

## Chapter 26

### Functioning of Regional Boards

#### 26.1: Expectation of Harmony and Faster Growth

1. Under the States Reorganisation Act of 1956 when Karnataka state was formed on November 1, 1956, it brought together several regions which were formerly parts of different states. For purposes of re-grouping the talukas in to the reorganized states, a linguistic criterion was used. The Kannada speaking people from the Indian Union, for whom their mother-tongue Kannada gave hopes of closer integration for the development of its economy; and its culture became euphoric and cherished very high expectations. The purpose of such a reorganisation was also felt necessary, among other things, to give an opportunity to develop on an equitable basis, to such talukas and regions with varying levels of economic development prior to the reorganisation. It was then felt that this would pave the way for better harmony and faster growth.

2. There is a history and purpose behind every act and action, be it by the people or the government, under the Constitution or outside of it. So is also the case with the formation of Regional Development Boards in Karnataka. At the time of state re-organisation in 1956, four districts of the then Bombay state, two districts of Madras state, three districts of the then Hyderabad-Karnataka and erstwhile Coorg joined the old Mysore state with ten districts then, to form the present Karnataka state. There was a wide spectrum of cultural, social, economic and historical diversity among these different regions, but with a common language as the binding strength for the present day Karnataka in demonstrating the power of democracy bringing unity with diversity.

3. Sooner, it was realized that there are grave differences in the status of development between the regions and also within the regions but between the districts. Thus it became an issue for the Vishal Karnataka for bringing more and more cohesive and balanced state of regional development in the entire state. Starting from the Fifth Five Year Plan (1974-79), increasing emphasis were laid on redressing regional disparities. The government then, took up this as a challenge through the planning process, and legal procedures by creating several avenues to bridge the gaps in regional development across the state. Several programmes under DPAP, Tribal Area Development, Command Area Development and many others were targeted to reduce the imbalances in development among the regions and sub-regions of the state. Additionally, in 1978, an element of decentralized planning was introduced at the district level. For this, allocation of plan resources were categorised as, 50% on population basis, and the rest on as many as 11 other indicators of backwardness. Subsequent to the Sixth Plan, however, these regional considerations were given up.

#### 26.2: Constitution of HKADB, MADB, BADB and BADP

4. Since the reorganization in 1956, people of old Bombay Karnataka, Hyderabad Karnataka and other border areas were airing their voices against the extent of regional disparity between the old Mysore talukas and those that have joined the new state. Several committees and academic studies went in to the regional disparity aspects in the past. Among the many, keeping in view of acute backwardness of the then Hyderabad Karnataka region,

a Committee was set up under the Chairmanship of Shri Dharam Singh in 1980. After some debate and consultations, Hyderabad Karnataka Area Development Board (HKADB) came in to existence following Karnataka Government Act 35 dated December 10, 1991. It was based partly on the recommendations of Shri Dharam Singh Committee and partly with the intention of developing the most backward region of the state comprising Gulbarga, Bidar, Raichur (now Koppal as another district), and Bellary districts in respect of social and economic infrastructures such as roads and bridges, health care, educational facilities, enhancing drinking water supply, providing minor irrigation, catering to animal husbandry, promoting sericulture, forestry and urban development. The HKADB started functioning from 1992.

5. On similar lines, the people of Malnad region brought pressure on the government of Karnataka to set up a separate regional development board. The Malnad Area Development Board (MADB) also came into existence under the Karnataka Act No. 36 of December 10, 1991. MADB started functioning from 1993. This was further followed by the promulgation of yet another Government Order, under the same Act, establishing Bayaluseeme Area Development Board in 1994. The Board started functioning from 26<sup>th</sup> October 1995. In addition, another programme under the title Border Area Development Programme (BADP) was started in 1990-91 with a view to develop talukas, which are on the state borders with Goa, Maharashtra, Andhra Pradesh, Tamil Nadu and Kerala. Very recently, Karnataka government had appointed another Official Committee in 1999 headed by the Chief Secretary. Based on the minimal information available at various departmental levels, the Committee did not find any substantial disparity among the northern and southern districts in the state.

