

CHAPTER V: MINISTRY OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Department of Urban Development

5. Integrated Development of Small and Medium Towns (IDSMT)

The Centrally Sponsored Scheme of Integrated Development of Small and Medium Towns (IDSMT) was launched in 1979-80 to develop small and medium towns capable of generating economic growth and employment and slowing down migration to urban areas. Coverage of towns under the scheme has not been adequate with only 1058 out of 4656 towns being covered up to March 2001. Project execution was not satisfactory since only 812 projects were completed out of 3870 projects approved during 1992-2001. The non-availability of financial resources has impeded implementation of the scheme. State Urban/Municipal Development Funds and Revolving Funds were not set up, as envisaged, to make the scheme self-sustaining. The inability to raise institutional finance or to generate internal resources was a major factor for tardy progress in project completion. Private participation for infrastructure development in small and medium towns was not forthcoming. On the other hand, Rs 131.50 crore remained unutilised as of 31 March 2001. In 9 States assets created at a cost of Rs 22.33 crore remained unutilised. Monitoring and Evaluation was ineffective at Ministry, State and Town levels. The Ministry has no data regarding the extent to which urban migration has been arrested.

Highlights

Out of 4656 small and medium towns, only 1058 towns had been covered in the span of 2 decades ending March 2001. Out of 3870 projects covering 541 small and medium towns approved during 1992-2001, only 812 projects were completed, 1020 are ongoing and 2038 are yet to be taken up.

Out of the total Central, State releases and institutional finance of Rs 802.92 crore, Rs 671.42 crore was spent as of March 2001 on the projects approved since 1979-2001.

Out of the total releases of Rs 435.23 crore since 1992 to March 2001, Rs 278.04 crore were incurred. The expenditure constitutes 64 per cent of the total release.

79 per cent projects were either yet to be taken up or were ongoing.

Private Sector participation in the development of town was not forthcoming.

The Ministry/State Governments sanctioned/ released funds without ensuring creation of revolving fund/State Urban /Municipal development fund. This resulted in failure to systematically channelize funds for infrastructure development.

There were defaults in repayment of loans sanctioned prior to August 1995.

The Central Government released a large portion of Central assistance towards the end of the financial year.

Monitoring and evaluation were not adequate and effective at Ministry, State and town levels.

5.1 Introduction

The Centrally Sponsored Scheme of Integrated Development of Small (Population below one lakh) and Medium Towns (Population above one lakh and below five lakh) (IDSMT) was launched in 1979-80 to develop small and medium towns, generate economic growth and employment so as to slow down migration from rural areas and smaller towns to larger cities. The Scheme is not applicable to towns with population between 50000 and 100000 covered under the Prime Minister's Integrated Urban Poverty Eradication Programme.

5.2 Main Objectives

The objectives of the Scheme were to:

- ◆ improve infrastructural facilities for economic growth and employment, and reduce migration of people belonging to rural and smaller urban areas to bigger cities and towns for jobs.
- ◆ decentralize economic growth and employment opportunities taking advantage of functional interlinkages between villages, towns and cities through a regional planning approach.
- ◆ integrate spatial and socio-economic planning as envisaged in the Constitution (74th Amendment) Act, 1992 and preparing/ implementing Town/City Development Plans.
- ◆ promote resource-generating schemes for the urban local bodies to improve their ability to undertake infrastructure for development on their own as well as to repay the borrowed capital and usher in necessary municipal reforms.

5.3 Selection of Towns and Components for funding

While selecting the towns, preference is to be given to headquarters of districts followed by mandi towns and industrial growth centres, tourist places and pilgrim centres, etc. The project components for assistance under the Scheme include works according to City/Town Development/Master Plans, which may have wide significance such as strengthening of master plan road facilities including ring, arterial bypass/link roads and small bridges, sites and services, development of bus/truck terminals, construction/ up gradation of master plan, drains including storm water drains/channels, solid waste management, development of market complexes/shopping centres, provision of tourist facilities, development of city/town parks, street lighting for master plan roads, slaughter houses, major public amenities like gardens, playgrounds,

marriage halls, pay-and-use toilets, cycle/rickshaw stands, traffic improvement and management schemes, construction of retaining walls and slope stability measures in hill station towns and social amenities, especially for the poorer sections.

