	821	211	70	1102
North	1200	1200	1200	3600	1548	1680	1740	4968	344	1376	1660	3380	<i>1204</i>	<i>304</i>	<i>80</i>	<i>1588</i>
Bangalore	500	500	500	1500	645	700	725	2070	138	497	521	1156	507	203	204	914
Mysore	300	300	300	900	387	420	435	1242	74	323	319	716	313	97	116	526
South	800	800	800	2400	1032	1120	1160	3312	212	820	840	1872	<i>820</i>	<i>300</i>	<i>320</i>	<i>1440</i>
Total	2000	2000	2000	6000	2580	2800	2900	8280	556	2196	2500	5252	<i>2024</i>	<i>604</i>	<i>400</i>	<i>3028</i>
Not furnished									962	962				
Grand Total	2000	2000	2000	6000	2580	2800	2900	8280	1518	2196	2500	6214	<i>1062</i>	<i>604</i>	<i>400</i>	<i>2066</i>

Note: outlay given in this table does not tally with the one given in table 1 because sources of data used are different

3 SECTORAL/DEPARTMENT WISE ALLOCATION AT THE STATE LEVEL:

Apart from division wise allocation pattern, the Nanjundappa Committee had also suggested a pattern of allocation for major sector/departments which is presented in Table 5. It may be noted that the total amount proposed under the Eight-year SDP by the Committee works out to exactly Rs. 30,725 crore which is rounded off to Rs 31.000 crore by the Committee. This outlay includes both the normal flow of funds and the additional fund required for bringing-up the backward taluks to the State average level of development. The Committee had given absolute figures as per the plan outlays across the major sectors. We have worked out the percentage share of each of these sectors in the plan outlay and shown it in the last column of Table 5. It can be seen from the Table that in terms of allocation, the priority sectors are: social services, irrigation, rural development, energy, agriculture and allied sectors and transport in that order. However, if one goes by the broad division of the Karnataka economy into rural and urban sectors the priority appears to be in favour of rural sector. Rural development, irrigation and a major part of social services and to some extent energy take a large proportion of the plan outlay. This is consistent with the pattern of level of development in Karnataka state whereas in other states the pattern is urban oriented as measured in terms of levels of income and basic needs and amenities. However, the SDP does not ignore the claims of the urbanites. As such the Committee also took care of the needs of the urban development in so far as it also emphasizes on energy, transport, industrial development, science and technology and certain economic and social services.

The sector-wise allocation pattern indicated in Table 5 suggests that the implementers are as far as possible expected to stick to the indicated allocation pattern across various sectors at the taluk level. It may be desirable at this point to state that in the Namoshi Committee meetings with the State, District and Taluk level development departments it is reported to have noted two points one being that the Nanjundappa Committee has not covered all the development departments in its allocation matrix. It was pointed out that departments like labour department which ensures labour welfare, forest department which undertakes social and farm forestry have not been explicitly mentioned in the SDP. Secondly, there is a reference to fisheries in SDP, sericulture, ports and air-ports which are not taluk based sectors and may not be implementable in all the taluks. Under the circumstances, the funds earmarked for these sectors cannot be spent in such taluks. Since these points are quite

relevant, the Namoshi Committee reported to have taken the position that wherever funds earmarked for sectors where spending is not possible, there should be some room for the implementers to divert such funds to sectors not explicitly mentioned by the Nanjundappa Committee and also possibly to other sectors which are of higher priority in the taluks considering the prevailing socio-economic conditions.

Table 5: Sectoral Allocations suggested by D.M. Nanjundappa Committee

Sl. No.	Sector/Programme	Outlay (Rs. in Cr)	Sector Total (Rs. in crore)	Percentage of sub-sector total	Allocation 2007-08 to 2009-10
I	Agriculture and Allied	2340	2340 (7.61)		(7.4)
1	Agriculture including market, training, land and soil improvement, machinery and equipment, price stabilisation fund		2000	85.47	
2	Sericulture		100	4.27	
3	Horticulture		100	4.27	
4	Fisheries		70	2.99	
5	Animal Husbandry		70	2.99	
II	Rural Development	7100	7100 (23.10)		(30.5)
1	Rural Roads		600	8.45	
2	Z.P. Roads		400	6.53	
3	Rural Water Supply		4500	63.38	
4	Rural Housing		1600	22.54	
	<i>Gama Swaraj</i>				
	Other				
III	Irrigation	8000	8000 (26.0)		(26.5)
1	Irrigation		7800	97.50	
2	Water Recharging Scheme		200	2.50	
IV	Energy		3000 (9.76)		(18.1)
1	Power		3000	100	
V	Industry & Minerals		400 (1.3)		(0.2)
1	Industry (Industrial Sheds, Industrial Infrastructure, State Finance Corporation of North Karnataka)	400	400	100	

VI	Transport	1650	1650 (5.37)		(8.0)
1	Railways		500	30.30	
2	Airstrips/Reviving airports fallen into disuse		1000	60.61	
3	Ports	150	150	9.09	
VII	Science and Technology	200	200 (0.65)		(Neg.)
1	I.T. & B.T.		200	100	
VIII	Economic Services	10	10 (0.03)		(Neg.)
1	Banking, Co-operation & other financial Institutions		10	100	
IX	Social Services	8025	8025 (26.11)		(13.1)
1	Health	800	800	9.97	
2	Education	1000	1000	12.46	
3	Sports	25	25	0.31	
4	Tourism	2000	2000	24.92	
5	Urban Development	200	200	2.49	
6	Urban Water Supply	3000	3000	37.38	
7	Weaker Section, Women Development & Social Welfare	1000	1000	12.46	
X	Total	30725	100		(100)
	Rounded off to	31000			

Note: Figures in parentheses are percentage of sectoral share under overall plan outlay to the SDP.

