

Chapter 5

Externally Aided Projects and State Finances

J.L. BAJAJ

In the early years of development planning in India, external assistance played a significant role in financing public sector investment. Official Development Assistance (ODA) financed, on average, 27 per cent of plan expenditure in the first three Five Year Plans and about 15.5 per cent in the Fourth and Fifth Plan periods (Table 5.1). External assistance has also been a stable source of balance of payments support to the economy. Since 1985 it has financed 12-15 per cent of total imports.

In the first half of the 1980s, foreign savings accounted for 6-7 per cent of Gross National Savings (Table 5.2). In recent years, this figure has increased to 10-11 per cent. The dependence on foreign savings for financing public sector investment has become significant. Foreign savings have accounted for less than three per cent of GDP, but between 1980-81 and 1984-85 they financed about 15 per cent and between 1985-86 and 1989-90 more than 22 per cent of gross fixed capital formation in the public sector. However, with declining access to foreign aid in the 1980s, the contribution of foreign aid to foreign saving fell from 103.2 per cent in 1980-81 to 47.1 per cent in 1985-86, followed by a light rebound to 54.8 per cent in 1989-90.

Within the overall framework of ODA, most inflows of funds are linked to pre-identified and mutually agreed investments. The bulk of these investments are project-specific and are in the public or governmental sectors; therefore they are incorporated into the respective plans of the central and state governments. Resource flows from external agencies in support of these investments are necessarily routed

to implementing agencies through the mechanism of plan transfers. The project-based framework of external funding is in consonance with the essentially schematic pattern of the plans, and, in fact, has reinforced the latter.

In recent years, several issues related to the external funding of development have been raised, reflecting increasing concerns among donor agencies and the Government of India (GOI) about the efficiency of utilization of foreign aid and its effectiveness. Issues relating to the adequacy of commitments, their composition and the terms and conditions on which they are extended have been highlighted by GOI. At the same time, the absorption of commitments in many sectors has been slower than expectations. Of growing concern to GOI in the light of its resource transfer objective, this is also indicative of less than adequate implementation performance. Continued slow absorption of external assistance may tend to undermine the rationale for expanding commitment levels. There is also at present an emphasis on the qualitative dimensions of aid transfers, based on an increasing recognition of the catalytic and complementary aspects of external assistance. These extend beyond the purely quantitative perspectives of resource support at the macro level.

The State Sector: Role and Performance

It is in this context that the role of the States of the Union and of the state sector in development assume significance. In the apportionment of developmental responsibilities, the states have been assigned a primary role. (The assignment of resources has not been commensurate, reflecting a Constitutionally mandated vertical imbalance in the federal structure.) In most spheres of developmental activity, including the critical areas of poverty alleviation, rural development, health, nutrition and education, the implementation role lies essentially, if not wholly, with the states. In the assigned sectors the states are called upon to develop and maintain infrastructure. In other sectors, the effectiveness of development initiatives is to a large extent dependent on interlinkages with state efforts and on the absorptive capacity of the states.

Table 5.3 shows the shares of developmental expenditures of the central government and the states, based on actual budgetary transactions. In some sectors, including many that have received relatively large support through external financing, the state sector dominates budgetary transactions (Table 5.4)

A significant (and increasing) proportion of ODA transfers are based on activities and expenditures in the state sector. This is partly

attributable to evolving changes in the composition of the external assistance portfolio. In the Fourth and Fifth Five Year Plans (1969-80), commitments of external assistance were concentrated in a limited range of sectors and activities within these sectors. The relatively rapid build up of commitments in the 1980s, in conjunction with emerging domestic resource constraints, brought to the fore limitations of absorptive capacity in several subsectors. The emergence of new sectors for external assistance was accentuated by continuing unresolved sectoral issues and also by shifts in donor policy. In many of the newer areas, the states are directly responsible for implementation, for instance in rural water supply, forestry and watershed management. In others, despite strong elements of central funding and policy guidance, state delivery mechanisms and infrastructure play a major role, for instance in family welfare. This trend is likely to continue, with the prospect of external financing of investments in education and health.

At the same time, the states have been increasingly constrained by adverse trends in their finances. This has led to a growing demand for "allocation" of externally aided projects, particularly from states that are less assured of central resource transfers. In the aggregate, the central government and the states have been in deficit on revenue account since 1982. This means that plans are being financed entirely through borrowing, as are also a portion of current and maintenance expenditures. The continuance of fiscal deficits has in turn impaired the ability of governments to finance developmental activities. In this environment, externally aided projects represent an additional source of development finance for the states and a means for them to take up projects.

The implementation and disbursement performance of state sector projects, however, seems to have been poorer than that of projects in the central or autonomous sectors. It appears, on the basis of a comparison of disbursement ratios for the period 1980-90, that state projects tend to take longer to implement than central projects (see Table 5.5 for some examples). State projects include those which are state financed and state implemented, for instance in the urban development and agriculture and irrigation sectors. They also include projects that are centrally funded but are implemented by state governments, for instance in the social forestry and family welfare sectors. In contrast, projects in the oil, railways and industry sectors exhibited a better performance from the perspective of utilization of commitments.

Cross-sectoral comparisons of this nature may not present a completely accurate picture. In addition to the respective capabilities

of the centre and the states, sectoral strategies and project design influence implementation performance. The slower implementation of state sector projects is partly due to project characteristics and those of the sectors in which they are concentrated. Typically, a state project has a longer implementation span and incorporates a complex set of interlinked investments in infrastructure and staff. A larger proportion of project costs in state-dominated sectors may need to be set aside for improvement of management and delivery systems and for training. Internal financing is likely to be uncertain, and access to external funds is gained through a time-consuming process of reimbursement, involving the accounting and compilation of disaggregated disbursements.

One of the few sectors where a comparative assessment can be made is electric power. Central and state governments both received external funding for similar types of power projects, for instance for investments in power generation by the National Thermal Power Corporation (NTPC) and the State Electricity Boards (SEBs). A comparison of disbursement ratios for World Bank assisted projects in the period 1980-90 shows a markedly better utilization performance by NTPC as compared with the SEBs (Table 5.5). To a considerable extent, NTPC's success is due to relatively assured funding and to the fact that its operations are confined to power generation. SEBs, on the other hand, conduct a range of operations, including generation, transmission and retail distribution, with far less organizational, infrastructure and resource support.

In many ways the SEBs are representative of state sector capabilities. The states are generally disadvantaged in comparison with the central government in terms of access to planning, design, technical and management expertise. (This is true as a general proposition, but it is more true of some states and some sectors than others.) These disadvantages have an impact not only at the institutional and project levels, but also at state planning and resource management levels. Planning, monitoring and evaluation capabilities tend to be limited; this in turn encourages ad-hocism and inhibits the development of longer-term sectoral perspectives. Similarly (and also partly as a consequence of tightening resource constraints), state finance departments devote the major part of their efforts to ways and means management.

Despite this, the state sector represents the pivot of developmental activities. It is difficult to envisage, given India's federal structure, a successful development strategy that does not significantly enhance the role of the state sector and its performance. Within the framework

of externally financed investments, there is also a need to factor in the state sector to a greater extent, and to compensate for deficiencies and disadvantages in project design, preparation and implementation.

The Framework of Centre-State Transfers

Despite the importance of the state sector in enabling external aid flows, until the mid 1970s there did not exist a formal mechanism for effecting centre-state transfers on this account. The need for such a mechanism stems from the fact that the states are not primary recipients of external resources. India's federal and fiscal framework, through a combination of statute and evolved practice, has effectively precluded the states from direct access to external borrowing or to the country's foreign exchange resources. (The management of both is highly centralized and is vested with GOI). It was only in 1976 that a system of clearly identifiable transfers on account of externally aided projects was initiated. Prior to this the disbursement cycle in external financing terminated with GOI, even for state sector projects.

The states did derive additional benefits from external assistance, to the extent that such assistance augmented the totality of plan resources. This in turn enhanced the capacity of the central government to spend on developmental activities and its ability to transfer resources to the states. Transfers to the latter were determined largely by the size of the "divisible pool" of plan resources and were allocated each year on the basis of the "Gadgil formula". A not unintended consequence, strengthened by the reimbursement characteristic of most external financing, was that this arrangement preserved an internally determined pattern of intersectoral and inter-regional distribution of plan resources. The additional resources generated by external flows were therefore shared among all states, not only those that undertook and implemented externally aided projects.

The initial modification of this equity-oriented and compartmentalized system took place in the Fifth Five Year Plan (1974-79). It took the form of an explicit resource incentive to prepare and implement externally aided projects. This measure was termed as "additionality" (ACA). Its introduction represented a break with established practices, since external assistance flows would no longer be overtly neutral in their impact on intersectoral and interstate allocations. Since then, through successive plan periods, the scope and extent of these incentives have been enhanced. ACA has progressively increased in size, as has also its relative significance as a resource for state plans.