5.4 Organizational set-up

The Ministry of Urban Development (MOUD) is responsible for release of Central assistance and monitoring of physical and financial projects of the Scheme. Since the decision taken in March 1995 to discontinue the Central Sanctioning Committee, the projects are now approved by State Level Sanctioning Committees, which are also responsible for project coordination, and periodic review, monitoring and evaluation of the implementation of the Scheme. The State Governments/UTs are to prepare and send detailed project reports to the Town and Country Planning Organization (TCPO) in the MOUD to facilitate the preparation of appraisal reports for consideration of the Sanctioning Committee at the State level. The State Governments/UTs send recommendations of the Sanctioning Committee, along with the consent of the Financial Institutions regarding Institutional Finance component to the MOUD through TCPO at the National level for consideration of release of Central assistance, the latter being the nodal agency for monitoring and evaluation of projects. Quarterly progress reports submitted by State Governments/UTs/Nodal agencies are scrutinized by TCPO, which in turn keeps the MOUD informed of the progress of the Scheme. Coordination, monitoring and evaluation of the IDSMT/urban development projects at the District level is undertaken by the District Collectors through District Urban Development Agencies or Monitoring Cells. These Agencies/Cells assist the District Planning Committees constituted under the Constitution (74th Amendment) Act.

5.5 Scope of Audit

The subject was earlier included in Report No 12 of 1989 of the Comptroller and Auditor General of India for the period ended 31 March 1988 as paragraph 14 - Chapter IV. Records in 25 States and 4 UTs pertaining to the years 1980-81 to 1987-88 were then examined. Some of the significant observations made were: Plan outlays in VI/VII Plans were inadequate, budget provision made and the actual release of Central assistance fell short of the plan outlay, State Government's share did not match Central Assistance, part of available funds remained unutilised by implementing agencies, release of Central assistance was not regulated evenly, physical progress of development of towns was tardy, benefits envisaged for Economically Weaker Sections/Low Income Group persons were not achieved, achievements under Low Cost Sanitation Scheme were inadequate, funds were diverted, and also blocked due to works remaining incomplete, assets created remained unutilised, there was delay in commencement and execution of projects, works were abandoned due to defective planning and monitoring of the Scheme at Central/State level was not effective.

Report No. 2 of 2002 (Civil)

MOUD in its reply to the ATN in this regard stated that the points raised in the Audit Report mainly related to the State Governments which were responsible for implementation of the projects, it had no direct control over release of matching contribution by states, a large number of towns could not draw Central Assistance due to land acquisition problems, selection of towns, approval of projects and monitoring the progress had all been decentralised under the guidelines modified in August 1995, State Governments were asked to create urban development funds at state level and Revolving Funds at town level to provide capital base for promoting infrastructure development on a continuous basis and that TCPO had been periodically reminding and pursuing with State Governments for compliance.

In the present review, Audit checked records of 122 towns out of 517 towns where projects were approved under the scheme in 20 States and one Union Territory, relating to the period 1992-2001 as shown in **Annex-I**, besides relevant records in the MOUD. This sample check covered 3870 projects sanctioned since 1992-93 till 2000-01, out of which 2345 projects were sanctioned prior to 31 March 1996, and 1525 projects sanctioned after 31 March 1996 ensuring coverage of such sanctioned projects which could have been completed within the maximum duration of five years life of a project. Our findings point out that the physical progress had declined to 34 per cent between 1992-93 to 2000-2001 as against 50 per cent in VI Five-Year Plan. The financial progress during VIII plan and 1997-98 to 2000-01 was 70.69 and 16.99 per cent respectively as against 80 per cent during VI plan and 66 per cent during 1985-86 to 1987-88, respectively.

5.6 Financial Outlay

A comprehensive view of the total financial outlays on projects sanctioned from the VI Plan Period to March 2001 is given below: -

(Rs in crore)

Sl. No.	Plan period	No. of Towns where projects were approved	Approved project cost	Central Assistance released	States Share released	Institutional Finance raised	Total	Expenditure
1.	VI	235	230.31	97.64	83.50	0.00	181.14	221.50
2.	VII	145	160.07	56.92	49.63	0.00	106.55	105.41
3.	1990-91	77	89.68	25.62	21.97	0.00	47.59	42.29
4.	1991-92	60	66.07	17.23	15.18	0.00	32.41	24.18
5.	VIII	387	906.71	203.11	106.94	69.98	380.03	268.66
6.	IX 1997-01	154	316.00	44.41	9.66	1.13	55.20	9.38
Total		1058	1768.84	444.93	286.88	71.11	802.92	671.42

State wise and plan wise position of cumulative release of Central Assistance, State Share, FIs loan and expenditure reported are indicated in **Annex II**.