Table 6 which presents the recommended allocation for sectors/departments brings out the following points:

1. Recommended share for agriculture and allied sectors is 7.55, though year wise variation is there in actual allocation. The average for the 3 year period is close to the recommended share (7.4%).
2. The recommended share of rural development is about 23 per cent and the actual is much higher at 30 per cent.
3. As for irrigation, the recommended share is 25.5% and the actual allocation for the 3 year period is less at 20.1%.
4. In the case of energy while the recommended share of 9.7% the actual works out to 18.1%, which is very high
5. Industry and minerals, science and technology and economic services are given low amount of allocation and as such actuals are also low.
6. Transport is recommended to get a share of 5.3 per cent but the actual allocation for the three year period works out to 8%.
7. Social services sector was recommended to have the highest share of 25.9 per cent but the actual allocation for the three year period is much less at 13.1 per cent.

From this analysis a point that arises is that barring agriculture sector, in respect of all other major sectors the actual allocation is not consistent with what was recommended by the D.M. Nanjundappa Committee.

Table 6: Sector wise money spent

Sl. No.	Sector/Programme	Recommended		Spent 2007-08			Spent 2008-09			Spent 2009-10			Spent during three years	
		Outlay	%	Actual	%		Actual	%		Actual	%		Actual	%
I	Agriculture and Allied	2340	7.55	60.97	6.4		155.55	8.9		80.29	6.1		297	7.4
1	Agriculture	2000	6.45	3.43	0.4	*	26.32	1.5	**	27.04	2.1	¥	57	1.4
2	Sericulture	100	0.32											
3	Horticulture	100	0.32	14	1.5		37.8	2.2		27.72	2.1		80	2.0
4	Fisheries	70	0.23											
5	Animal Husbandry	70	0.23	43.54	4.6		72.05	4.1		6.62	0.5		122	3.1
6	<i>Social Forestry</i>						19.37	1.1		18.91	1.4		38	1.0
II	Rural Development	7100	22.9	344.33	36.3		513.93	29.5		358.56	27.4		1217	30.5
1	Rural Roads	600	1.94	98.23	10.3		95.21	5.5		98.44	7.5		292	7.3
2	Z.P. Roads	400	1.29											
3	Rural Water Supply	4500	14.52				17.49	1.0		22.8	1.7		40	1
4	Rural Housing	1600	5.16	100	10.5		361.88	20.8		188.45	14.4		650	16.3
	<i>Gama Swaraj</i>			146.6	15.4		39.35	2.3		48.87	3.7		235	5.9
	Other										0.0			
III	Irrigation	8000	25.81	225.58	23.8		323.44	18.6		255.28	19.5		804	20.1
1	Irrigation	7800	25.16	225.58	23.8		289.42	16.6	"	247.08	18.9	μ	762	19.1
2	Water Recharging Scheme	200	0.65				34.02	2.0	***	8.2	0.6	§	42	1.1
IV	Energy	3000	9.68	132.22	13.9		378.13	21.7		213.67	16.4		724	18.1
1	Power	3000	9.68	132.22	13.9		378.13	21.7		213.67	16.4		724	18.1

V	Industry & Minerals	400	1.29	2.42	0.3		6.6	0.4		0		9	0.2
1	Industry (Industrial Sheds, Industrial Infrastructure, State Finance Corporation of North Karnataka)	400	1.29	2.42	0.3		6.6	0.4				9	0.2
VI	Transport	1650	5.32	118.52	12.5		108.17	6.2		92.54	7.1	319	8
1	Railways	500	1.61	28	2.9		20	1.1		25	1.9	73	1.8
2	Airstrips/Reviving airports fallen into disuse	1000	3.23	19.5	2.1		46.58	2.7		26.63	2.0	93	2.3
3	Ports	150	0.48										
	<i>Road Transport</i>			71.02	7.5		41.59	2.4		40.91	3.1	154	3.8
VII	Science and Technology	200	0.65					0.0		0.0			
1	I.T. & B.T.	200	0.65										
VIII	Economic Services	10	0.03										
1	Banking, Co-operation & other financial Institutions	10	0.03										
IX	Social Services	8025	25.89	64.89	6.8		231.05	13.3		226.62	17.3	523	13.1
1	Health	800	2.58	20	2.1		26.73	1.5		27.65	2.1	74	1.9
2	Education	1000	3.23				112.37	6.5		91.76	7.0	204	5.1
3	Sports	25	0.08										
4	Tourism	2000	6.45							14.5	1.1	15	0.4
5	Urban Development	200	0.65							27	2.1	27	0.7
6	Urban Water Supply	3000	9.68										

7	Weaker Section, Women Development & Social Welfare	1000	3.23			91.95	5.3	'	65.71	5.0	£	158	3.9
	<i>Energisation of G.K. Wells</i>			44.89	4.7							45	1.1
X	<i>Karnataka State Accelerated Fire and Emergency Services (KSAFE)</i>					9.28	0.5					9	0.2
XI	<i>Labour</i>					13.28	0.8		20	1.5		33	0.8
XII	<i>Public Work</i>								59.38	4.5		59	1.5
	Total	30725	99.11										
	Rounded off to	31000	100										
	Anticipated flow (outlay) in Annual plans (114 Taluks)	15000	48.39										
	Net Additional Outlay (114 Taluks)	16000	51.61										
	Total Earmarked SDP Outlay			1571.5		2547.34			2543.86			6663	
	Amount Released			956.58		1710.42			1420.12			4087	
	Expenditure			949.42	100.0	1739.41	100.0		1306.34	100.0		3995	100