Transfers of ACA were Rs 297 crores in 1975-80 and Rs 1551 crores in 1980-85. In the next five years (the Seventh Five Year Plan),

ACA transfers doubled to Rs 3,159 crores. Undoubtedly contributing significantly to the increases was the evolving policy on ACA, which has consistently moved toward a greater liberalization of its provisions. From initial coverage of a limited range of World Bank aided projects with predominantly local currency expenditures, the scope has been gradually widened to cover all externally aided projects in the state sector irrespective of their financing source and import intensity. Similarly, from an initial figure of 25 per cent of external receipts in 1975, the proportion transferred has been raised to 100 per cent for most implementing sectors from 1989 onwards. In 1989-90 ACA flows to the states increased by almost 55 per cent over the preceding year. A large part of the increase was due to full transfer of external receipts in the agriculture, rural development, irrigation and social service sectors.

Motivating the continuing liberalization of the incentive framework have been not only trends in government finances but also a related, gradual, and continuing build-up of committed but undisbursed resources for externally aided projects, including those in the state sector. Undisbursed commitments of external assistance by countries that are members of Aid India Consortium have grown steadily from Rs 20,016 crores in 1985-86 to Rs 25,665 crores in 1989-90 (Table 5.6). These figures, in conjunction with gross commitments and disbursement figures over the same period, indicate that utilization of external assistance has often not kept pace with commitments of external resource. Disbursements grew at marginally more modest rates, but they exhibited an accelerating trend between 1985 and 1989. An increasing proportion of disbursements were related directly or indirectly to the state sector, reflecting also a changing sectoral composition in favour of the social sectors and poverty alleviation programs.

The continuing liberalization of ACA should therefore be seen not only as a facilitating measure for the states and as a central transfer, but also in the light of the central government's own resource position and its need to gain access to additional foreign exchange flows. Of relevance here is the fact that this is an essentially incentive-based response by the centre, but the centre faces limits in continuing to expand these incentives. A related issue is the extent to which this solely incentive-based framework has improved project performance and facilitated the maintenance of an effective pipeline of projects for external funding.

Periodic liberalization of ACA provisions has led to increasing transfers to the states. In 1982-83 and 1989-90, there were discontinuous rises in ACA releases, undoubtedly largely as a result of

facilitating measures taken by the central government in the immediately preceding years. It would ordinarily be assumed that this would be a major factor in improving project performance, since counterpart funding (or the lack of it) has been singled out as a key factor in implementation delays. The actual impact of these measures on the implementation performance of individual projects is not very clear, however. ACA transfers serve (1) to augment the state plan size *ex-ante* and (2) to increase overall state receipts *ex-post*, but they do not necessarily flow to the sector of origin. Moreover, a large part of the efforts of state finance departments is currently devoted to ways and means management, at the expense of planning and longer-term resource perspectives. Hence the states may not be in a position to ensure that rising ACA inflows translate into enhanced resource availability for the projects concerned.

In this environment, it is possible that alternatives to an exclusively incentive-oriented framework may need to be considered, to provide a more direct linkage with project performance. For instance, earmarking of project resources for externally aided projects by the Planning Commission could be strengthened. While this has existed as a principle of allocation since the Seventh Plan, in practice it has been difficult to enforce. A related measure could be the formulation of explicit disincentives to diversion of project outlays to other sectors, or even to different schemes within the same sectors. These disincentives, to be effective, would need to be resource based. For example, linkage of plan transfers, or even a part of them, to adherence to an agreed project implementation and disbursement schedule could be envisaged.

In its present form, the ACA mechanism does not free the states from the obligation to put in their own resources upfront and to expend them on project activities prior to reimbursement. The benefits of pre-financing, or of advance disbursements in the form of revolving funds, are not always passed on to the states or to the implementing entities. If passed on and adequately earmarked, such funds may prove more useful in addressing project-specific counterpart fund issues than a further expansion of the incentive framework.

Terms and Conditions of Central Transfers

ACA is presently made available to the states on the same terms and conditions as other forms of central plan assistance. On several occasions the states have suggested that ACA transfers should instead be related to the terms on which they are received from donor agencies. Variations of this include the passing on of concessional

credits (for instance IDA) at the same rates of interest at which they are received or alternatively with a higher grant component. The Ninth Finance Commission (NFC, 1990) considered this issue and made specific recommendations to GOI, namely, that (1) for IBRD assistance the repayment period should be the same as prescribed by the Bank and (2) IDA assistance should be passed on as a loan at a rate of interest of six per cent per annum, with a repayment period of 30 years (including a grace period of five years). Until recently, plan assistance (and ACA) was extended by the central government at a rate of 9.75 per cent per annum, with a repayment period of 15 years. As a consequence of the acceptance of other recommendations of the NFC, the repayment period has been increased to 20 years, with 50 per cent of the loans carrying a grace period of five years.

The effective cost of borrowing from the World Bank includes the nominal rate of interest, commitment and service charges, front-end fees, and the additional costs due to variations in the exchange rate. In the period 1985-90, the cost of borrowing, including costs attributable to exchange fluctuations, averaged 12.97 per cent per annum for IDA credits and 19.97 per cent for IBRD loans. The weighted average cost of World Bank group borrowing was 17.89 per cent per annum, taking into consideration the respective commitments of IDA and IBRD in this period. ADB assistance also is expensive, closer to IBRD costs than to IDA. In the case of bilateral credits, if the interest rate structure, exchange risks and higher costs associated with source-tied supplies are taken into account, the overall costs are higher than those of borrowing from multilateral institutions.

The NFC assumed that the effective cost of borrowing of the states on account of ACA transfers was 6.8 per cent per annum, given the fact that such assistance is available in a 70-30 loan-grant mix. This calculation would only be valid however if 70 per cent is assumed to be a loan at 9.75 per cent rate of interest and the balance of 30 per cent an interest free loan. In fact, the latter is a non-recoverable grant, so the effective cost of borrowing is therefore less than six per cent. The NFC recommendation for IDA borrowings (which is based on a 100 per cent loan component), contrary to intent, would therefore imply raising the costs to the states of IDA transfers. For special category states (admittedly with a relatively low profile in external assistance), which receive plan funds as 90 per cent grant and only 10 per cent loan, the difference and additional costs would be considerable.

Similarly, the suggestion with respect to repayment periods for IBRD loans advocated by the NFC is unlikely to benefit the states. IBRD repayment periods commence with loan effectiveness, irres-

pective of the actual pattern of disbursements of funds. On the other hand, states repay ACA loans over 20 years from the date of disbursement of funds. State sector projects have average disbursement periods, depending on the sector, of 6-9 years, indicating a loan repayment period of 20-26 years. This is to their advantage in comparison with the IBRD repayment profile of 20 years.

There appears to be little advantage in seeking to further refine the terms and conditions associated with internal flows of externally originated assistance. Despite increasing flows, they still represent a relatively small proportion of aggregate central transfers (3.1 per cent in 1989-90). The issues of state indebtedness and of debt relief are much wider. In the more limited perspective of implementation of externally aided projects, it is unlikely that such measures would facilitate and expedite project implementation to any significant degree.

Aggregate ACA Transfers

An examination of aggregate annual net central transfers to the states and of flows of ACA in the period of 1980-90 shows near-stability in their relative proportions over the decade (Table 5.7). Despite major annual fluctuations in both, ACA flows ranged consistently between two and three per cent of net central transfers, tending to attain the upper end of the range toward the end of plan periods. The extraordinary growth of net transfers in 1982-83 and 1985-86 was on account of term loans (Rs 1,743 crores in 1982-83 and Rs 1,628 crores in 1985-86) extended by the central government for clearing overdrafts.

In the Sixth and Seventh Plans, aggregate ACA transfers increased, as did their role in plan financing. Transfers of ACA represented 3.2 per cent of aggregate intended state plan outlays in the Sixth Plan; this figure rose to 3.9 per cent in the Seventh Plan. If plan outlays and ACA transfers of special category states and union territories are excluded, i.e. only the major states are considered, the figures are 3.5 per cent and 4.3 per cent for the Sixth and Seventh Plans respectively. The unusual growth of ACA in the period from 1982-83 and in 1989-90 is essentially attributable to the impact of additional incentives, that is (1) extension of ACA coverage to import-intensive projects and activities in 1983 and (2) raising of the proportion passed on to the states from 70 per cent to 100 per cent in most sectors in 1989.

Interstate Allocations of ACA

Table 5.8 shows the pattern of actual releases of ACA to state governments in the mid- and late 1970s. While ACA amounted to Rs

135.20 crores during the Fifth Plan, in one year -- 1979-80 -- it increased to Rs 162.02 crores. In the period 1975-80 more than half of ACA was given to three states only, namely Andhra Pradesh, Karnataka and Maharashtra.

Table 5.9 provides similar data for the Sixth and Seventh Five Year Plans (1980-90). Two states (Maharashtra and Gujarat) accounted for over a third of ACA releases in the Sixth Plan. Four states (Maharashtra, Gujarat, Uttar Pradesh and Madhya Pradesh) received more than half of the releases in the Seventh Plan and, in particular, over 60 per cent of the releases in the last year of the Seventh Plan, 1989-90. (If the releases to Tamil Nadu are also taken into account, then almost 71 per cent of ACA flows went to just five states.) It is reasonably clear from the figures that external assistance flows are concentrated in few states.