6. The Regional Boards in Karnataka have functioned from six to ten years now. All together about Rs. 802 Crores have been invested till 2001 on all the boards' activities and programmes. The rough breakup of these releases are: 63.44% to HKADB, 22.51% to MADB, 3.39% to BADB and the rest to Border Area Programme. The year-wise, constituency-wise and sector-wise allocations/utilizations of funds differ quite significantly, depending upon (a) the total release of funds in any year, (b) the number of constituencies, (c) the number of projects and so on. Some details of these are available in Accompaniment 2 to this Main Report in which the evaluation report from CMDR is reproduced.

7. Falling within the questions of redressing regional disparity in the state, among other things, the Government of Karnataka has specifically referred the matter regarding the functioning of regional boards to the High Power Committee. The specific Terms of Reference assigned to the HPC reads as follows:

*In Karnataka, three Development Boards, viz., Hyderabad-Karnataka Area Development Board, Malnad Area Development Board, and Bayaluseeme Area Development Board have been constituted. Various Committees and the previous Planning Board, have recommended abolition of these Boards in view of creation of Zilla Panchayats and Taluka Panchayats. The Committee may suggest appropriate institutional mechanism for implementing the strategy for reducing inter-regional disparities suggested by it.*

8. Accordingly, HPCFRRI has examined the role of the Regional Boards in depth, with specific reference to reducing inter-regional disparities. A special study was commissioned with Centre for Multi-Disciplinary Development Research (CMDR) to evaluate all the Boards, as well as the Border Area Development Programme, whose findings were taken note of by the HPCFRRI. It has also examined the functioning of similar boards in different states such as Andhra Pradesh and Maharashtra. Experience from area specific development boards such as Sundarban Development Board in West Bengal and North East Development Council were also analysed. Finally, consultations were held regarding the constitutional framework to evolve and suggest appropriate institutional mechanism as well.

### **26.3: Examination of the Objectives of the Boards**

9. The objectives of establishing the regional boards in Karnataka were well founded. Regional Development Boards are the initial responses to the felt need to bridge the developmental gaps between the regions in the newly constituted state of Karnataka. They were visualized as long back as 1980 for evolving a plan for backward area development in the context of the most backward regions of the state, viz. Hyderabad-Karnataka region. Though the broad objectives for setting up of these Boards were roughly the same, the terms of references were quite at variance from each other. Therefore, one always wondered at the outset, if they were actually set up to redress regional disparity at all or not. The charter for all the Boards was like a standard statement on planning. To substantiate this fact, the charter for HKADB reads as follows:

*Whereas it is expedient to provide for establishment of a Development Board for Hyderabad – Karnataka Area, which shall prepare annual plan containing programme and projects for development of Hyderabad-Karnataka Area, supervise the implementation of projects and programmes and monitor and evaluate the implementation of its plan.*

10. In the spirit of the charter and procedure mentioned, the Boards are supposed to (a) prepare the annual plans first, (b) supervise the implementation of the projects, (c) monitor them, and (d) also evaluate the plans. The Boards, however, followed totally different methods of allocating the plan funds, different methods or no methods of supervision, different methods or no methods of implementation, and different methods or no methods of monitoring, and no methods of evaluation at all. Table 26.2 shows a summary of the allocative patterns. As analysed by CMDR, HKADB claimed that when it came to the preparation of annual plans, they followed more or less the pattern of allocation and choice of projects as recommended by the Dharam Singh Committee. These are supposed to be: Road and communication (40%), Health (9%), Education (6%), Minor Irrigation (11%), Animal Husbandry (3%), Sericulture (3%), Forest (19%), Urban development (3%), Others (3%). Clearly, a sectoral approach was taken up, rather than any regional approach. In actuality however, as pointed out in detail by the CMDR study, even this guideline set up by the Dharam Singh Committee was not at all followed. In the ten year period, for instance, 63% of the amount received was spent on roads, 3.6% on health, 5% on minor irrigation, none on forestry and a massive 10% on others including Village Gate and Samudaya Bhavan etc.

11. Likewise, MADB also has not followed the guidelines or objectives of the Boards to redress regional disparity. For instance, as against recommended 20% of works under

‘school buildings’, a meager 3% were taken up. In place of expected 15% allocation on health care, just about 3% were spent. Instead, as against expected 45% allocation on roads, 85% were spent.

12. The story is the same with BADB. Under the objectives for the Bayaluseeme region, sectors like water conservation, soil conservation, development of forests, horticulture and animal husbandry and allied agricultural activities are mentioned, on which ‘no less than 60% of funds were to be allocated. But in actuality, just about 50 % were spent on these. Moreover, such sectoral approach was totally against the spirit of reducing the regional imbalances.