Note: *Raith Sampark Kendra

**-Raith Sampark Kendra - 1.28 and UAS Raichur 0.23

***-Rastriya Krishi Vikasa Yojane Watershed - 1.35 and Restoration & Rejuvenation of ZP Tanks -0.61

Major Irrigation

' Social Welfare 5.26 and Women & Child Development - 0.03

¥- Rastriya Krishi vikasa Yojane Agriculture - 1.71, Enrichment of soil fertility 0.36

§ - Rastriya Krishi Vikasa yojane Watershed741 and Restoration & Rejuvenation of ZP Tanks 78.48

Rural Communication -0.67, Block Grants (CMGSY) - 1.16

¶ Infrastructure for Urban Ashraya Layouts 2.07

µ Major irrigation 16.77 and minor Irrigation 2.15

£ Social Welfare 3.88, Women and Child Development 1.1

TALUK WISE ALLOCATION OF SDP OUTLAY:

The scheme of allocation suggested in Table 2 refers only to the divisions. The implementation authorities need to work out the taluk-wise allocation too because the Nanjundappa Committee has insisted on the plan implementation at the taluk level by the taluk development departments. The basis for such allocation, of course, should be the value of the taluk CDI. The Nanjundappa Committee, on the basis of its exercise, arrived at CDI values for each of the taluks and grouped the taluks on the basis of the level of development into three categories, namely, most backward, more backward and backward⁵. And then based on the CDI values, suggested the resource allocation ratio in respect of each of the three categories of taluks as shown in the Table 7.

Table 7: Taluk-wise CDI Class Intervals, CDI Values and Resource Allocation Ratio

Category of Taluks	CDI Class Intervals	CDI Values	Resource Allocation Ratio (% to total)
Most Backward	0.52-0.79	0.48	60
More Backward	0.79-0.88	0.21	24
Backward	0.88-1.00	0.12	16

From this Table, it is evident that in the matter of resource allocation more weight-age is given to the most backward taluks compared with others because of the longer distance these taluks have to travel in the development scale to reach the state average. For the benefit of the implementers of the SDP, the guideline is that they should first arrive at the division-wise allocation out of the budgetary provision by following the CDI formula shown in Table 2. Out of the quantum of funds arrived at thus at the division level, the implementers are advised to distribute this fund to each of the taluks across the three categories of taluks in the ratio indicated in Table 7 viz., 60:24:16. If such an exercise is done, the beneficiary taluks on an average should get more funds in Gulbarga division than in Belgaum division and more in the north when compared with south. Also within north, the most backward more backward and backward taluks of Gulbarga division should get more funds compared with similar categories of taluks in Belgaum division. So is the case with Mysore division and Bangalore division. It is of some interest at this stage to examine to what extent the actual allocation across the three categories is consistent with the spirit of the above guideline.

⁵ It may be stated here that ever since the committee worked out the CDI values in the year 2001-02, there would have been some changes in the development levels of the taluks under consideration. Ideally, it would be desirable to capture these changes and rework the CDI values. This work is underway in the Planning Department. Till the results of this work are out, we have to be content with the analysis of the static situation.

With a view to examining the consistency between recommended and actual value here two exercises have been done. In the first exercise, given the CDI in respect of each of the 114 taluks two sets of values are given in Table 8 – one being the recommended values brought to the current prices and the other being the actual budgetary allocation values. Comparing both values gaps are identified. In the next stage, actual expenditure in respect of each of these taluks is compared with the budgetary allocation figures and the gaps between the two thereof are presented. These figures are presented in Appendix Table 1.

Using the above data two summary Tables are prepared and presented as Table 8 and Table 9. In Table 8 the CDI values of each of the three categories of taluks is cumulated to arrive at the Table which shows deprivation level in these taluks under various divisions. Assuming that the SDP recommended outlay for the eight year period of 2002-03 to 2010-11 is Rs. 2000 crore for each year, the recommended amount that each of these categories should get is arrived at in proportion to the total value of CDI. This amount is escalated by the whole sale price index numbers for each of the years from 2007-08 to 2009-10 and the resultant amounts are then cumulated for three years which add-up to Rs. 8,280 crore. From this Table it may be seen that Gulbarga, Belgaum, Bangalore and Mysore respectively should get Rs. 3,291 crore, Rs. 1,715 crore, Rs. 2,139 crore and Rs. 1,135 crore. But actual allocation falls short of the recommended amount because the budgetary allocation itself is lower compared with the recommended amount (Table 3). Secondly, in addition to the budgetary allocation being short of the recommended amount, the other point is that the expenditure part is also short of the recommended amount because the released amount has been less than what was allocated in the budget (Table 4)

Consequent to these reasons two points emerge. One, the various divisions are deprived of the share in the recommended SDP and second, within each division the different categories of taluks are also deprived of their share in the SDP funds. These two points emerge from the data presented in Table 9. It will be seen from this Table that during the three years of 2007-08 to 2009-10, while Gulbarga ought to have received 40 per cent of outlay it gets only 35.15 per cent of the SDP outlay. The other division which has got less than the recommended share of 15 per cent is Mysore division with about 14 per cent of SDP outlay. The loss of these two divisions is a gain for Belgaum which gets 23.13 per cent as against 20 per cent and Bangalore gets 27 per cent against 25 per cent recommended.