In the Sixth Plan period Maharashtra received the largest ACA (Rs 326.1 crores), followed by Gujarat (Rs 208.49 crores) and Madhya Pradesh (Rs 119.70 crores). They accounted for 20.68 per cent, 13.45 per cent and 7.72 per cent respectively of total ACA released to the states. In the Seventh Plan, Uttar Pradesh displaced Maharashtra and was the largest recipient of ACA, amounting to Rs 492.16 crores (15.58 per cent of total ACA). Maharashtra got Rs 460.92 crores (14.59 per cent), Gujarat Rs 354.92 crores (11.24 per cent) and Madhya Pradesh Rs 338.90 crores (10.73 per cent). Punjab, on the other hand, got only Rs 33.78 crores as ACA in this period. Another way of looking at the importance of ACA is to relate it to normal central assistance. In the 1980s ACA has been a very important source of central transfers to Maharashtra, Haryana, Karnataka and Gujarat, as is evident from Table 5.10.

The concentration of external assistance is also illustrated by Table 5.11, which provides information on Gadgil formula based allocation and ACA transfers in the Seventh Plan period (1985-90). Among the states, the gainers were undoubtedly Gujarat and Maharashtra and, to a lesser extent, Orissa, Haryana, Madhya Pradesh and Karnataka. The special category states were clearly disadvantaged, as were Bihar, Andhra Pradesh, Punjab and Rajasthan. In some sense, however, the inclusion of special category states in this analysis is distortionary. The plans of these states are already heavily centrally funded, ranging from 81 per cent for Himachal Pradesh to 94 per cent in the case of Assam and full coverage of plans for Jammu and Kashmir, Manipur, Nagaland, Sikkim, Arunachal Pradesh and Mizoram. In per-capita terms plan transfers to these states are impressive multiples of transfers to other states. They are intended to compensate for their many

disadvantages, of which one is the relative lack of access to external funding sources. (In fact, since the plans are in effect wholly centrally financed, as is a major share of nonplan expenditures, there is little real incentive to seek external funding as an additional resource.)

Table 5.12 provides information for only the major states, excluding Gadgil allocations (and actual ACA flows) to the special category states. Clearly, there has been some impact on the pattern of regional distribution of central plan transfers among major states. This has only marginally, if at all, affected the special category states. The major beneficiaries have been Gujarat, Maharashtra, Orissa, Haryana, Karnataka, Madhya Pradesh and Tamil Nadu. In fact, if Punjab is excluded (for obvious reasons), the only major state with a per-capita income above the national average that has not gained ACA resources in excess of what it would otherwise have received is West Bengal.

ACA Allocations: A Sectoral Perspective

Planners in India traditionally have been sensitive to the possible distortionary effects of external financing. A related issue is the impact of external transfers on the sectoral allocation of resources. It is often claimed that the composition of external assistance extended by donor agencies has altered domestic priorities and the pattern of inter-sectoral allocations. At first glance this does not appear to be so. Since the additionality provisions are not formally operative for the central sector, the incremental impact of external flows should logically exist only in the state sector. Table 5.13 shows the pattern of ACA releases disaggregated by sector. In comparison of aggregates for all states of plan outlays and ACA trends, the displacement effect of externally aided projects is not readily apparent. This is because of the large absolute magnitudes of plan outlays and the relatively small size of ACA transfers.

An examination of disaggregated central and state data (Table 5.14) also confirms that externally aided projects have in general had little displacement effect. The largest disbursement of ACA in the Sixth Plan period was to the irrigation sector. This constituted only 8.18 per cent of total expenditure by the states on irrigation projects. In the Seventh Plan, external assistance was spread out and did not have a dominating influence on any sector.

Disbursements (and therefore ACA transfers) represent only a portion of total project costs, however. The proportion of state sector project costs eligible for foreign assistance has ranged between 50 and 70 per cent. In addition, there may be project-related costs that are either

not reimbursable at all (such as land acquisition costs) or are excluded from the formal definition of the project, perhaps because they are not incremental in nature. The corresponding state outlays are therefore likely to have been at least twice the volume of ACA transfers.

Moreover, not only is access to external assistance largely availed of by only a few states, but such assistance has been concentrated in a few sectors, namely, agriculture, irrigation, power and urban development. The irrigation sector accounted for over 50 per cent of external assistance flows in the Sixth Plan and 40 per cent in the Seventh Plan. More significantly 50 per cent of ACA flows based on expenditures on irrigation in 1989-90 went to only two states (Madhya Pradesh and Uttar Pradesh). Similarly, almost 65 per cent of power sector flows were attributable to expenditures of just two states (Uttar Pradesh and Maharashtra), as were 56 per cent of flows of ACA in the social services sectors (Gujarat and Tamil Nadu).

Equity considerations apart (for which there are several compensating mechanisms in India's framework of centre-state transfers), this concentration of external assistance has implications for the sustainability of the present pattern of externally aided projects in the state sector. The dilemma of the states is best illustrated by a few examples. In the Seventh Plan (1985-90), Karnataka spent approximately Rs 66 crores in the environment, forests, wildlife and soil conservation sectors. Of this expenditure, 74 per cent was accounted for by externally aided social forestry projects. (Despite this, the World Bank assisted project, which commenced in 1982-83, did not achieve its assigned targets and has required three annual extensions). In 1990-91, 73 per cent of allocations for the sector were earmarked for the World Bank assisted projects, resulting in only token provisioning for the other schemes.

In Uttar Pradesh in the Seventh Plan, plan expenditures on irrigation (major and minor) were Rs 1,834 crores. The Eighth Plan (1990-95) outlay is envisaged as Rs 2,720 crores. This is, however, likely to be reduced significantly in view of the state's difficulties in financing the plan. The actual availability of plan resources may therefore be at best around Rs 2,100 crores. There are as many as 44 ongoing projects, at various states of execution. The requirement of funds for ongoing projects has been conservatively estimated by the Planning Commission at Rs 4,100 crores (at 1989-90 prices). It is likely, according to the Commission, taking into account escalation factors, that the requirement of funds in the Eighth Plan on this account would be Rs 7,000 crores. Even if these resources were available, some of the projects (and therefore an additional requirements of funds) would

spill over further into Ninth Plan. Some of the currently ongoing projects actually commenced even before the Fifth Plan (1974-79). In its discussions with the state government on the Eighth Plan, the Commission laid down priorities for the projects. At the top of the list, ahead of interstate projects, pre-Fifth Plan projects and other ongoing projects, was the lone externally aided project in the subsector. This project commenced in 1982-83 and would still require an additional Rs 248 crores in the Eighth Plan.

This situation, to varying degrees, arises for externally aided projects in different sectors. The "crowding out" effect is to a great extent a consequence of ambitious but insufficiently funded plans. It is accentuated by project design factors, exchange rate fluctuations and implementation delays. This last problem in particular adds to both costs and resource requirements.

ACA and the Plans

An analysis of ACA in the context of the financing of state plans reveals substantial *ex ante* overestimation of ACA flows as an intended plan resource (see Table 5.15). Most states increased their intended aggregate plan outlays as reflected in the difference between revised and original Seventh Plan provisions, the exceptions being Gujarat (Rs 411 crores shortfall) and Haryana (Rs 34 crores). Most states also raised the intended contribution of ACA. ACA was revised downward only for Punjab (where there were no fresh projects in the Seventh Plan), Madhya Pradesh and Maharashtra (where extremely large initial provisions had been made). Aggregate normal central assistance to the states grew by 37 per cent to Rs 22,600 crores; ACA increased correspondingly (39 per cent) to Rs 5,120 crores. Aggregate plan sizes, however, increased by only nine per cent to Rs 78,250 crores. This shows that a larger component of state plans was being sought to be financed through central transfers. At almost Rs 28,000 crores, the latter represented 35.5 per cent of the revised total plan outlays, compared to 28 per cent of the original provisions.

With the exception of Rajasthan, no state actually attained its revised target for ACA, including the states which had revised their provisions downward. The closest state in this respect to Rajasthan was Punjab (which, however, is clearly exceptional), whose central plan assistance increased by over 500 per cent, but which had the lowest actual ACA provisioning (Rs 34 crores). Most states in the end did not even attain their original targets for ACA. The actual aggregate achievement was 84 per cent of the original target, or 60 per cent of the revised target.

These figures are particularly significant because (1) the revised

plan projections were formulated in 1988-89, with the knowledge of actual expenditures and trends for three plan years, and (2) at that stage, the further liberalization of ACA transfers, from 70 per cent of external disbursements to 100 per cent for most externally assisted projects in the state sector, was not anticipated. (This provision provided an estimated Rs 200 crores of ACA to the states in 1989-90 as unanticipated transfers.)

The above data clearly confirm the fact of substantial ex-ante overestimation of ACA as a plan resource and of "own" resources in state plans. This is largely explained by the desire to have larger plans and a corresponding political and systemic inability to confront or attempt to ameliorate a situation of inadequate resources. In modern India's development lexicon, a plan "cut" is often viewed as a management failure, particularly since the exercise of plan formulation takes place through a prolonged process of negotiations and accommodation. On the resources side, this has consistently resulted in overestimation, not only of ACA but of other relatively flexible funding sources, for instance the impact of Additional Resource Mobilization (ARM) measures put forward by the states and the contribution of state public enterprises and undertakings.