Out of 2441 projects sanctioned, 1022 projects were pending.

Test check now conducted of the status of projects sanctioned between 1979-80 and 1991-92 in 13 states revealed that out of 2441 projects sanctioned, only 1419(58 *per cent*) were completed and 1022 projects (42 *per cent*) were pending completion as on 31 March 2001. Total funds released by MOUD and the 13 States came to Rs 367.69 crore, which was 67.3 *per cent* of the approved project cost during this period.

Out of Rs 435.23 crore, 157.19 crore remained unutilised.

Against the total funds of Rs 380.03 crore released during the Eighth Plan period and Rs 55.20 crore during the years 1997-98 to 2000-2001 of 9th Plan, the implementing agencies reported an expenditure of Rs 268.66 crore (70.69 *per cent*) and Rs 9.38 crore (16.99 *per cent*) only respectively leaving an unutilised amount of Rs 111.37 crore (29.31 *per cent*) and Rs 45.82 crore (83.01 *per cent*) respectively as on 31st March 2001. Details of States/UTs where more than 25 *per cent* of the funds remained unutilised are given in **Annex-III**. Ministry stated in November 2001 that the implementing agencies and States have been advised to take corrective measures and expedite utilisation of funds released within the stipulated period.

No funds were made available from municipal bodies.

Institutional finance of only Rs 71.11 crore was obtained between 1992-93 and 2000-01, which worked out to only 19.53 *per cent* of the Central and State funds taken together that were available for spending under the programme. No funds were made available from the resources of the Municipalities/Local bodies. Assistance from financial institutions and own resources ought to have been mobilised to the extent of at least Rs 242.75 crore at the minimum average rate of 40 *per cent* of the project cost prescribed under the guidelines. Funds could have been fruitfully utilised for more projects in the shape of central/state assistance if the institutional and own financial resources were raised adequately as envisaged under the guidelines. The shortfall of Rs 171.64 crore (Rs 242.75 crore minus Rs 71.11 crore) in obtaining Institutional finance and raising own resources was a major reason for tardy progress in completion of the projects. In addition, Rs 131.50 crore was not spent as on 31 March 2001, on the programme even though funds were available.

Out of 3870 projects sanctioned, only 812 completed.

With regard to physical progress, out of 3870 projects sanctioned during the period 1992-93 to 2000-01, only 812 (21 *per cent*) projects were completed as on 31 March 2001, of which 661 were sanctioned prior to 31 March 1996 and 151 sanctioned after 31 March 1996. 1020 projects were ongoing as on 31 March 2001, of which 676 were sanctioned prior to 31 March 1996 and 344 sanctioned after 31 March 1996. 2038 projects were not taken up at all. The total projects approved and their current status as of March 2001 is detailed in **Annex-XII**. Neither MOUD nor the State governments had maintained any separate details of projects sanctioned and not taken up. If detailed information was maintained, remedial measures could have been taken up in a planned manner and benefits could have been extended to a much larger number of towns.

5.7 Financing pattern

The programme was funded with loan from GOI and State governments in the ratio of 50:50 during VI and VII five-year plans and annual plans for 1990-91 and 1991-92. Though the pattern of assistance in the form of loan remained unaltered, financing pattern was changed with effect from 1992-93 with the inclusion of financing from Hudco and other institutions which were to form 40 to 70 *per cent* of the project cost depending on the population in the towns, with the balance coming as loan from GOI and states in the ratio of 60:40. Maximum population in a town was to be below 300,000. This scheme was modified from August 1995 when population limit of towns with elected bodies was raised to 500,000 and institutional finance limit was restricted to 20 to 40 *per cent* of the project cost. The most significant change was that the assistance from GOI/States was modified from loan to Grant-in-aid. The emphasis was to adopt a comprehensive town development approach and create State urban development funds to provide capital base and revolving funds at the Municipal level for continuous sustainable development of infrastructure in towns. Projects were to be taken up in the ratio of 40:30:30 in terms of those from which returns could be obtained commercially, those from which user charges could be collected and those which were considered essential for up gradation of quality of living even though considered unremunerative. Wage/ staff cost was not to be funded.