Table 8: Outlay recommended and actual amount spent by the three categories of taluks

Region	CCDI	CDI	Amount Recommended						Budgetary Outlay				Amount Spent				Gap (Recomm ended-amount spent)	% achiev ed
			Total in 8 years in 2002-02 prices	Every Year in 2002-03 prices	2007-08 Current Prices	2008-09 (CP)	2009-10 (CP)	Three years (CP)	07-08 (CP)	08-09 (CP)	09-10 (CP)	Three years (CP)	07-08 (CP)	08-09 (CP)	09-10 (CP)	Three years (CP)		
MSB (21)	13.93	7.07	5619	702	906	983	1019	2908	178	674	788	1639	164	516	213	893	2015	31
MRB (5)	4.25	0.75	596	75	96	104	108	308	18	132	136	286	29	76	19	123	185	40
B (2)	1.82	0.18	143	18	23	25	26	74	11	97	81	188	21	60	12	93	-19	126
Gulbarga Division (28)	20	8	6359	795	1025	1113	1153	3291	207	903	1004	2114	214	652	244	1110	2181	34
MSB (5)	3.45	1.55	1232	154	199	216	223	638	39	151	184	374	34	116	50	199	439	31
MRB (12)	10.27	1.73	1375	172	222	241	249	712	42	189	206	437	70	118	104	292	420	41
B (14)	13.11	0.89	707	88	114	124	128	366	43	110	148	300	82	114	63	259	107	71
Belgaum Division (31)	26.83	4.17	3314	414	534	580	601	1715	123	450	538	1111	186	348	216	750	965	44
MSB (11)	8.34	2.66	2114	264	341	370	383	1094	88	268	287	644	120	168	86	374	720	34
MRB(13)	10.91	2.03	1614	202	260	282	292	835	32	142	144	318	68	112	37	217	618	26
B(9)	8.49	0.51	405	51	65	71	73	210	17	85	82	184	45	143	79	266	-57	127
Bangalore Division (33)	27.74	5.2	4133	517	666	723	749	2139	138	495	513	1146	233	423	201	857	1282	40
MSB (2)	1.5	0.5	397	50	64	70	72	206	17	58	83	159	12	29	6	46	159	22
MRB (10)	8.35	1.65	1311	164	211	230	238	679	34	152	136	322	51	115	30	195	484	29
B (10)	9.39	0.61	485	61	78	85	88	251	22	112	96	231	49	119	32	200	51	80
Mysore Division (22)	19.24	2.76	2194	274	354	384	398	1135	74	322	316	712	111	263	67	441	694	39
Grand Total	93.81	20.13	16000	2000	2580	2800	2900	8280	542	2169	2371	5082	744	1686	729	3158	5122	38

Note: District level plan expenditure have been excluded

Table 9: Outlay recommended and actually spent by division in percentage

Region	As a share to total SDP					As a share to division				
	Recommended	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	Three years	Recommended	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	Three years
MSB (21)	35.12	22.05	30.61	29.26	28.28	88.38	76.71	79.17	87.26	80.48
MRB (5)	3.73	3.86	4.49	2.59	3.9	9.38	13.45	11.6	7.73	11.11
B (2)	0.89	2.83	3.57	1.68	2.96	2.25	9.85	9.23	5.01	8.42
Gulbarga Division (28)	39.74	28.74	38.67	33.53	35.15	100	100	100	100	100
MSB (5)	7.7	4.51	6.86	6.8	6.29	37.17	18.06	33.23	22.94	26.5
MRB (12)	8.59	9.42	7	14.22	9.24	41.49	37.68	33.94	47.95	38.91
B (14)	4.42	11.06	6.78	8.63	8.21	21.34	44.25	32.83	29.11	34.59
Belgaum Division (31)	20.72	24.98	20.64	29.65	23.74	100	100	100	100	100
MSB (11)	13.21	16.16	9.94	11.83	11.85	51.15	51.63	39.62	42.85	43.64
MRB(13)	10.08	9.15	6.65	5.01	6.86	39.04	29.21	26.49	18.15	25.27
B(9)	2.53	6	8.5	10.77	8.44	9.81	19.16	33.88	39	31.08
Bangalore Division (33)	25.83	31.31	25.1	27.62	27.14	100	100	100	100	100
MSB (2)	2.48	1.56	1.71	0.79	1.46	18.12	10.43	10.99	8.58	10.48
MRB (10)	8.2	6.85	6.8	4.05	6.18	59.78	45.81	43.61	44.06	44.23
B (10)	3.03	6.55	7.08	4.36	6.33	22.1	43.76	45.4	47.36	45.29
Mysore Division (22)	13.71	14.96	15.6	9.2	13.97	100	100	100	100	100

Note: District level plan expenditure has been excluded

Coming to the three categories of taluks, the Table shows that the most backward taluks get less than their recommended share (7 percentage points in Gulbarga, 1.4 percentage share in Belgaum, Bangalore and 1 percentage point in Mysore division). Similar is the case with more backward taluks in Belgaum, Bangalore and Mysore divisions because they get less than the recommended outlay during the 3 years under reference – exception being Gulbarga division where more backward districts get slightly higher share compared to the recommended outlay. The loss of these two categories of the taluks is a gain for backward taluks as they get as much as two times of the recommended share. To say the least, inequitable distribution of outlay across the different categories of taluks has happened as for as resource allocation is concerned.