At the same time, the states (and for that matter, center) have been unable to stem the rising tide of nonplan expenditure, particularly (but not confined to) nonplan spending on revenue account. Revenue expenditures, in the aggregate, have consistently exceeded revenue receipts throughout the Seventh Plan. Negative balances from current revenue for most states have eroded the resource base of state plans. This has another implication for developmental activities and for externally aided projects: in the prevalent scheme of things, nonplan revenue expenditures get preference over plan expenditures and even within plan spending, revenue expenditures tend to displace capital expenditures, which therefore effectively get the lowest priority.

In this situation, externally aided projects are vulnerable on a number of counts. In the first place, they tend to be relatively expensive compared to domestically financed projects, partly on account of the need for additional project-specific management and support systems. Where the project is limited to a defined geographical area, or to only a part of the state, this may lead to duplication and the creation of costly parallel administrative structures. While many of the additional costs associated with such projects do lead to better and more sustainable project implementation, this may not always be so.

Equally important, the success of the preparation process for externally aided projects is often measured, by donor agencies and implementing departments alike, by the extent to which incremental plan resources are committed. For development-oriented depart-

ments, access to an externally aided project represents an opportunity to secure additional resources, administrative structures and staff (and thereby promotional avenues), vehicles, etc.

Departments consequently tend to underestimate project costs at the preparation stage. Also underplayed is the longer-term impact of recurrent liabilities that will be created by the project, partly intentionally and partly on account of inadequate attention to project financing, cost-effectiveness and viability at the preparation stage. This tendency, often encouraged by donor attention to the project, is to some extent offset by formal investment clearance procedures. More often, the skepticism of Finance Departments on the relative costs and benefits of externally aided projects plays a moderating role.

In the state plans, therefore, the impact of externally aided projects is sought to be inflated on the resources side. At the same time, there is a tendency to underplay the counterpart resources required in the form of state plan outlays. The latter phenomenon occurs essentially for three reasons: (1) limited resources; (2) many competing demands from different sectors (also reflective of the relative inability of a system of planning and allocation by consensus to prioritize); and (3) multiple priorities and schemes within sectors. Despite these issues, some of which can be ascribed to operational complexities of the planning process, external assistance has been of undoubted benefit to the states.

One of the key areas that require attention is procurement procedures and contract management. Contracting and procurement organizations in the states tend to work with outdated systems unsuitable to present-day project management techniques. There is a tendency to split contracts into very small lots. Contract sizes have to be sufficiently large for efficient execution. In addition, procedures are often not transparent and are inadequately publicized. There has been inevitable resistance from operational levels to the procurement process for externally aided projects. In fact, this is a major contributory factor delaying implementation.

Another area where action is required is project accounting and management systems. Government accounts are designed for different purposes and are often delayed in compilation, leading to reimbursement delays. As a result, externally aided projects have incorporated project-specific accounting systems.

In recent years, externally aided projects have become more attractive to the states on account of liberalized ACA provisions. In most states balance from current revenues is negative. At the same time, the central government's capacity to increase plan assistance is limited. There is consequently a growing need in the states to utilize external assistance for financing their projects.

Table 5.1

Flows of ODA, 1950-90

(Rs crores)

	<i>Gross ODA</i>	<i>Aggregate plan</i>	<i>Gross imports</i>	<i>ODA as per cent of plan</i>	<i>ODA as per cent of imports</i>
I-III Plan	4080.49	15208.5	14743	26.8	27.7
IV-V Plan	8615.91	55205.0	37552	15.6	22.9
VI Plan	8713.43	110467.3	73415	7.9	11.9
1985-86	2428.22	33059.9	19658	7.3	12.4
1986-87	3022.17	39149.7	20096	7.7	15.0
1987-88	4396.30	42920.6	22244	10.2	19.8
1988-89	4385.42	48069.8	28235	9.1	15.5
1989-90	4766.77	57016.9	35412	8.4	13.5

Table 5.2

Foreign Resources, Gross Savings and Investment

Item/year	1980-81	81-82	82-83	83-84	84-85	85-86	86-87	87-88	88-89	89-90
GDP (mp)	136013	159760	178132	207589	231387	261920	291974	332616	394992	442769
Gross National Savings	30880	36089	36634	41488	45450	57898	60093	74386	94432	106501
GNS as % of GDP	22.7	22.9	20.6	20.0	19.6	22.1	20.6	22.4	23.9	24.1
Foreign Savings (FS)	2094	2611	2566	2517	3292	6234	6355	6825	11134	10584
FS as % of GDP	1.5	1.6	1.4	1.2	1.4	2.4	2.2	2.1	2.8	2.4
FS as % of GNS	6.8	1.2	7.0	6.1	7.2	10.8	10.6	9.2	11.8	9.9
GFCE	26276	31455	35769	39991	45568	54255	61260	70838	83205	94837
GFCF-Public Sector (GFCFPS)	22693	14598	18586	20450	23396	27501	33254	34561	39542	46067
FS as % of GFCFPS	17.9	17.9	13.8	12.3	14.1	22.7	19.1	19.1	28.2	23
Foreign Aid	2162	1865	2252	2266	2359	2936	3605	5052	5304	5803
FA as % of Foreign Saving	103.2	71.4	87.8	90	71.7	47.1	56.7	74	47.6	54.8

Abbreviations:

GDP = Gross Domestic Product; FS = Foreign Savings; GFCF = Gross Fixed Capital Formation; GFCFPS = Gross Fixed Capital Formation in the Public Sector; and FA = Foreign Aid.

Note:

Estimates of GDP, savings and investment are the latest revised figures released by the CSO. The figures for 1989-90 are quick estimates. Foreign savings have been derived as the difference between the estimates of gross domestic capital formation (GDCF) and gross domestic savings (GDS), GNS is defined as the sum of GDS and FS. Foreign aid represents the latest information on gross disbursement of external assistance made available by CAA&A.

Table 5.3

Developmental Expenditure, 1985-90^a

(Rs. crore)

	1985-86	1986-87	1987-88	1988-89	1989-90	Total
Revenue Expenditure						
Center	11731 (45.1)	14067 (46.2)	16803 (46.2)	19971 (47.3)	25214 (47.3)	87786 (46.6)
States	14254 (54.9)	16408 (53.8)	19436 (53.6)	22208 (52.7)	28098 (52.7)	100404 (53.4)
Total	25985 (100.0)	30475 (100.0)	36269 (100.0)	42179 (100.0)	53312 (100.0)	188190 (100.0)
Capital Expenditure						
Center	6876 (55.2)	7820 (55.7)	6150 (48.3)	6548 (47.9)	8116 (50.8)	35510 (51.6)
States	5575 (44.8)	6225 (44.3)	6587 (51.7)	7118 (52.1)	7851 (49.2)	33356 (48.4)
Total	12451 (100.0)	14045 (100.0)	12737 (100.0)	13666 (100.0)	15967 (100.0)	68866 (100.0)
All Expenditures						
Center	18607 (48.4)	21887 (49.2)	22953 (46.9)	26519 (47.5)	33330 (48.1)	12396 (48.0)
States	19829 (57.6)	22633 (50.8)	26023 (53.1)	29826 (52.5)	35949 (51.9)	133760 (52.0)
Total	38436 (100.0)	44520 (100.0)	48976 (100.0)	55845 (100.0)	62927 (100.0)	257056 (100.0)

^a Figures in parentheses are percentages to the total expenditure in the relevant category. Data for states include the union territories.

Source: *Indian Economic Statistics (Public Finance)*, 1990, Department of Economic Affairs, Govt. of India.

Table 5.4

Developmental Expenditure by Sector, 1985-90

(Rs. crore and percent)

	Central government		State and Union Territories		Total
	Amount	Share of Total	Amount	Share of Total	
Education	7290	13.3	47702	86.7	54992
Health Water Supply	2537	10.9	20814	89.1	23351
Family Welfare	2870	86.2	4591	3.8	3329
Agriculture and allied services	8141	22.6	27885	77.4	36026
Power	7568	61.7	4704	38.3	12272
Irrigation	450	3.6	1199	96.4	12441
Other developmental expenditure	94440	82.4	20205	17.6	114645
Total	123296	48.0	133760	52.0	257056

Source: *Indian Economic Statistics (Public Finance)*, 1990; Department of Economic Affairs.