13. HPCFRRI is of the opinion that the regional boards have not at all adhered to the principle of justice and redressal of regional disparity.

#### **26.4: Balancing Regional Development**

14. The only aspect of regionalisation and balancing, if any, was found to be in terms of distribution of funds equally among the constituencies. HPCFRRI basically questions this approach as a long-term procedure for regional development. Regional imbalances appear between talukas and villages because of several factors. The notable ones are landscape and topography, weather (or climate), water supply; social structure and demographic pressure, cultural and historical diversity and so on.

15. When different Boards comprise areas of different levels of development, it is expected that the allocation of funds and choice of the number of works should be positively associated with the level of backwardness and the number of backward areas. No such rationale is witnessed when the activity plans and expenditures of three Boards are compared. Invariably more number of works have been carried out by allotting and spending more funds in the developed districts/constituencies as compared to their backward counterparts of all the Boards. Thus allocation of equal amount of funds by a given Board to each of its constituencies, irrespective of its level of development, amounts to equal treatment of unequals leading to further inequity in the ultimate. Inequality and regional disparity should have been tackled by justifiable allocation of resources to different districts, talukas and constituencies.

16. HPCFRRI is of the view that the equal distribution of powers to use the funds by the constituencies is totally against the objectives of redressing regional imbalances. Just to cite examples of implications of such erroneous approach, one has only to study the cases of development of mainland Punjab with irrigation from Bhakra canal ( in contrast to poorly developed Khandi area of Punjab), plains of Haryana (leaving out Shivalik Haryana), West UP (as a contrast to rest of UP), Southern Gujarat (in contrast to Kutch), Gangatic plains of Bihar (in contrast to former Jharkhand region), wherein better water, electricity, roads, and communications have also brought more public investments. The net result is the visible increased regional imbalances.

## 26.5: A Review of Performance of Regional Boards

17. HPCFRRI has reviewed the Evaluation report from CMDR, and also took note of several recommendations of the Karnataka Planning Board. For instance, the Sixth Plan had devoted an entire chapter on this issue of Regional Balance and Development of Backward Areas. In the light of Zilla Panchayats coming in to action, the Planning Board had also recommended the Government of Karnataka to abolish the Regional Boards.

18. The main findings about the performance of the Regional Boards as highlighted in the CMDR study are reproduced here.

- Though it was supposed to be a planned way of promoting development to redress regional imbalance, no concrete effort or procedures of planning were applied. Neither a proper data base were created, nor maintained, about the effects and impacts of the programmes and projects.
- Even the minimal procedures such as (a) holding regular meetings of the Boards (quarterly, as per the Charters of the Boards), (b) attendance by all the Members, (c) choice of venue of the meetings at the headquarter or in different districts (instead, mostly held in Bangalore only), (d) major departures from the plan proposals to actual implementations (just a compendium of projects and schemes suggested by the Members), and (e) failure to constitute Implementation Committees or irregular functioning.
- As per the Focus Group Discussions (FGD) conducted by CMDR, the voices of the people have come out very sharply. People expected larger number of works and larger allocation of funds with regard to the basic needs like drinking water supply, health care facilities, school buildings, etc. A careful prioritization of the works implemented would have been more consistent with the guidelines and also people's perceptions of their needs. Better mileage in outcome could have been achieved with the same amount of resources if there were a proper planning.
- In summary, the Boards are found to be functioning according to their own style, not so much in line with the Charters and Guidelines. An element of ad-hocism is witnessed at different stages of Boards' activities. Choice of the works does not seem to be very much consistent with the real needs of the people. Correction of regional imbalances does not seem to be the explicit focus of Boards activities. Quality of works is the casualty on account of lack of systematic supervision and monitoring. People do not seem to have been involved at different stages of planning, implementation, supervision and evaluation of the works.

19. Tables 26.1 to 26.3 highlight some of these figuratively. In a seminar organised in September 1994 at Gulbarga, similar views have been expressed by scholars like Prof. Abdul Aziz, in an article presented in the Seminar on Hyderabad-Karnataka Regional Economy: Problems and Prospects, held at Gulbarga in September 1994.