The situation is not different if the shares of these taluks within each division are observed. It may be seen from Table 9 the allocation of outlay for most backward and more backward taluks in Gulbarga division is 8 percentage points and 1.25 percentage points less than the recommended share respectively. In the Belgaum division the corresponding figures are 10.7 per cent and 1.5 per cent less than the recommended share respectively for most backward and more backward taluks. In Bangalore division the shortage in the share of these taluks respectively is 8.5 per cent and 14.8 per cent respectively, and the corresponding figures in Mysore division are 7.6 per cent and 15.5 per cent. Since the allocation within the divisions is lower for most backward and more backward taluks the beneficiary taluks are of course backward taluks. Under the circumstances, development imbalance is likely to emerge among the various categories of backward taluks.

5. FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

Following findings emerge from the analysis of the data on resource allocation for broad regions, sectors/departments and taluks.

1. The budgetary outlay for all the 4 years falls short of the outlay adjusted to 2002-03 prices as recommended by the D. M. Nanjundappa Committee. The gap is more in 2007-08 – as much as more than Rs. 1000 core
2. The budgetary allocation for every year has been higher than 60 per cent for the north region and it is less than 40 per cent for south region.

3. The amount released has been only 76 per cent of budgetary allocation in 2008-09 and 31 per cent in the year 2009-10 (for the 9 month period of this year). As for 2007-08, the amount released is only Rs. 1,207 crore as against Rs 1,518 crore allocated, which means the release works out to 79 per cent
4. If one considers expenditure part of the budgetary allocation, more or less the same pattern emerges. The released amount compared to total outlay is equal to or lower or higher than the amount released during some years.
5. As for the sectoral/departmental allocation is concerned, while the actual allocation in respect of agriculture and allied sector is consistent with the recommended share, rural development gets a higher level of allocation but irrigation does not get the recommended share. Surprisingly, energy gets double the recommended share and transport gets one third (1/3) higher share than was recommended. **The social services sector is the most neglected sector getting only half of the recommended share of the outlay.**
6. The taluk wise allocation is also quite away from the recommended pattern. **The most backward and more backward taluks end-up getting lower than the recommended share.** The loss of these categories of taluks is the gain of backward taluks, whose actual shares are two times the recommended shares. This means that there is lack of consistency between actual allocation and the recommended allocation in respect of the most backward, more backward and backward taluks. Since not so backward taluks get more resources than the recommended amount compared to the more and most backward taluks the following scenario may emerge. Within the group of 114 backward taluks the not so backward taluks may grow faster than the more backward and most backward taluks. Such a development may give rise to imbalance within the group of the backward taluks.

Implementation of D. M. Nanjundappa Committee Recommendations for Redressal of Regional Imbalance

Appendix Table 1: Taluk wise Progress of Special Development Plan from 2007-08 to 2009-10