Table 5.5

Disbursement Performance of Externally assisted Projects in Selected Sectors

(Rs. crore and percent)

	Urban development and water supply (State financed and implemented)			Forestry (centrally financed, state implemented)			Railways (centrally financed and implemented)			
	Open- ing	Dis- bursed	Clos- ing (incl. commit- ment)	Open- ing	Dis- bursed	Clos- ing (incl. commit- ment)	Open- ing	Disb- bursed	Clos- ing (incl. commit- ment)	
1980-81	1359	49	1428	420	4	452	996	17	1066	
1981-82	1428	43	1509	452	11	408	1066	18	1140	
1982-83	1509	68	1572	480	18	503	1140	60	1179	
1983-84	1572	51	1657	503	22	524	1179	34	1247	
1984-85	1657	88	1713	524	34	535	1247	40	1309	
1985-86	1713	84	1777	535	33	548	1309	50	1373	
1986-87	1777	177	1753	548	76	519	1373	91	1401	
1987-88	1753	128	1777	519	70	494	1401	136	1386	
1988-89	1777	196	1735	494	104	433	1386	270	1235	
1989-90	1735	160	1729	433	119	351	1235	245	1098	
	<i>National Thermal Power Corporation</i>						<i>State Electricity Boards (states)</i>			
	<i>Undisbursed commitments</i>	<i>Disburse-ments</i>	<i>Disburse-ment ratio</i>	<i>Undisbursed commitments</i>	<i>Disburse-ments</i>	<i>Disburse-ment ratio</i>				
1985-86	8905	253	3.7	3899	209	5.4				
1986-87	7252	415	5.7	4029	133	3.3				
1987-88	7467	703	10.3	4245	111	2.6				
1988-89	7413	887	11.9	4503	234	5.2				
1989-90	7031	1222	17.4	4661	215	4.6				

Table 5.6

ODA Commitments and Disbursements (1985-90)

(Rs. crore)

<i>Year</i>	<i>Aid India consortium pledges</i>	<i>Undisbursed commitments beginning of the year</i>	<i>Disbursements during the year</i>	<i>Disbursement ratios (percent)</i>
<i>1985-86</i>				
Multilateral	3357	14577	1264	8.7
Bilateral	1405	5439	999	18.4
Total	4762	20016	2263	11.3
<i>1986-87</i>				
Multilateral	3904	13313	1740	13.1
Bilateral	1816	4440	1430	32.2
Total	5720	17753	3170	17.8
<i>1987-88</i>				
Multilateral	4237	12127	2997	24.7
Bilateral	2835	3620	1770	48.9
Total	7072	15747	4767	30.2
<i>1988-89</i>				
Multilateral	5295	18367	3233	17.6
Bilateral	3738	4818	1373	28.5
Total	9033	23185	4606	19.9
<i>1989-90</i>				
Multilateral	6383	17194	3267	19.0
Bilateral	3721	8471	1808	21.3
Total	10104	25665	5075	19.8

Table 5.7

Central Transfers of Resources to States and Union Territories, 1989-90

	1980-81	81-82	82-83	83-84	84-85	85-86	86-87	87-88	88-89	89-90
	(Rs. crore)									
Total GOI receipts	23572	27074	31598	36434	44705	54359	64665	70486	61791	90155
Net transfers to the states and UTs	9010	9395	12822	13882	14720	22262	21195	24870	27485	30794
ACA flows	181	211	302	424	433	462	545	603	609	939
Net transfers as a proportion of total receipts	37.9	34.7	40.6	36.7	32.9	40.9	32.8	35.3	33.6	34.2
ACA flows as a proportion of net transfer	2.0	2.2	2.4	3.2	3.0	2.1	2.6	2.4	2.2	3.0
Rate of growth of ACA flows	--	16.6	43.1	40.4	2.1	6.7	18.0	10.6	1.0	54.2
Rate of growth of net transfers	--	4.3	36.5	4.4	10.0	51.2	4.8	17.3	10.5	10.7

Table 5.8

ACA Releases to Different States, 1974-80

(Rs. crore)

	<i>Fifth Plan (1974-75 to 1978-79)</i>	<i>Plan Holiday (1979-80)</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Percent of total ACA</i>
Andhra Pradesh	43.81	44.21	88.02	29.6
Bihar	1.09	1.84	2.93	1.0
Gujarat	1.73	16.84	18.57	6.3
Haryana	2.91	11.04	13.95	4.7
Karnataka	20.02	14.51	34.53	11.6
Kerala	3.20	2.08	5.28	1.8
Madhya Pradesh	10.29	3.33	13.62	4.6
Maharashtra	6.88	23.98	30.86	10.4
Orissa	4.72	7.44	12.16	4.1
Punjab	1.00	4.77	5.77	1.9
Rajasthan	16.28	4.65	20.93	7.0
Tamil Nadu	2.46	4.01	6.47	2.2
Uttar Pradesh	15.39	6.30	21.65	7.3
West Bengal	2.39	16.17	18.56	6.2
Major States	132.09	161.17	293.26	98.7
Other states	3.11	0.89	4.00	1.3
Total	135.20	162.06	297.26	100.0

Table 5.9

ACA Releases to States 1989-90

	1980-81	81-82	82-83	83-84	84-85	85-86	86-87	87-88	88-89	89-90
Andhra Pradesh	28.14	17.03	18.91	21.70	23.68	7.55	15.24	13.67	35.78	38.09
Bihar	2.63	3.89	8.94	8.39	10.63	14.58	37.98	25.34	32.37	12.62
Gujarat	17.40	28.41	45.31	56.19	61.18	37.12	42.28	76.71	62.87	135.99
Haryana	14.81	9.91	12.62	22.56	21.46	20.74	21.17	16.79	13.76	21.55
Karnataka	11.21	10.25	13.38	22.23	38.09	44.70	39.50	23.39	31.03	44.81
Kerala	0.14	0.20	9.83	21.26	13.00	20.39	24.11	29.66	35.35	24.87
Madhya Pradesh	1.72	4.13	22.19	39.14	52.52	60.95	63.38	71.86	53.32	89.39
Maharashtra	44.87	54.06	60.43	86.12	75.13	98.54	89.67	88.18	81.45	103.08
Orissa	12.34	15.65	14.89	23.30	29.38	37.26	56.93	52.20	62.07	58.13
Punjab	11.95	15.04	12.55	11.63	14.32	12.76	14.29	3.56	3.13	--
Rajasthan	2.70	10.15	18.83	18.45	12.42	19.29	23.15	16.42	28.13	9.35
Tamil Nadu	5.64	11.16	12.62	26.48	28.20	23.72	38.51	58.25	52.04	95.49
Uttar Pradesh	8.96	11.12	29.07	34.36	30.06	34.60	44.67	96.55	76.55	239.79
West Bengal	16.72	17.46	20.92	22.50	13.42	14.84	23.55	18.93	27.24	49.15
Major States	179.21	208.27	300.48	414.30	423.50	447.04	534.42	591.36	595.10	922.29
Other States	1.42	2.45	1.85	9.58	9.59	15.26	10.96	11.82	13.82	16.76
Total	180.63	210.72	302.33	423.89	433.08	462.30	545.38	603.17	608.92	939.05

(Rs. crore)

Table 5.10

ACA in Relation to Total Central Plan Assistance

(Rs. crore)

	Central assistance released in the Sixth Plan		Percent of central assistance	Central assistance released in the Seventh Plan		Percent of central assistance
		ACA		ACA		
1. Andhra Pradesh	898	109	12.13	1628	110	6.75
2. Arunachal Pradesh	--	--	--	--	--	--
3. Assam	1216	9	0.07	2521	6	0.23
4. Bihar	1400	34	2.42	2545	123	4.83
5. Goa	--	--	--	--	--	--
6. Gujarat	438	208	47.48	781	355	45.45
7. Haryana	210	81	38.50	339	94	27.72
8. Himachal Pradesh	449	12	2.67	945	35	3.70
9. Jammu & Kashmir	1054	4	0.37	2157	20	0.92
10. Karnataka	469	95	20.25	829	183	22.07
11. Kerala	439	44	10.02	1067	134	12.55
12. Madhya Pradesh	965	120	12.43	1531	339	22.10
13. Maharashtra	748	321	42.90	1257	461	36.67
14. Manipur	287	--	--	606	--	--
15. Meghalaya	249	--	--	525	--	--
16. Mizoram	--	--	--	--	--	--
17. Nagaland	291	--	--	706	--	--
18. Orissa	663	96	14.47	1060	267	25.18
19. Punjab	272	65	23.89	420	34	8.00
20. Rajasthan	661	63	9.53	1259	96	7.62
21. Sikkim	136	--	--	288	--	--
22. Tamil Nadu	673	84	12.48	1408	268	18.25
23. Tripura	267	--	--	660	9	--
24. Uttar Pradesh	2094	114	5.44	3498	492	14.00
25. West Bengal	670	91	13.58	1134	134	11.81
Total	14549	1550		27164	3160	

Table 5.11

ACA Allocations and Gadgil Transfers

(Rs. crore)

	Allocations (Gadgil formula)	Actual ACA releaseses	Hypothetical ACA transfers	Difference	Difference as a proportion of transfers
Special Category States	7102.05	68.62	944.45	-875.83	-12.3
Major States	16932.37	3055.74	2179.91	875.83	5.3
Andhra Pradesh	1483.47	110.34	197.28	86 94	-5.9
Bihar	2134.74	122.88	283.88	-161.00	-7.5
Gujarat	607.63	354.97	80.80	274.17	45.1
Haryana	323.46	94.01	43.01	51.00	15.8
Karnataka	767.72	183.42	102.09	81.33	10.6
Kerala	923.57	123.37	122.82	11.55	1.3
Madhya Pradesh	1400.35	338.90	186.22	152.68	10.9
Maharashtra	1169.82	460.91	155.57	305.34	26.1
Orissa	910.43	266.59	121.07	145.52	16.0
Punjab	383.73	33.74	51.03	-17.29	-4.5
Rajasthan	1096.46	96.34	145.81	-49.47	-4.5
Tamil Nadu	1238.49	268.00	164.70	103.30	8.3
Uttar Pradesh	2944.85	457.55	391.61	65.94	2.2
West Bengal	1007.65	133.72	134.00	-0.28	--
Total	23494.42	3124.36	3124.36	--	--

Note: The first column indicates the allocations in the Seventh Plan resulting from an application of the modified Gadgil formula and incorporated in the original resource exercise of the plan. From the divisible pool of plan resources, the needs of the special category states were first catered to, and the balance allocated amongst major states, on the basis of population, per-capita income, special needs and relative tax effort. The second column indicates the actual ACA releases, while the third column provides an alternative, hypothetical allocation of the ACA resources, based on the same principles as the modified Gadgil formula allocations, i.e., as if the external flows based on state sector expenditures were re-allocated, not to the states from which the expenditures originated, but to the divisible pool of plan resources. The fourth column shows the difference between the second and third one, while the last column represents the difference expressed as a proportion of the originally derived Gadgil allocations of 'normal' central assistance.