## 26.6: Constitutional Provision and Experience with Boards in Karnataka and Elsewhere

20. There are alternative constitutional approaches normally followed to address on the issue of regional disparity. The first alternative is to bring the elected representatives of the concerned region to work together under certain constitutions framework. The Regional Boards in Karnataka came in to existence under the Karnataka State Act No. 35 and 36. These were enacted under the wisdom and powers of the Constitutional Legislative Assemblies. Under this Act, the elected members of the Legislative Assembly automatically constitute the Members of the respective Regional Boards. The experience with such a representative system in the regional boards have already been summarised in the earlier section. In brief, the regional boards in Karnataka do not seem to be functioning to redress regional disparity in the state.

21. HPCFRRI took a close look at the possibilities of alternative institutional arrangements, planning processes, and provisions in the Constitution of India. The *first option* is that of Regional Boards under state acts, as done in Karnataka. On similar lines as done in Karnataka, the state of Nagaland has enacted 'The Nagaland Village and Area Council Act 1978', under which Village Development Boards are set up. Similarly, the former Bihar government had special Development Authority created in Chota Nagpur region under the title : Chota Nagpur Plateau Development Board. In West Bengal, a backward and tribal region in 24-Paraganas district, namely the Sundarban area consisting of 13 blocks was given a special attention by framing a separate Development Board. With about Rs. 35 crores over a period of 5 years, the programme covered about 25 lakh population over an area of 3.36 lakh hectares. The experience of all such regional boards, authorities and councils seem to be similar to that of Karnataka with very minimal impact in redressing regional disparity.

22. The *second option* is to bring in the central government in to this picture. There are several options that the Central Government has also been following under the Constitution of India. Under Article 371 of the Constitution of India, the President of India may by special order with respect to any state, provide for any special responsibility to the Governor for development fund allocation, establishment of development boards, on matters of law and order to the concerned states, regarding structures of legislative assemblies, and such other responsibilities. So far, under this Article, the President of India provided special responsibility to the Governor of Maharashtra (and Gujarat) for the establishment of separate development boards for Vidharbha, Marathwada and the rest of Maharashtra (or in Gujarat for Saurashtra, Kutch and the rest of Gujarat). Likewise, under Articles 371-A in Nagaland regarding law and order in the state of Nagaland, 371-B in Assam for the constitution and functions of a Committee for the Legislative Assembly members from the tribal areas, 371-C in Manipur for administration of Hill areas, 371-D in Andhra Pradesh for the state to provide for equal opportunities and facilities in matter of public employment, 371-E in Andhra Pradesh for establishment of a University in the state, 371-F in Sikkim regarding the size of the Legislative assembly, 371-G in Mizoram regarding the size of the Legislative Assembly, 371-H in Arunachal Pradesh regarding law and order, and 371-I in Goa regarding the size of the Legislative Assembly.

23. Several views have been aired in the past about applicability of Article 371 of the Constitution in redressing regional disparity in a state. The merit of this option is the

possibility of clear-cut mandate, direction and objective with which the Governor will have to act. He has the freedom to set up any machinery to implement the schemes and programmes on time to redress the disparity and imbalances in the regions of the state. Because of such a mechanism, the process seems to work faster, more efficiently and effectively. However, the Governor will still require a competent advisory group or committee to guide him in this matter. Since HPC has already identified all the deficiencies, disparity and imbalances along with the necessary estimates of backlogs and financial estimates, the Governor can make use of these estimates immediately. Additionally, he can also continue to take guidance from the same Committee. HPC studied the Maharashtra experience in respect of all these issues, which is presented in a summary form in Section 26.7

24. A *third alternative* to address to this question on regional imbalances is through the Planning Board directly. In Karnataka, this was tried since the Fifth Plan, till about the Seventh Plan (as reviewed earlier in Chapters Two, Three, and Eight). The Planning Commission in the Central Government has been acting on such a line, with special provision of resources and monitoring the programmes in certain areas. The notable ones are North East Development Council, or Western Ghat Development Council (cutting across several states). On these lines, within the state government, the State Planning Board can have a special department (as has been the case in the Central Planning Commission) under the title 'Multi-Level Planning or Regional Planning'. Several aspects of regional disparity can be looked in to, by the present Planning Board in Karnataka. But redressal of regional disparity is a priority item in terms of timing and resource allocation in the planning process requiring both designing and monitoring the developmental programmes and schemes. Therefore, the Planning Board may not be the most appropriate set up for this matter.