Most Backward Taluks																			
SL	Division	District	Name of the Taluk	CCDI	CDI	Money Recommended						Money Spent				Target Achieved in %			
						Total in 8 years in 2002-02 prices	Every Year in 2002-03 prices	2007-08 Current Prices	2008-09 (CP)	2009-10 (CP)	Three years (CP)	2007-08 (CP)	2008-09 (CP)	2009-10 (CP)	Three years (CP)	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	Three years
1	Gulbarga	Raichur	Devdurga	0.53	0.47	374	46.7	60.24	65.38	67.71	193	3	28	2	34	6	43	4	18
2	Gulbarga	Gulbarga	Chincholi	0.57	0.43	342	42.72	55.11	59.81	61.95	177	8	34	12	54	15	57	20	31
3	Gulbarga	Gulbarga	Jevargi	0.57	0.43	342	42.72	55.11	59.81	61.95	177	6	12	4	21	10	20	6	12
4	Gulbarga	Gulbarga	Aland	0.61	0.39	310	38.75	49.99	54.25	56.18	160	11	14	36	61	22	26	64	38
5	Gulbarga	Gulbarga	Afzalpur	0.62	0.38	302	37.75	48.7	52.86	54.74	156	9	40	31	81	19	76	57	52
6	Gulbarga	Gulbarga	Shahpur	0.62	0.38	302	37.75	48.7	52.86	54.74	156	11	25	10	45	22	47	18	29
7	Gulbarga	Koppal	Yelbarga	0.63	0.37	294	36.76	47.42	51.47	53.3	152	7	13	3	24	16	25	6	16
8	Gulbarga	Raichur	Lingasagur	0.63	0.37	294	36.76	47.42	51.47	53.3	152	6	15	4	25	12	29	8	17
9	Belgaum	Bijapur	Sindhgi	0.64	0.36	286	35.77	46.14	50.07	51.86	148	6	32	13	50	13	63	24	34
10	Gulbarga	Koppal	Kushtagi	0.64	0.36	286	35.77	46.14	50.07	51.86	148	6	20	10	36	12	40	19	24
11	Gulbarga	Bidar	Aurad	0.65	0.35	278	34.77	44.86	48.68	50.42	144	9	48	17	73	19	98	33	51
12	Gulbarga	Gulbarga	Chittapur	0.65	0.35	278	34.77	44.86	48.68	50.42	144	10	40	32	81	21	82	64	57
13	Belgaum	Bijapur	Indi	0.66	0.34	270	33.78	43.58	47.29	48.98	140	8	40	10	58	17	85	21	41
14	Gulbarga	Gulbarga	Yadgiri	0.67	0.33	262	32.79	42.3	45.9	47.54	136	15	19	4	37	35	41	8	28
15	Belgaum	Bijapur	B.Bagevadi	0.69	0.31	246	30.8	39.73	43.12	44.66	128	8	21	10	39	21	49	22	31
16	Belgaum	Bijapur	Muddebihal	0.69	0.31	246	30.8	39.73	43.12	44.66	128	7	10	5	22	17	23	12	17
17	Gulbarga	Bidar	Basavakalyan	0.69	0.31	246	30.8	39.73	43.12	44.66	128	7	20	3	29	17	46	6	23
18	Gulbarga	Raichur	Manvi	0.69	0.31	246	30.8	39.73	43.12	44.66	128	5	20	4	28	12	46	8	22
19	Gulbarga	Gulbarga	Shorapur	0.7	0.3	238	29.81	38.45	41.73	43.22	123	8	16	8	32	22	38	18	26
20	Bangalore	Davangere	Harapanahalli	0.72	0.28	223	27.82	35.89	38.95	40.34	115	12	12	5	29	33	31	12	25
21	Bangalore	Tumkur	Pavagada	0.72	0.28	223	27.82	35.89	38.95	40.34	115	12	17	2	31	34	43	4	27
22	Gulbarga	Gulbarga	Sedam	0.72	0.28	223	27.82	35.89	38.95	40.34	115	5	7	2	14	15	18	5	12
23	Mysore	Mysore	H.D. Kote	0.72	0.28	223	27.82	35.89	38.95	40.34	115	4	13	2	20	12	34	6	17
24	Bangalore	Tumkur	Sira	0.73	0.27	215	26.83	34.61	37.56	38.9	111	14	13	2	29	39	35	6	26
25	Gulbarga	Bidar	Humnabad	0.73	0.27	215	26.83	34.61	37.56	38.9	111	8	15	3	26	23	41	7	23
26	Bangalore	Ramanagara	Kanakapura	0.74	0.26	207	25.83	33.32	36.16	37.46	107	13	30	24	67	38	84	63	62
27	Bangalore	Tumkur	Madugiri	0.74	0.26	207	25.83	33.32	36.16	37.46	107	10	15	3	28	30	41	9	26
28	Gulbarga	Bellary	Kudligi	0.74	0.26	207	25.83	33.32	36.16	37.46	107	11	21	7	39	33	59	19	36
29	Gulbarga	Bidar	Bhalki	0.74	0.26	207	25.83	33.32	36.16	37.46	107	6	48	12	66	17	132	33	62
30	Gulbarga	Bellary	Sandur	0.75	0.25	199	24.84	32.04	34.77	36.02	103	7	10	6	23	22	28	17	22
31	Bangalore	Chikballapur	Bagepalli	0.76	0.24	191	23.85	30.76	33.38	34.58	99	6	10	2	18	21	31	4	19
32	Belgaum	Bagalkote	Bilagi	0.77	0.23	183	22.85	29.48	31.99	33.13	95	5	13	12	29	16	40	35	31
33	Bangalore	Chitradurga	Hosadurga	0.78	0.22	175	21.86	28.2	30.6	31.69	90	8	17	3	27	28	54	9	30
34	Bangalore	Davangere	Channagiri	0.78	0.22	175	21.86	28.2	30.6	31.69	90	10	14	35	60	36	46	111	66

Implementation of D. M. Nanjundappa Committee Recommendations for Redressal of Regional Imbalance