Table 5.12

**ACA Allocations and Gadgil Transfers for Major States,
1985-90**

(Rs. crore)

	<i>Allocations (Gadgil formula)</i>	<i>Actual ACA releases</i>	<i>Hypothetical ACA transfers</i>	<i>Difference</i>	<i>Difference as a proportion of transfers</i>
Andhra Pradesh	1483.47	110.34	276.58	-166.24	-11.2
Bihar	2134.74	122.88	397.94	-275.06	-12.9
Gujarat	607.63	354.97	113.27	241.70	39.8
Haryana	323.46	94.01	60.30	33.71	10.4
Karnataka	767.72	183.42	143.11	40.31	5.3
Kerala	923.57	123.37	172.16	-37.79	-4.1
Madhya Pradesh	1400.35	338.90	261.04	77.86	5.6
Maharashtra	1169.82	460.91	218.07	242.84	20.8
Orissa	910.43	266.59	169.72	96.87	10.6
Punjab	383.73	33.74	71.53	-37.79	-9.8
Rajasthan	1096.46	96.34	204.39	-108.05	-9.9
Tamil Nadu	1238.49	268.00	230.87	37.13	3.0
Uttar Pradesh	2944.85	457.55	548.96	-91.41	-3.1
West Bengal	1007.65	133.72	187.84	-54.12	-5.4
All Major States	23494.42	3124.36	3055.74		

Table 5.13

Sectoral Composition of ACA, 1980-90

(Rs. crore)

	Agriculture	Rural Deve- lopment	Irri- gation	Power	Indus- try	Trans- port	Social services	Total
1980-81	21.5	21.0	97.9	17.9	--	--	22.2	180.6
1981-82	24.6	9.8	123.3	14.4	0.1	4.3	41.6	210.7
1982-83	34.9	4.2	157.7	28.6	1.8	17.8	57.4	302.3
1983-84	46.9	1.6	227.1	57.9	2.7	12.1	75.6	423.9
1984-85	68.3	0.8	243.3	41.0	3.8	7.6	68.3	433.1
1985-86	72.6	2.1	239.2	47.5	3.7	4.5	92.6	462.3
1986-87	122.2	4.5	220.3	63.9	4.6	1.4	128.5	545.4
1987-88	90.7	--	254.5	94.1	5.0	1.8	157.1	603.2
1988-89	90.8	0.2	253.8	112.9	3.5	6.7	11.0	608.9
1989-90	161.9	1.0	285.1	206.2	0.5	12.6	271.8	939.1
VI Plan	196.2	37.4	849.3	159.8	9.1	59.1	260.0	1550.6
VII Plan	538.1	9.8	1253.0	524.6	17.3	27.1	790.1	3158.9

Table 5.14

Plan Outlays and ACA Transfers

(Rs. crore)

	Plan outlays (States, UTs)			ACA transfers		
	Sixth Plan	Seventh Plan	1989-90	Sixth Plan	Seventh Plan	1989-90
Agr. & Rural Dev.	7339.02	10223.1	4095.5	233.6	545.9	162.9
Irrigation	8301.46	15223.39	3666.7	849.3	125.0	285.1
Power	14293.56	22786.15	5955.1	159.8	524.6	206.2
Industry	2074.33	3464.48	1098.1	9.1	17.3	0.5
Transport	3604.78	5608.19	1557.0	59.1	27.1	12.7
Social Services	9495.44	17782.96	5766.8	260.0	790.1	271.8
Total	45108.59	75088.27	23151.6	1550.1	3158.8	939.1

Table 5.15

**ACA as a Resource for the State Plans
during the Seventh Plan**

(Rs. crore)

	Original Provisions			Revised Provisions			ACA actuals	Attainment of revised ACA target (percent)
	Plan outlay	Normal central assis- tance	ACA resource	Plan outlay	Normal central assis- tance	ACA reso- urce		
Andhra Pradesh	5200	1483	158	5560	1818	207	110	53
Bihar	5100	2135	170	6901	2677	345	123	36
Gujarat	6000	698	358	5589	865	528	35	67
Haryana	2900	323	71	2866	626	103	94	91
Karnataka	3575	768	114	4226	926	204	183	90
Kerala	2100	924	217	2211	1266	222	134	61
Madhya Pradesh	7000	1400	496	7663	1752	443	339	76
Maharashtra	10500	1170	620	11190	140	585	461	79
Orissa	2700	910	242	3560	1113	427	268	62
Punjab	3285	384	84	3314	2457	35	34	95
Rajasthan	3000	1096	58	3105	1363	74	96	130
Tamil Nadu	5750	1238	216	6180	1563	305	268	88
Uttar Pradesh	10447	2945	670	11512	3445	1461	458	31
West Bengal	4125	1008	215	4379	1215	177	134	76
All Major States	71682	16482	3689	78255	22621	5117	3090	60

Source: Seventh Five Year Plan and Mid-Term Review.

Annexure 1

Additional Central Assistance released to States (Sectorwise) during the year 1980-81

(Rs. in lakhs)

S. State No.	Agriculture	Rural development	Irrigation	Flood Control & cyclone protection	Power	Industry & Mines	Transport	Social services	Area development	Others	Total
1. Andhra Pradesh	63.1	--	1323.2	55.3	1240.3	--	--	132.4	--	--	2814.3
2. Arunachal Pradesh	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
3. Assam	79.6	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	79.6
4. Bihar	94.3	21.7	--	--	146.6	--	--	--	--	--	262.6
5. Goa	--	--	1239.0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1239.0
6. Gujarat	363.6	--	1411.5	--	137.2	--	--	--	--	--	1912.3
7. Haryana	69.2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	69.2
8. Himachal Pradesh	60.4	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	60.4
9. Jammu & Kashmir	1.6	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1.6
10. Karnataka	166.5	--	943.7	--	9.2	--	--	1.2	--	--	1120.6
11. Kerala	--	--	--	--	13.6	--	--	--	--	--	13.6

S. No.	State	Agriculture	Rural development	Irrigation	Flood Control & cyclone protection	Power	Industry & Minerals	Transport services	Social services	Area development	Others	Total
12.	Madhya Pradesh	172.0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	172.0
13.	Maharashtra	--	--	3311.1	--	188.2	--	--	987.7	--	--	4487.0
14.	Manipur	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
15.	Meghalaya	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
16.	Mizoram	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
17.	Nagaland	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
18.	Orissa	455.0	--	779.7	--	-0.5	--	--	--	--	--	1234.3
19.	Punjab	--	--	510.3	--	--	--	--	581.0	103.3	--	1194.6
20.	Rajasthan	205.8	--	--	--	--	--	--	64.3	--	--	270.1
21.	Sikkim	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
22.	Tamil Nadu	--	--	163.1	55.3	3.3	--	--	--	342.2	--	563.9
23.	Tripura	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
24.	Uttar Pradesh	304.5	--	--	--	--	--	--	454.2	137.2	--	895.9
25.	West Bengal	118.5	--	--	--	54.5	--	--	--	1498.7	--	1671.7
Total		2154.0	21.7	9681.6	110.6	1792.6	--	--	2220.9	2081.4	--	18062.6

Annexure 2

Additional Central Assistance released to States (Sectorwise) during the year 1981-82

(Rs. in lakhs)

S. State No.	Agriculture	Rural development	Irrigation	Flood Control & cyclone protection	Power	Industry & Mines	Transport	Social services	Area development	Others	Total
1. Andhra Pradesh	181.1	--	1080.4	44.7	92.0	--	--	304.8	--	--	1703.1
2. Arunachal Pradesh	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
3. Assam	43.4	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	43.4
4. Bihar	25.9	--	--	--	334.9	--	28.7	--	--	--	389.4
5. Goa	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
6. Gujarat	515.0	--	2056.0	--	107.9	--	--	162.3	--	--	2841.2
7. Haryana	57.4	--	933.4	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	990.09
8. Himachal Pradesh	188.6	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	188.6
9. Jammu & Kashmir	13.2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	13.2
10. Karnataka	160.4	--	781.1	--	6.0	77.4	--	--	--	--	1024.9
11. Kerala	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1.6	1.6