25. Karnataka has always had a long history of decentralized planning with Panchayat raj institutions. Under the 73<sup>rd</sup> and 74<sup>th</sup> Amendments of the Constitutions, Zilla Panchayats, Taluka panchayats and Gram Panchayats have come in to existence now. At present, they are crowded with a large number of regular development programmes, with very little to go about on redressing the disparity in the state. But given an opportunity they can be called upon to implement programmes and schemes on redressal matters. But their ability to take on the full responsibility of designing programmes and schemes to redress issues pertaining to regional disparity is not certain. This because of lacking machinery to prepare annual plans. Even the existing office of Director of Planning in ZP is reduced to the level of coordination and implementation and not making five year and annual plans.

## **26.7: Experience of Maharashtra**

26. The experience of the state of Maharashtra is of special interest to the HPCFRRI, since the provision of the Article is specifically regarding the establishment of development boards. The issue of regional imbalances within Maharashtra cropped up from time to time, since 1956. However, only after a great deal of debate since 1990's, finally a special order was passed by the President of India under Article 371(2) of the Constitution of India. The position regarding developments in respect of dealing with regional disparity, since then, is summarised in the Box below.

### Experience of Maharashtra regarding Regional Development

The state of Maharashtra (special responsibility of Governor for Vidharbha, Marathwada and the rest of Maharashtra) Order 1994 made by the President of India under Article 371 (2) of the Constitution of India has given the Governor of Maharashtra the special responsibility for matters specified in sub-clauses (b) and (c) of Clause (2) of Article 371 of the Constitution in respect of the area of Development Boards for Vidarbha, Marathwada and rest of Maharashtra.

According to Rule 7 of the Development Boards for Vidarbha, Marathwada and the rest of Maharashtra Order 1994, the Governor of Maharashtra has the special responsibility of ensuring equitable allocation of funds for development expenditure over the areas of the Development Boards, subject to the requirements of the state as a whole. According to Rule 8 of the said Order, 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 out by the state Governor and the funds so allocated shall be non-divertible from the area of one Board tot hat of another Board.

In order to discharge his duty in this respect, the Governor had constituted an Indicators and Backlog Committee in 1995 with terms of reference covering (a) deciding upon appropriate indicators for assessing relative levels of development and backlogs in different areas and (b) in different sectors, for every district and if possible every taluka, (c) appropriate action for brining about balanced regional development, (d) suggestions on appropriate methods for ensuring equitable allocation of development expenditures.

The Governor of Maharashtra has followed the recommendations of the said Indicators and Backlog Committee (after the same was reviewed by the Maharashtra Government) and accepted their calculated backlog of Rs. 14,006.77 crore as on 31, March 1994. The major actions that followed are:

- He has directed the government of Maharashtra to liquidate this backlog in a period of five years, i.e., by 31 March 2006.
- Further he has directed that the region-wise and sector-wise allocation of outlays for removal of backlog be done in proportion to the remaining backlog of the respective region or sector.
- Keeping in view of the financial difficulties faced by the state government, he has approved the proposal to allocate 12% of the total Annual Plan or Rs. 1500 crore, whichever is more on backlog removals.

### 26.8: Proposal of the HPC FRRI

27. Considering all the options dealt in Section 26.6, and on the basis of detailed evaluation of the existing regional boards, the following views emerge.

1. The issue of 'role and relevance of the Regional Boards' had come for discussion in the State Planning Board earlier in 1999. The relevant portion from the Recommendations of Planning Board is reproduced here.

*.... The District Plan should also include the programmes of the Regional Planning Boards specially set up with separate financial allocation for Hyderabad-Karnataka, Malnad Region and the Maidan Districts. The Board felt that special Boards had not made any dent on the development process, especially, making up the deficiency in basic minimum needs and in other sectors where the region was lagging behind the state average. Therefore, the Board resolved that Special Development Boards are inconsistent with decentralized planning and the people's involvement in formulating the plan from below had not taken place. Therefore, the State Planning Board recommends to the Government that all Special Development Boards are to be phased out progressively during IX Five Year Plan to facilitate integrated planning at the local level.*

HPCFRRI is of the opinion that the Government of Karnataka should have followed the recommendation of the State Planning Board. In the light of the special evaluation study on all the regional boards carried out now, the HPCFRRI strongly recommends abolition of all the regional boards and border area programmes immediately.