More Backward Taluks																			
SL	Division	District	Name of the Taluk	CCDI	CDI	Money Recommended						Money Spent				Target Achieved in %			
						Total in 8 years in 2002-02 prices	Every Year in 2002-03 prices	2007-08 Current Prices	2008-09 (CP)	2009-10 (CP)	Three years (CP)	2007-08 (CP)	2008-09 (CP)	2009-10 (CP)	Three years (CP)	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	Three years
1	Bangalore	Davangere	Jagalur	0.8	0.2	159	19.87	25.63	27.82	28.81	82	5	9	2	16	19	34	8	20
2	Mysore	Chamrajnagar	Kollegal	0.8	0.2	159	19.87	25.63	27.82	28.81	82	4	11	3	17	15	38	10	21
3	Mysore	Mandya	Krishnarajpet	0.8	0.2	159	19.87	25.63	27.82	28.81	82	6	14	3	22	23	49	9	27
4	Bangalore	Chitradurga	Chellakare	0.81	0.2	151	18.88	24.35	26.43	27.37	78	7	13	5	25	31	49	17	32
5	Mysore	Chamrajnagar	Gundlupet	0.81	0.2	151	18.88	24.35	26.43	27.37	78	5	8	2	15	19	31	9	20
6	Mysore	Chikmagalur	Kadur	0.81	0.2	151	18.88	24.35	26.43	27.37	78	6	11	4	21	26	42	13	27
7	Gulbarga	Koppal	Koppal	0.81	0.2	151	18.88	24.35	26.43	27.37	78	8	21	3	33	35	81	9	42
8	Belgaum	Bagalkote	Badami	0.82	0.2	143	17.88	23.07	25.04	25.93	74	7	8	3	17	30	30	10	23
9	Belgaum	Uttar Kannada	Batkal	0.82	0.2	143	17.88	23.07	25.04	25.93	74	1	4	1	6	6	15	4	9
10	Bangalore	Shimoga	Soraba	0.82	0.2	143	17.88	23.07	25.04	25.93	74	3	12	5	20	12	49	18	27
11	Bangalore	Tumkur	C.N. Halli	0.83	0.2	135	16.89	21.79	23.65	24.49	70	6	8	3	17	28	35	13	25
12	Bangalore	Tumkur	Koratagere	0.83	0.2	135	16.89	21.79	23.65	24.49	70	6	6	2	14	27	24	8	19
13	Mysore	Mandya	Nagamangala	0.83	0.2	135	16.89	21.79	23.65	24.49	70	5	8	1	14	21	33	5	20
14	Bangalore	Chikballapur	Gowribidanur	0.83	0.1	87	10.93	14.1	15.3	15.85	45	7	11	3	21	49	74	19	47
15	Mysore	Hassan	Arakalgud	0.84	0.2	127	15.9	20.51	22.26	23.05	66	3	16	2	21	17	70	9	32
16	Bangalore	Chikballapur	Gudibande	0.84	0.2	127	15.9	20.51	22.26	23.05	66	1	4	1	5	4	16	4	8
17	Gulbarga	Bellary	H.B. Halli	0.84	0.2	127	15.9	20.51	22.26	23.05	66	5	10	1	16	24	45	5	25
18	Bangalore	Chitradurga	Holalkere	0.84	0.2	127	15.9	20.51	22.26	23.05	66	5	6	2	14	24	29	9	21
19	Belgaum	Dharwad	Kalghatagi	0.84	0.2	127	15.9	20.51	22.26	23.05	66	5	10	5	20	26	45	21	31
20	Mysore	Mandya	Malavalli	0.84	0.2	127	15.9	20.51	22.26	23.05	66	5	12	3	21	25	56	13	31
21	Bangalore	Chitradurga	Molakalmur	0.84	0.2	127	15.9	20.51	22.26	23.05	66	3	7	1	11	14	31	6	17
22	Belgaum	Haveri	Shiggaon	0.84	0.2	127	15.9	20.51	22.26	23.05	66	4	6	3	13	19	28	13	20
23	Belgaum	Bagalkote	Hunugund	0.85	0.2	119	14.9	19.23	20.86	21.61	62	7	33	12	52	37	158	54	84
24	Belgaum	Belgaum	Gokak	0.86	0.1	111	13.91	17.94	19.47	20.17	58	11	9	27	48	62	48	136	83
25	Bangalore	Davangere	Honnali	0.86	0.1	111	13.91	17.94	19.47	20.17	58	5	11	4	20	27	54	21	34
26	Belgaum	Belgaum	Saudhatti	0.86	0.1	111	13.91	17.94	19.47	20.17	58	7	10	29	46	39	50	144	80
27	Gulbarga	Bellary	Siruguppa	0.86	0.1	111	13.91	17.94	19.47	20.17	58	6	8	3	17	35	43	14	30
28	Bangalore	Tumkur	Turuvekere	0.86	0.1	111	13.91	17.94	19.47	20.17	58	6	6	2	14	36	32	8	25
29	Gulbarga	Bellary	Hadagali	0.87	0.1	103	12.92	16.66	18.08	18.73	53	6	13	10	29	39	72	53	55
30	Bangalore	Chitradurga	Hiriyur	0.87	0.1	103	12.92	16.66	18.08	18.73	53	8	10	3	20	46	53	15	38
31	Mysore	Mysore	Nanjanagud	0.87	0.1	103	12.92	16.66	18.08	18.73	53	8	7	3	17	48	37	14	33
32	Gulbarga	Raichur	Raichur	0.87	0.1	103	12.92	16.66	18.08	18.73	53	2	23	2	28	15	126	13	52
33	Belgaum	Haveri	Savanur	0.87	0.1	103	12.92	16.66	18.08	18.73	53	4	5	2	11	25	25	13	21
34	Belgaum	Uttar Kannada	Supa(Joida)	0.87	0.1	103	12.92	16.66	18.08	18.73	53	2	4	2	8	12	25	10	16
35	Mysore	Mysore	T.Narasipur	0.87	0.1	103	12.92	16.66	18.08	18.73	53	4	21	5	30	23	117	28	56
36	Belgaum	Belgaum	Athani	0.88	0.1	95	11.92	15.38	16.69	17.29	49	11	9	5	25	69	54	28	50
37	Belgaum	Haveri	Hirekerur	0.88	0.1	95	11.92	15.38	16.69	17.29	49	7	7	1	15	45	39	7	30
38	Mysore	Mysore	Hunsur	0.88	0.1	95	11.92	15.38	16.69	17.29	49	5	8	4	16	33	46	21	33
39	Bangalore	Kolar	Mulbagal	0.88	0.1	95	11.92	15.38	16.69	17.29	49	7	9	4	19	44	53	21	39
40	Belgaum	Gadag	Mundaragi	0.88	0.1	95	11.92	15.38	16.69	17.29	49	4	14	14	31	24	82	78	63

Implementation of D. M. Nanjundappa Committee Recommendations for Redressal of Regional Imbalance