S. State No.	Agriculture development	Rural development	Irrigation	Flood Control & cyclone protection	Power	Industry & Minerals	Transport	Social services	Area development	Others	Total
12. Madhya Pradesh	130.3	--	158.0	--	--	--	--	38.0	--	87.0	413.3
13. Maharashtra	--	--	3802.2	--	678.8	--	--	924.7	--	--	5405.7
14. Manipur	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
15. Meghalaya	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
16. Mizoram	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
17. Nagaland	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
18. Orissa	254.8	--	1291.0	18.9	0.0	--	--	--	--	--	1564.7
19. Punjab	--	--	859.8	--	--	--	--	525.7	118.3	--	1503.8
20. Rajasthan	314.7	--	270.0	--	--	--	--	429.8	--	--	1014.5
21. Sikkim	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
22. Tamil Nadu	58.8	--	123.9	38.5	8.6	--	--	886.2	--	--	1116.0
23. Tripura	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
24. Uttar Pradesh	310.8	--	--	--	--	--	--	792.3	--	8.4	1111.5
25. West Bengal	202.9	--	--	59.9	215.8	--	406.0	--	861.7	--	1746.3
Total	2457.4	--	11355.7	162.0	1444.1	77.4	434.7	4063.8	980.0	97.0	21072.2

Annexure 3

Additional Central Assistance released to States (Sectorwise) during the year 1982-83

(Rs. in lakhs)

S. State No.	Agriculture	Rural development	Irrigation	Flood Control & cyclone protection	Power	Industry & Minerals	Transport	Social services	Area development	Others	Total
1. Andhra Pradesh	89.7	--	811.0	--	848.4	--	--	142.0	--	--	1891.2
2. Arunachal Pradesh	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
3. Assam	151.2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	151.2
4. Bihar	67.9	--	347.9	--	22.0	--	456.4	--	--	--	894.2
5. Goa	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
6. Gujarat	783.3	--	3261.4	--	37.6	--	--	384.9	--	63.7	4530.9
7. Haryana	84.6	--	1177.3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1262.0
8. Himachal Pradesh	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
9. Jammu & Kashmir	33.4	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	33.4
10. Karnataka	511.8	--	646.5	--	--	179.8	--	--	--	--	1338.0
11. Kerala	67.2	--	821.8	--	--	--	--	91.5	--	2.8	983.3

<i>S. State No.</i>	<i>Agriculture</i>	<i>Rural development</i>	<i>Irrigation</i>	<i>Flood Control & cyclone protection</i>	<i>Power</i>	<i>Industry & Minerals</i>	<i>Transport services</i>	<i>Social development</i>	<i>Others</i>	<i>Total</i>
12. Madhya Pradesh	350.4	--	1594.6	--	--	--	--	--	273.7	2218.7
13. Maharashtra	147.0	--	3794.1	--	145.3	--	--	1956.5	--	6042.9
14. Manipur	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
15. Meghalaya	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
16. Mizoram	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
17. Nagaland	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
18. Orissa	56.0	--	1428.9	3.6	--	--	--	--	--	1488.5
19. Punjab	--	--	700.2	--	--	--	--	382.2	172.2	1254.7
20. Rajasthan	247.5	--	1041.6	--	--	--	--	593.6	--	1882.7
21. Sikkim	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
22. Tamil Nadu	423.5	--	141.4	--	--	--	--	697.2	--	1262.1
23. Tripura	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
24. Uttar Pradesh	291.2	--	--	--	1479.0	--	--	1121.5	--	15.4 2907.1
25. West Bengal	186.2	--	--	--	323.1	--	1322.3	--	246.4	14.0 2091.9
Total	3490.9	--	15766.8	3.6	2855.4	179.8	1778.7	5369.4	418.6	369.6 30232.7

Annexure 4

Additional Central Assistance released to States (Sectorwise) during the year 1983-84

(Rs. in lakhs)

S. No.	State	Agriculture	Rural development	Irrigation	Flood Control & cyclone protection	Power	Industry & Minerals	Transport services	Social Area development	Others	Total
1.	Andhra Pradesh	170.7	--	1569.0	--	354.7	--	--	75.2	--	2169.6
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
3.	Assam	73.1	--	--	--	397.6	--	--	--	--	470.7
4.	Bihar	43.4	--	319.9	--	99.4	--	376.6	--	--	839.3
5.	Goa	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
6.	Gujarat	626.5	--	4830.9	--	7.9	--	--	129.7	23.8	5618.9
7.	Haryana	261.8	--	1902.5	--	91.7	--	--	--	--	2256.0
8.	Himachal Pradesh	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	356.2	--	356.2
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	131.7	--	131.7
10.	Karnataka	630.5	--	1318.6	--	--	273.7	--	--	--	2222.9
11.	Kerala	88.2	--	676.2	204.3	982.5	--	--	174.4	--	2125.6

S. State No.	Agriculture	Rural development	Irrigation	Flood Control & cyclone protection	Power	Industry & Minerals	Transport services	Social development	Others	Total
12. Madhya Pradesh	508.5	--	3211.4	--	--	--	194.0	--	--	3913.9
13. Maharashtra	472.2	--	4605.4	--	294.7	--	3239.5	--	--	8611.8
14. Manipur	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
15. Meghalaya	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
16. Mizoram	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
17. Nagaland	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
18. Orissa	140.7	--	1509.7	22.6	646.8	--	10.5	--	--	2330.2
19. Punjab	--	--	695.1	--	--	--	468.3	--	--	1163.4
20. Rajasthan	41.0	--	1263.9	--	--	--	539.7	--	--	1844.6
21. Sikkim	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
22. Tamil Nadu	343.0	--	445.2	--	1153.6	--	706.3	--	--	2648.1
23. Tripura	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
24. Uttar Pradesh	811.2	--	--	--	1717.1	--	877.4	--	30.1	3435.9
25. West Bengal	477.8	--	--	135.0	41.5	--	828.8	606.9	159.7	2249.8
Total	4688.8	--	22347.6	361.9	5787.6	273.7	1205.4	7509.8	159.7	53.9 42388.6

Annexure 5

Additional Central Assistance released to States (Sectorwise) during the year 1984-85

(Rs. in lakhs)

S. State No.	Agriculture	Rural development	Irrigation	Flood Control & cyclone protection	Power	Industry & Minerals	Transport	Social services	Area development	Others	Total
1. Andhra Pradesh	185.6	--	1298.5	25.0	717.4	--	--	141.5	--	--	2368.0
2. Arunachal Pradesh	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
3. Assam	177.8	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	177.8
4. Bihar	35.7	--	593.6	--	--	--	434.0	--	--	--	1063.3
5. Goa	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
6. Gujarat	808.5	--	4789.2	--	--	--	--	519.9	--	--	6117.6
7. Haryana	347.9	--	1798.3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	2146.2
8. Himachal Pradesh	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	584.2	--	--	584.2
9. Jammu & Kashmir	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	196.9	--	--	196.9
10. Karnataka	1363.6	--	2082.8	--	--	--	382.8	--	--	--	3809.2
11. Kerala	143.5	--	621.6	31.5	330.2	--	--	173.1	--	--	1299.8

S. State No.	Agriculture	Rural development	Irrigation	Flood Control & cyclone protection	Power	Industry & Minerals	Transport	Social services	Area development	Others	Total
12. Madhya Pradesh	633.2	--	4539.3	--	--	--	--	79.8	--	--	5252.2
13. Maharashtra	757.5	--	3602.4	--	30.1	--	--	3122.7	--	--	7512.6
14. Manipur	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
15. Meghalaya	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
16. Mizoram	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
17. Nagaland	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
18. Orissa	145.9	--	2057.3	49.6	685.3	--	--	--	--	--	2938.1
19. Punjab	--	--	1189.3	--	--	--	--	242.9	--	--	1432.2
20. Rajasthan	6.0	--	922.5	--	--	--	--	313.6	--	--	1242.1
21. Sikkim	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
22. Tamil Nadu	1125.7	--	517.3	8.8	689.8	--	--	478.3	--	--	2819.8
23. Tripura	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
24. Uttar Pradesh	686.5	--	218.4	--	1645.0	--	--	456.3	--	--	3006.1
25. West Bengal	410.7	--	--	135.0	--	--	329.7	523.6	77.7	--	1341.7
Total	6828.1	--	24210.5	115.0	4097.8	382.8	763.7	6832.8	77.7	--	43308.4

Annexure 6

Additional Central Assistance released to States (Sectorwise) during the year 1985-86

(Rs. in lakhs)

S. State No.	Agriculture	Rural development	Irrigation	Flood Control & cyclone protection	Power	Industry & Minerals	Transport services	Social Area development	Others	Total
1. Andhra Pradesh	152.2	--	394.8	--	106.4	--	--	101.8	--	755.2
2. Arunachal Pradesh	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
3. Assam	--	--	--	--	454.3	--	--	--	--	454.3
4. Bihar	222.3	--	967.2	--	--	268.1	--	--	--	1457.6
5. Goa	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
6. Gujarat	736.7	--	2272.4	--	--	--	702.6	--	--	3711.6
7. Haryana	329.7	--	1726.9	--	17.6	--	--	--	--	2074.2
8. Himachal Pradesh	160.2	--	--	--	--	--	265.3	16.2	--	441.7
9. Jammu & Kashmir	203.3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	203.3
10. Karnataka	1519.9	--	2548.0	--	--	374.9	--	26.9	--	4469.7
11. Kerala	442.4	--	1003.8	110.8	139.8	--	--	342.4	--	2099.1