2. With 73<sup>rd</sup> and 74<sup>th</sup> Amendments to the Constitution, and ZP, TP and GP in place, people seem to be expecting concrete results from the governmental initiatives for reducing regional imbalances and for realizing faster socio-economic development of all sections of population. The strategy for development therefore needs to be evolved in this background of high expectations by the people, need for transparency in decision-making, feasibility of effective and timely implementation and increased participation of the people.
3. HPCFRRI has already gone in to an elaborate exercise of identifying and estimating the disparity issues, imbalances and deprivations in various talukas in the state. HPC now feels that it is time to act. Therefore, it is proposed here to make provision for the Governor to undertake the immediate action, on the lines of Maharashtra government, under the Article 371 of the Constitution of India, to set apart a Special Development Fund with a plan to implement to redress regional disparity in the state. The Governor can act through the State Planning Department to work out the outlays for each taluka and by programmes and schemes, broadly base on the backlogs estimated by HPCFRRI. He may be assisted additionally by an Expert Committee till such time as the backlogs are cleared out. The implementation of the schemes and programmes can be vested with the ZP, PWD and other major line departments.
4. HPCFRRI also is of the opinion that under the same Article 371 of the Constitution of India, a Central University be established in North Karnataka, preferably in Gulbarga area. Additionally, there is a need to set up a Federal University in Bangalore with only the post-graduate departments and advanced research centres; an Indian Institute of Technology is to be set up at Raichur and an Indian Institute of Management is to be set up at Hubli-Dharwad / Belgaum.

5. The District and Regional Planning Divisions of the Planning Department should be fully revamped. Their main responsibility would be to, independently guide the District Planning Committees of the ZPs in the preparation of annual plans, assessment and evaluation of extent of disparity, and to draw upon necessary corrective programmes. Detailed recommendations are made in the chapter on Organisation and Management.
6. HPCFRRI had to spend considerable amount of time in understanding and analyzing the extent of regional disparity at the taluka level. For this, as many as 35 major indicators covering agriculture, industry, social infrastructure, economic infrastructure, and population and demographic aspects have been developed using the most recent data and information. This was necessary to arrive at a more representative picture of regional disparity in the whole state, identified at the taluka level. This exercise will have to be continued, and even enlarged to cover, sub-taluaka level disparity issues. Secondly, till such time when the extent of regional imbalances are reasonably reduced and redressed, a continuous monitoring the progress on this score is also very necessary. With this in mind, HPCFRRI feels that there is a need for regular data collection, processing of information, monitoring the activities at the grass-root level, evaluation of major activities and investment, and preparing alert reports from time to time. Such a task be entrusted to a social science based national level research institution in the state, preferably located in north Karnataka.

**Table –26.1:Information on Meetings of Boards**

Name of Boards	No. of Meetings		Attendance		Place of Meeting	
	Supposed to be held	Actually held	Avg.No. of Members attended	Percentage of members attended	At HQ	At Bangalore
<b>Hyderabad - Karnataka Area Development Board</b>	24	13	28	50	1	12
<b>Malnad Area Development Board</b>	32	17	NA	NA	NA	NA
<b>Bayaluseeme Development Board</b>	20	12	36	25.87	5	7

Note : Data from 1996 onwards for HKADB, from 1994 onwards for MADB and from 1996 onwards for BDB

**Table –26.2 : Details of Target and Allocation of Funds (in per cent)**

<b>Hyderabad Karnataka Area Development Board</b>			<b>Malnad Area Development Board</b>			<b>Bayaluseeme Development Board</b>		
	Target	Allotted		Target	Allotted		Target	Allotted
Roads and Bridges	40	56.25	Roads and Bridges	45	88.68	Roads and Bridges	NA	38.19
Health	9	3.17	Education	25	1.51	Health	NA	4.25
Education	6	5.36	Health	20	0.57	Education	NA	1.9
Minor Irrigation	11	6.45	Minor Irrigation	Not mentioned	4.09	Minor Irrigation	NA	23.25
Animal Husbandry	3	NA	Water Supply Works	10	3.35	Soil Conservation and Land Development	NA	27
Sericulture	3	NA	Others	Not mentioned	1.8	Others	NA	5.41
Forest	19	NA				According to the Charter 60 per cent of funds need to be allocated for agriculture development		
Urban Development	3	NA						
Others	3	8.92						
Share of Capital formation to Gulbarga Area Development Corporation	3	NA						
DWS	NA	16.84						
Energy	NA	3.01						