The Central share is released in instalments and routed through the State Government or a special agency designated by it to ensure accountability and proper maintenance of accounts. The State Governments/UT Administrations are to identify the financial institutions, which have expressed interest in funding the required investment and send their financial appraisal reports to Government of India while submitting proposals for release of Central assistance. For release of second and subsequent instalments, all the categories of towns must satisfy the condition that qualifying expenditure exceeds 70 *per cent* of the Central assistance released and State share taken together.

5.8 Funds released but no expenditure made

No expenditure was incurred till end of March 2001 out of Central assistance of Rs 36.61 crore released in 22 States and 3 UTs. The releases were meant for projects in 145 towns as detailed in **Annex-IV**.

5.9 Expenditure incurred less than 25 *per cent*

Only Rs 68.56 crore (12.95 *per cent*) was utilised by 19 States out of total Central release of Rs 78.50 crore in 8th and 9th Plans. The releases covered projects in 170 towns as detailed in **Annex-V**.

5.10 Delay in release of central funds

There were delays in releasing Central assistance of Rs 16.68 crore in 11 States and one UT to the implementing agencies by 12 months or more from the date of its release by the Ministry, as detailed in **Annex-VI**.

5.11 Non release and short release of central funds by the states

State Governments/UTs were required to release Central assistance to the implementing agencies within one month of receipt. However, the State/UT Governments did not release the entire Central Assistance. Cases of short release of Central assistance by States by more than 25 *per cent* are given below:

(Rs in lakh)

State	Central Assistance received	Central Assistance released	Short release to implementing agencies	Percentage of Short release of central funds
Eighth Plan				
Assam	149.11	105.00	44.00	29.50
Bihar	241.00	46.00	195.00	80.91
Ninth Plan				
Assam	103.00	0.00	103.00	100.00
Bihar	50.00	0.00	50.00	100.00
Haryana	294.60	150.00	144.60	49.08

The Ministry stated in November 2001 that the State Governments have been directed to release matching contribution within the stipulated time.

5.12 Delay in release of State matching share

There were also delays in release of States' matching share of Rs 16.40 crore to the local bodies in 7 States from two to 72 months given in **Annex-VII**.

5.13 Rush of disbursements during March

Release of funds in the last quarter ranged between 61.77 and 93.25 *per cent*.

The Ministry released funds ranging between 27.99 to 72.51 *per cent* of the total releases in the month of March during 1996-2001. 100 *per cent* Central assistance was released only in March to the States of Bihar (1996-97, 1998-99 & 2000-01) Haryana (1996-98), Madhya Pradesh (1996-97), Maharashtra (1996-97) Manipur (1996-97), Meghalaya (1996-97, 1999-2000), Nagaland (1996-97), Orissa (1996-97) and Tamil Nadu (1996-97), Arunachal Pradesh (1997-98, 1999-2000), Himachal Pradesh and Punjab (1997-98), Jammu & Kashmir (1997-99), , Sikkim (1997-98, 1999-2001) and Daman & Diu in 1997-98, Assam (1998-2000), Tripura and Dadra & Nagar Haveli in 1998-99, Goa, Mizoram, Uttar Pradesh and Pondicherry in 1999-2000. Details of releases during the last quarter based on sanctions issued ranged between 61.77 *per cent* and 93.25 *per cent* as given below:

(Rs in lakh)

Year	Amount released during the year	Funds released during March		Funds released during last quarter	
		Amount	Percentage to total release	Amount	Percentage to total release
1996-97	2592.01	1328.11	51.23	2417.11	93.25
1997-98	2601.51	728.35	27.99	1607.09	61.77
1998-99	3535.80	2563.44	72.51	2563.44	72.51
1999-00	4346.00	2566.05	59.04	2566.05	59.04
2000-01	5617.00	2486.59	44.26	4548.96	80.98

The Ministry stated in November 2001 that the Central releases are mainly based on submission of utilisation certificates of the earlier releases. The Government of India waits till the submission of utilisation certificates, hence the large chunk of funds are released in the last quarter.

5.14 Misutilisation of funds

In 13 States, Rs 4.86 crore were diverted on unapproved works/activities not covered under the scheme **Annex-VIII**. Misutilisation was mainly on staff salary, purchase of office furniture, TA and office expenditure, purchase of bus and evaluation of project etc.

5.15 Advances treated as final expenditure

Advances of Rs 31.24 crore made to various executing agencies/contractors/suppliers were treated as final expenditure though they were awaiting adjustment/recovery in States of Assam, Jammu & Kashmir, Karnataka, Madhya Pradesh, Orissa, Rajasthan, Tripura, West Bengal and Pondicherry as shown in **Annex- IX**.