Backward Taluks																			
SL	Division	District	Name of the Taluk	CCDI	CDI	Money Recommended						Money sSent				Target Achieved in %			
						Total in 8 years in 2002-02 prices	Every Year in 2002-03 prices	2007-08 Current Prices	2008-09 (CP)	2009-10 (CP)	Three years (CP)	2007-08 (CP)	2008-09 (CP)	2009-10 (CP)	Three years (CP)	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	Three years
1	Belgaum	Belgaum	Hukkeri	0.89	0.1	87	10.93	14.10	15.30	15.85	45	3	14	4	21	20	90	25	45
2	Belgaum	Gadag	Sirahatti	0.89	0.1	87	10.93	14.10	15.30	15.85	45	6	9	2	18	43	61	15	39
3	Gulbarga	Gulbarga	Gulbarga	0.89	0.1	87	10.93	14.10	15.30	15.85	45	16	40	10	65	111	261	60	144
4	Mysore	Chikmagalur	Tarikere	0.89	0.1	87	10.93	14.10	15.30	15.85	45	6	32	6	44	42	212	38	98
5	Bangalore	Bangalore Urban	Anekal	0.9	0.1	79	9.94	12.82	13.91	14.41	41	5	58	24	87	40	415	165	211
6	Belgaum	Belgaum	Ramdurg	0.9	0.1	79	9.94	12.82	13.91	14.41	41	6	11	3	20	45	82	22	49
7	Bangalore	Chikballapur	Sidlaghatta	0.91	0.1	72	8.94	11.54	12.52	12.97	37	5	9	2	16	46	72	13	43
8	Mysore	Hassan	Arasikere	0.91	0.1	72	8.94	11.54	12.52	12.97	37	6	6	3	15	49	51	26	42
9	Bangalore	Shimoga	Shikaripura	0.92	0.1	64	7.95	10.25	11.13	11.53	33	4	30	7	40	39	266	59	123
10	Belgaum	Belgaum	Raybag	0.92	0.1	64	7.95	10.25	11.13	11.53	33	10	9	3	22	95	81	25	66
11	Belgaum	Bijapur	Bijapur	0.92	0.1	64	7.95	10.25	11.13	11.53	33	11	13	6	30	104	121	56	93
12	Belgaum	Gadag	Rona	0.92	0.1	64	7.95	10.25	11.13	11.53	33	7	6	2	15	64	57	16	45
13	Belgaum	Haveri	Hanagal	0.92	0.1	64	7.95	10.25	11.13	11.53	33	7	12	2	21	65	104	21	63
14	Belgaum	Uttar Kannada	Siddapur	0.92	0.1	64	7.95	10.25	11.13	11.53	33	2	6	1	8	15	52	10	26
15	Mysore	Hassan	Chennarayapatna	0.92	0.1	64	7.95	10.25	11.13	11.53	33	6	9	2	18	61	85	22	55
16	Mysore	Mysore	K.R. Nagar	0.92	0.1	64	7.95	10.25	11.13	11.53	33	5	5	2	12	47	46	16	36
17	Bangalore	Kolar	Malur	0.93	0.1	56	6.95	8.97	9.74	10.08	29	5	7	5	17	58	69	54	60
18	Gulbarga	Koppal	Gangavathi	0.93	0.1	56	6.95	8.97	9.74	10.08	29	5	20	3	28	61	208	27	99
19	Mysore	Hassan	Belur	0.94	0.1	48	5.96	7.69	8.35	8.64	25	5	7	3	16	68	86	39	64
20	Mysore	Mandya	Pandavapur	0.94	0.1	48	5.96	7.69	8.35	8.64	25	5	5	3	13	66	58	36	53
21	Bangalore	Ramanagara	Chennapattana	0.95	0.1	40	4.97	6.41	6.95	7.20	21	9	4	2	15	136	62	24	71
22	Belgaum	Belgaum	Bailhongala	0.95	0.1	40	4.97	6.41	6.95	7.20	21	9	8	24	42	146	120	336	204
23	Belgaum	Dharwad	Kundagol	0.95	0.1	40	4.97	6.41	6.95	7.20	21	4	6	1	11	65	86	13	54
24	Mysore	Mandya	Maddur	0.95	0.1	40	4.97	6.41	6.95	7.20	21	7	6	3	16	102	85	44	76
25	Bangalore	Kolar	Bangarpet	0.96	0	32	3.97	5.13	5.56	5.76	16	6	9	7	22	114	166	128	136
26	Bangalore	Bangalore Rural	Hoskote	0.97	0	24	2.98	3.85	4.17	4.32	12	3	7	27	37	88	171	616	301
27	Bangalore	Chikballapur	Chintamani	0.97	0	24	2.98	3.85	4.17	4.32	12	5	10	3	18	126	245	61	144
28	Bangalore	Haveri	Byadagi	0.97	0	24	2.98	3.85	4.17	4.32	12	6	4	3	12	146	89	72	101
29	Mysore	Hassan	Holenarasipura	0.97	0	24	2.98	3.85	4.17	4.32	12	3	10	4	17	69	245	84	134
30	Mysore	Mysore	Piriyapatna	0.97	0	24	2.98	3.85	4.17	4.32	12	4	33	2	39	96	800	42	315
31	Bangalore	Kolar	Srinivasapura	0.98	0	16	1.99	2.56	2.78	2.88	8	2	9	2	14	86	340	83	171
32	Belgaum	Uttar Kannada	Ankola	0.98	0	16	1.99	2.56	2.78	2.88	8	2	4	1	7	76	140	44	86
33	Mysore	Mandya	Srirangapatna	0.98	0	16	1.99	2.56	2.78	2.88	8	3	5	3	10	110	162	101	125
34	Belgaum	Dharwad	Navalgund	0.99	0	8	0.99	1.28	1.39	1.44	4	6	5	1	12	435	383	92	297
35	Belgaum	Haveri	Haveri	0.99	0	8	0.99	1.28	1.39	1.44	4	6	6	8	20	436	461	539	480