S. State No.	Agriculture	Rural development	Irrigation	Flood Control & cyclone protection	Power	Industry & Minerals	Transport	Social services	Area development	Others	Total
12. Madhya Pradesh	701.0	4953.2	--	28.7	--	--	412.4	--	--	--	6095.2
13. Maharashtra	962.2	--	3122.4	--	1927.8	--	--	3841.1	--	--	9853.6
14. Manipur	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
15. Meghalaya	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
16. Mizoram	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
17. Nagaland	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
18. Orissa	179.2	--	2404.1	--	980.2	--	--	162.8	--	--	3726.3
19. Punjab	--	--	930.3	--	--	--	--	345.6	--	--	1275.9
20. Rajasthan	98.0	--	1297.8	--	--	--	--	533.4	--	--	1929.2
21. Sikkim	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
22. Tamil Nadu	593.9	--	692.4	--	39.4	--	--	1045.9	--	--	2371.5
23. Tripura	--	--	--	--	426.6	--	--	--	--	--	426.6
24. Uttar Pradesh	605.1	--	1446.9	--	633.5	--	--	718.0	56.7	--	3460.2
25. West Bengal	349.6	--	--	52.7	--	--	184.8	761.6	135.6	--	1484.3
Total	7255.6	--	23760.2	163.5	4754.3	374.9	452.9	9259.7	208.5	--	46229.6

Annexure 7

Additional Central Assistance released to States (Sectorwise) during the year 1986-87

(Rs. in lakhs)

S. State No.	Agriculture	Rural development	Irrigation	Flood Control & cyclone protection	Power	Industry & Minerals	Transport	Social services	Area development	Others	Total
1. Andhra Pradesh	579.4	--	152.8	243.5	--	--	--	548.7	--	--	1524.3
2. Arunachal Pradesh	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
3. Assam	--	--	--	--	10.7	--	--	--	--	--	10.7
4. Bihar	--	--	--	--	3660.8	--	137.2	--	--	--	3798.0
5. Goa	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
6. Gujarat	698.0	--	2493.4	--	45.2	--	--	991.7	--	--	4228.3
7. Haryana	303.1	--	1768.9	--	44.6	--	--	--	--	--	2116.6
8. Himachal Pradesh	525.3	--	--	--	15.7	--	--	112.5	--	--	653.5
9. Jammu & Kashmir	414.7	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	414.7
10. Karnataka	1771.6	--	1626.1	--	--	460.9	--	91.3	--	--	3950.0
11. Kerala	1908.2	--	--	--	90.8	--	--	411.6	--	--	2410.6

<i>S. State No.</i>	<i>Agriculture</i>	<i>Rural development</i>	<i>Irrigation</i>	<i>Flood Control & cyclone protection</i>	<i>Power</i>	<i>Industry & Mines</i>	<i>Transport</i>	<i>Social services</i>	<i>Area development</i>	<i>Others</i>	<i>Total</i>
12. Madhya Pradesh	1062.1	--	4742.1	--	74.2	--	--	459.4	--	--	6337.7
13. Maharashtra	1065.8	--	3012.8	--	196.7	--	--	4691.4	--	--	8966.7
14. Manipur	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
15. Meghalaya	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
16. Mizoram	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
17. Nagaland	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
18. Orissa	403.6	--	3226.2	28.7	1751.6	--	--	283.2	--	--	5693.5
19. Punjab	--	--	557.2	--	--	--	--	871.8	--	--	1429.0
20. Rajasthan	631.0	--	664.6	--	--	--	--	1019.2	--	--	2314.8
21. Sikkim	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
22. Tamil Nadu	1357.0	--	1128.6	7.9	33.0	--	--	1324.5	--	--	3851.0
23. Tripura	--	--	--	--	17.6	--	--	--	--	--	17.6
24. Uttar Pradesh	1089.5	--	2382.1	--	445.5	--	--	278.7	250.7	--	4446.5
25. West Bengal	416.7	--	--	--	--	--	--	1741.6	196.6	--	2354.9
Total	12226.0	--	21754.8	280.2	6386.4	460.9	137.2	12825.7	447.3	--	54518.4

Annexure 8

Additional Central Assistance released to States (Sectorwise) during the year 1987-88

(Rs. in lakhs)

S. State No.	Agriculture	Rural development	Irrigation	Flood Control & cyclone protection	Power	Industry & Minerals	Transport	Social services	Area development	Others	Total
1. Andhra Pradesh	139.3	--	260.3	--	--	--	--	967.8	--	--	1367.4
2. Arunachal Pradesh	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
3. Assam	--	--	--	--	1.8	--	--	--	--	--	1.8
4. Bihar	403.4	--	1284.2	--	497.9	--	285.6	63.0	--	--	2534.1
5. Goa	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
6. Gujarat	1137.9	--	2586.4	--	2063.7	--	53.2	1829.8	--	--	7671.0
7. Haryana	287.7	--	1374.1	--	17.5	--	--	--	--	--	1679.3
8. Himachal Pradesh	563.9	--	--	--	--	--	--	355.2	--	--	919.1
9. Jammu & Kashmir	244.6	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	244.6
10. Karnataka	1188.5	--	788.2	--	--	292.0	--	70.2	--	--	2338.9
11. Kerala	407.4	--	842.1	--	181.1	207.2	--	1328.2	--	--	2965.9

S. State No.	Agriculture	Rural development	Irrigation	Flood Control & cyclone protection	Power	Industry & Minerals	Transport	Social services	Area development	Others	Total
12. Madhya Pradesh	824.6	--	5944.1	--	286.7	--	--	130.6	--	--	7186.0
13. Maharashtra	387.3	--	2569.1	--	2094.2	--	--	3766.9	--	--	8817.6
14. Manipur	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
15. Meghalaya	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
16. Mizoram	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
17. Nagaland	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
18. Orissa	452.9	--	2509.8	--	1834.0	--	--	423.3	--	--	5219.9
19. Punjab	--	--	356.3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	356.3
20. Rajasthan	532.3	--	516.1	--	--	--	--	593.6	--	--	1642.0
21. Sikkim	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
22. Tamil Nadu	912.1	--	944.6	--	1810.4	--	--	2158.0	--	--	5825.1
23. Tripura	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
24. Uttar Pradesh	1143.3	--	5359.2	--	620.3	--	--	2532.1	--	--	9654.9
25. West Bengal	448.0	--	112.7	--	--	--	-154.7	1487.4	--	--	1893.4
Total	9073.1	--	25447.2	--	9407.5	499.2	184.1	15706.1	--	--	60317.3

Annexure 9

Additional Central Assistance released to States (Sectorwise) during the year 1988-89

(Rs. in lakhs)

S. No.	State	Agriculture	Rural development	Irrigation	Flood Control & cyclone protection	Power	Industry & Minerals	Transport	Social services	Area development	Others	Total
1.	Andhra Pradesh	1110.8	--	633.8	--	1076.2	--	--	757.2	--	--	3578.0
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
3.	Assam	110.4	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	110.4
4.	Bihar	--	--	2745.1	--	112.3	--	379.7	--	--	--	3237.1
5.	Goa	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
6.	Gujarat	1024.5	--	3950.8	--	514.5	--	289.6	507.9	--	--	6287.1
7.	Haryana	321.9	--	1033.9	--	20.1	--	--	--	--	--	1375.9
8.	Himachal Pradesh	859.3	--	--	--	--	--	--	11.5	--	--	870.9
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	400.8	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	400.8
10.	Karnataka	769.5	--	1464.4	--	516.0	297.4	--	56.0	--	--	3103.4
11.	Kerala	595.0	--	1480.2	--	528.6	--	--	931.3	--	--	3535.1

S. State No.	Agriculture	Rural development	Irrigation	Flood Control & cyclone protection	Power & Mines	Industry & Transport	Social services	Area development	Others	Total
12. Madhya Pradesh	679.0	--	4132.2	--	366.2	--	154.9	--	--	5332.4
13. Maharashtra	241.8	--	1296.3	--	4062.4	--	2544.4	--	--	8144.9
14. Manipur	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
15. Meghalaya	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
16. Mizoram	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
17. Nagaland	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
18. Orissa	78.7	--	2529.7	--	3025.0	--	533.9	19.4	--	6206.7
19. Punjab	--	--	247.4	--	--	--	65.8	--	--	313.2
20. Rajasthan	443.1	--	389.8	--	--	--	1980.1	--	--	2813.0
21. Sikkim	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
22. Tamil Nadu	311.4	--	1110.5	--	866.5	50.1	2865.7	--	--	5204.2
23. Tripura	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
24. Uttar Pradesh	1410.8	--	3693.6	--	--	--	2550.3	--	--	7654.7
25. West Bengal	725.6	--	675.3	--	204.0	--	1119.1	--	--	2724.0
Total	9082.6	--	25383.1	--	11291.8	347.6	669.2	14098.0	19.4	60891.8