In February/ March 1997 APUFIDC paid mobilisation advances amounting to Rs 3.11 crore inclusive of non-interest bearing special advance of Rs 2.15 crore to NBCC and its sub contractors for execution of works in Guntur and Chittoor towns of Andhra Pradesh. It did not; recover interest of Rs 40.30 lakh as of March 2001.

5.16 State Urban/Municipal Development Fund

One of the important refinements made in the guidelines of August 1995 was that the state governments were to create a State Urban/Municipal Development Fund at the state level so as to provide a capital base for promoting infrastructure development. The funds were to consist of a mix of selected/earmarked Government Grants and market loans. Loans for IDSMT schemes could be sanctioned to municipalities at varying rates of interest depending upon the size of municipality and subject to stipulated municipal performance. Similar funds could be created at the level of IDSMT and non – IDSMT municipalities from out of municipal resources. The State Urban Development Funds were not created in atleast 5 states, namely, Assam, Bihar, Haryana, Kerala and Maharashtra. One of the important requisites for obtaining institutional finance was that the State Urban Development Fund could serve as a mechanism for providing adequate guarantees to the local bodies. In the absence of the fund, at least six states and one UT namely Assam, Bihar, Haryana, Karnataka Manipur Tripura and Pondicherry did not arrange institutional loans. Only limited institutional finance was arranged in 7 states, namely, Gujarat, Kerala, Madhya Pradesh, Punjab, Rajasthan, Uttar Pradesh and West Bengal.

5.17 Revolving fund

The guidelines of August 1995 also envisaged that both direct and indirect cost recovery was to be built into the projects and the Central and State share

of grant together with Institutional Finance should flow into a special Revolving Fund into which receipts in the form of rents, deposits, premium, sales proceeds, user charges, betterment levies, development charges etc from the assets created under the projects would also be credited. This was done *inter alia* to enable local bodies to support the infrastructure projects on a continuing basis.

Depending on the nature of projects, only 25 *per cent* of the amount given by the Central and State Government is to be accounted for as outright grant from the Fund in the case of non-remunerative projects. The remaining 75 *per cent* amount is to be treated as a corpus to be returned to the Revolving Fund for self-sustaining development. Keeping the fragile revenue base of small and medium towns in view, the flow back of money to the Fund, in case of towns in the categories A and B would be within a period of 10 years. For other categories of towns, it would be 7 years. The Ministry/State Governments sanctioned/ released funds without ensuring creation of revolving fund. This resulted in failure to systematically channelize funds for infrastructure development so as to give effect to state/town development plans. The Ministry stated in November 2001 that the creation of Revolving Fund at the Town level was taken up with the State Governments by the Government of India in Regional Review meetings, SLSC meetings and also through general directives from time to time.

Results of sample test check revealed that the states of Andhra Pradesh, Assam, Bihar, Gujarat (Bharuch, Jamnagar and Nadiad Municipalities), Haryana, Himachal Pradesh, Karnataka, Kerala, Madhya Pradesh (except in 4 local bodies viz., Berasia, Champa, Janjgir and Kanker) Manipur, Orissa, Punjab (Sirhind, Mansa), Maharashtra, Sikkim, Tamilnadu, Tripura (Sonamura, Khowai and Teliamura Nagar Panchayat), Uttar Pradesh (Dadri and Loni towns), West Bengal and Pondicherry did not create Revolving Fund at Town level.

Sample check revealed that in **Andhra Pradesh** (Anantapur Municipality) realised Rs 21.59 lakh as rent during 1996-2000 and goodwill of Rs 132.41 lakh in 1998-99 and did not credit these to the Revolving Fund. Rs 18.50 lakh and Rs 76.02 lakh was utilised therefrom on payment of salaries for March 1999 and payment of works bill not connected with IDSMT scheme, respectively. In Miryalaguda Municipality, Rs 8 lakh was realised from auction of 32 shops in December 99 and credited to General Fund Account. The Municipality incurred Rs 3.23 lakh on electrification of these shops.

In **Gujarat**, sale proceeds of Rs 678.49 lakh of 262 shops sold during October, 1997 to March 2001, at Bharuch (134: Rs 321.87 lakh), Bhavnagar (81: Rs 197.56 lakh), Jamnagar (17 shops, 2 offices and 6 stalls: Rs 71.06 lakh) and Nadiad (30: Rs 88.00 lakh) towns of Gujarat were credited to General Fund of the Municipalities as against its credit to the Revolving Fund.