**Note:** Target - according to Dharam Singh Committee Report for HKADB, Planning Department (GoK - as mentioned in Audit Report for the period 1992-93 to 1997-98 for MADB and the Charter for BDB

**Table – 26.3 : Indicators of Achievements of the Boards**

Sl No	Indicator	HKADB		BADB	
		Number/Unit	Amount Utilized (Rs. In Lakh)	Number/Unit	Amount utilised (Rs. In Lakh)
<b>I. Road and Bridges</b>					
1. Construction of Roads (in Kms)					
a)	Tar Road (in Kms)	4462.88	15205.07	165	248.01
b)	Kucha Road (in Kms)	6614.28	13811.575	441	449.34
2. No. of Bridges Constructed					
a)	Big	27	454.42	3	18.5
b)	Small	283	886.71	32	99.14
	<b>Total</b>	<b>11387.16</b>	<b>30357.775</b>	<b>641</b>	<b>814.99</b>
<b>II. Education</b>					
1a)	No. of school rooms constructed	1147	1641.61	6	12.2
b)	Compound walls constructed to schools(No)	48	119.61	34	51.58
c)	No. of Balawadi/Anganawadi Bhavans constructed	37	44.02	10	11.66
2. Amount spent for providing furniture to schools (in Rs)					
a)	Rural	-	-		
b)	Urban	1	2.59		
3a)	Aid to Colleges/Universities	43	1412.04		
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1276</b>	<b>3219.87</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>75.44</b>
<b>III. Health</b>					
1.a)	No. of Toilets constructed	35	45.28	1	0.25
b)	No. of PHCs/Sub Centers constructed including Hospitals	134	1630.36	2	4
c)	No. of Veterinary Hospitals constructed	30	225.9	28	90.99
	<b>Total</b>	<b>199</b>	<b>1901.54</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>95.24</b>
<b>IV. Energy</b>					
a)	No. of villages electrified	<b>648</b>	<b>1344.55</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>
<b>V. Irrigation</b>					
1. No. of Irrigation Works					
a)	Major	1	55.61	5	15
b)	Medium	19	570.81	301	335.84
c)	Minor	306	1220.34	183	171.37
	<b>Total</b>	<b>326</b>	<b>1846.76</b>	<b>489</b>	<b>522.21</b>

.... Contd

SI No	Indicator	HKADB		BADB	
		Number/Unit	Amount Utilized (Rs. In Lakh)	Number/Unit	Amount utilised (Rs. In Lakh)
<b>VI. Others</b>					
1.a)	No. of Yuva Kendra/Samudaya Bhavan constructed	665	1063.19	35	69.09
b)	No. of Kalyan Mantap constructed	217	481.13		
c)	No. of Gram Panchayat/Taluk Panchayat buildings constructed	34	81.73	1	3
2. No. of Cultural Halls constructed in					
a)	Villages	60	89.93		
b)	Taluk Headquarters	4	10.99		
3.a)	Amount spent for sports activities (stadium/Play ground Construction)etc	14	157.31		
4. a)	Others (it includes const. of Teachers quarter, ANM quarters, Hospital, Auditorium, hostel, government offices and other works)	479	1554.56	5	9.55
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1473</b>	<b>3438.84</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>81.64</b>
<b>VII. Drainage and Water Supply</b>					
1. a)	No. of Drinking Water Schemes	413	3822.12		
b)	No. of Borewells	34	61.45	2	5
c)	No. of Tanks	41	582.1	9	12.46
2.a)	No. of Drainage and Sewage works	193	728.37		
	<b>Total</b>	<b>681</b>	<b>5194.04</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>VIII. SC/STs Programmes</b>					
	No. of Schemes/Works carried out for SC/ST and weaker sections	<b>1173</b>	<b>NA</b>	222	133.27
<b>IX. Agro Based Industries</b>					
a)	No. of Agro-based industries promoted by giving special aids:	<b>3</b>	<b>1238.75</b>		
<b>X. Soil Conservation</b>					
	Watershed	Not Availabe	Not Available	646	683.43