In **Haryana**, revenue of Rs 21.68 lakh received by Yamunanagar, Barwala and Pehowa Municipalities under IDSMT Scheme was treated as normal MC receipts as against its credit to Revolving Fund. Further, Rs 12.05 lakh in

Report No. 2 of 2002 (Civil)

Charkhi Dadri MC credited to the Revolving Fund was utilized for other works.

In **Himachal Pradesh**, interest earned by Mandi and Una towns on grants received during 1992-2000 was not credited to the Revolving fund.

In **Tamil Nadu** the revenue of Rs 15.46 crore were diverted to General funds of the 26 Urban Local Bodies for their regular expenditure.

In **West Bengal**, revenue of Rs 58.92 lakh realised from infrastructure created under the scheme in selected Municipalities was utilised in day-to-day expenditure of the Municipality without crediting to the Revolving fund.

5.18 Opening of Bank Account and Maintenance of Account Books

Separate Bank account and Account books were not opened.

The Scheme funds are to be credited to a separate bank account, which may be operated jointly by the Chief Executive of the Local Body/Town Planner or an officer designated by the State Government. Separate account books for Central assistance, State share and for loans from financing institutions are to be maintained by the local bodies in respect of the approved programmes. Test check of records of 122 towns in 20 states and one Union Territory revealed that almost all executing agencies in these towns had neither opened separate bank accounts nor they had separate account books. Their financial transactions were generally executed keeping the funds in personal deposit, civil deposit etc. A few cases of short term fixed deposit were noticed in the state of Orissa and Tamil Nadu.

Rs 42.04 crore were parked in PL/PD accounts.

During 1992-2001, Bihar, Gujarat, Karnataka, Kerala, Orissa, Rajasthan, Tamil Nadu, Tripura and Uttar Pradesh, were parking the Scheme funds and spending therefrom. Rs 42.04 crore are lying in PL/PD/Civil Deposit Accounts as of March 2001 as shown in **Annex-X**.

5.19 Default in repayment of loan and interest

Rs 282.63 crore were due for recovery.

Central assistance of Rs 282.63 crore inclusive of interest which was given to 25 states on matching basis as soft loan on going projects sanctioned prior to revision of guidelines in August 1995 was due for recovery. The loan was repayable in 25 years after observing moratorium of five years. In the case of late repayment, penal interest at rate upto 2.75 *per cent* above the normal rate was chargeable. Details of over due amount of principal and interest in respect of loans sanctioned as on 31.3.2001 are shown in **Annex-XI**. The Ministry stated in November 2001 that State Governments are being advised to repay the loan along with the interest as per the schedule given in the terms and conditions of the sanctions orders.

5.20 Improper Planning

The scheme was applicable only to those towns where elected bodies were in position. Projects were to be implemented only where land was in the possession of the Municipal Committees.

The implementing agencies were required to adopt a basket type approach so that expenses incurred on non-remunerative projects and for weaker sections are made up through adequate returns from remunerative components such as markets, shopping centres, bus/truck terminals etc.

Sample check revealed the following shortcomings:

Andhra Pradesh: In Guntur Town, the work for construction of Shopping Complex at Red Tank Area at Rs 3.78 crore was awarded to NBCC in December 1996, to be completed within 15 months. It handed over the site only in September 1997. In January 1998, it asked the NBCC not to proceed with the construction till a decision for revision of the plans was taken after spending Rs 1.25 crore on the scheme. Sanction of the revised technical estimates was awaited as of March 2001.

Gujarat: In Modasa town, work relating to one road with approved cost of Rs 35.33 lakh commenced in April 1997. After incurring an expenditure of Rs 24.45 lakh the work was discontinued in April 1998 as possession of remaining agricultural land measuring 147 meters was not with the municipality.

Haryana: Against a projected minimum rent of Rs 600 for 73 shops constructed in Yamuna Nagar, 11 shops were let out on monthly rents between Rs 200 and Rs 500 from May 1999 to July 2001. 27 shops were vacant since their completion (March 1999 to October 2000). Non-letting out of 27 shops and letting out of 11 shops on lower rent than envisaged in the Project Report incurred loss of Rs 4.52 lakh by way of rent.

The Municipal Committee, Charkhi Dadri completed (October 2000) construction of 70 shops at a shopping complex near the city Police Station and City Park at a cost of Rs 49.40 lakh. 31 shops remained vacant during April 1999 to March 2001 for periods ranging between 5 and 15 months. This resulted in a loss of rent of Rs 6 lakh calculated at projected rent of Rs 417 per month.

The slaughterhouse at Yamuna Nagar was completed in March 1999 at a cost of Rs 7.90 lakh. The project report envisaged an annual income of Rs 4.65 lakh through slaughtering fee of Rs 15/- per animal. Against this, actual income during 1999-2000 and 2000-2001 was Rs 20,764 and Rs 23,343, *i.e.*, only 4 *per cent* and 5 *per cent* respectively of the envisaged income. The expected income shown in the project document was not realistic and the project financially unviable.

Under the project development of Barwala town, 63 shops were constructed at a cost of Rs 32.95 lakh during June 1997 to March 1998. An enquiry revealed that the walls and roofs of the shops developed cracks due to poor workmanship, use of substandard material and non-execution of works as per PWD specifications. The inquiry officer held the Municipal Junior Engineer responsible for the lapses. Departmental action had not been taken as of May 2001.

Report No. 2 of 2002 (Civil)

Himachal Pradesh: An elected body was not in position in Mandi town between March 1990 and December 1995 when schemes were approved and executed. Funds were directly released to the Deputy Commissioner (DC), Mandi instead of Municipal Committee of the town. This resulted in violation of the prescribed procedure.

A remunerative project "shop-cum office complex near Indira Stadium" at a cost of Rs 54.59 lakh was projected for completion during the years 1996-97 to 1998-99. The work could, however, not be taken up as land from Sports Council Una could not be transferred to Municipal Council. The lackadaisical approach resulted in not achieving the anticipated benefit.

Municipal Committee, Mandi, envisaged earning of rent amounting to Rs 37.35 lakh from 88 shops measuring area of 1245 square metre. 234 shops covering an area of 2761 square metres constructed at a cost of Rs 2.33 crore during the period 1989 to October 1994. The rent of Rs 24 lakh was being collected annually at the rate of Rs 60 per square metre against Rs 250 per square meter envisaged in Project Report.

Karnataka: City Municipal Council, Shimoga and Bellary incurred Rs 31 lakh and Rs 91.88 lakh during 1995-96 on non-remunerative projects of asphaltting of roads and up gradation of storm water drain. The prescribed ratio of 40:30:30 between remunerative, user-charge based and non-remunerative project was not adhered to.

A shopping complex in Hassan town was constructed (June 1999) at a cost of Rs 46.65 lakh even without the approval of revised estimates and technical sanction. Though the building was complete in all respects it could not be rented out, as electricity supply was not obtained.

Maharashtra: Dondaicha and Mukhed municipal councils spent Rs 16 lakh and 7 lakh respectively as on 31st March 2001 only on non-remunerative components viz. roads, parks and gardens mainly due to non-availability of land for taking up the remunerative components.

Manipur: Infrastructure and ancillary facilities in the towns were to be planned so as to integrate them within the jurisdiction of the concerned Municipal Council or Nagar Panchayat. During the periods 1992-93 to 2000-2001, out of the total expenditure of Rs 149.81 lakh allocated for works in the towns of Sekmai and Thoubal, expenditure of Rs 84.26 lakh (56 *per cent*) was incurred in areas beyond the jurisdiction of said towns. As a result, the scattered assets (markets) could not be handed over to the concerned municipal council for want of any elected body and the infrastructure created failed to provide any benefit.

Punjab: In Rajpura town, the construction of 34 shopping booths and 21 shop-cum-flats was stopped midway, after incurring an expenditure of Rs 3.77 lakh up to January 1997, due to ownership dispute.

The estimate for a Community Centre at Anandpur Saheb was initially approved for Rs 33.52 lakh (August 1998) and the work was to be completed

by July 1999. Subsequently, the designs were changed and estimates revised. As of March 2001, Rs 48 lakh had been incurred and work completed up to roof level. Change in design indicated failure and to formulate the project properly in the first instance, which resulted in delay in completion of the project.

Rajasthan: In Jaisalmer town, 8 schemes of the Project costing Rs 272 lakh were approved by TCPO in March 1996 to develop the town for tourism purpose up to March 2001. Only one scheme of improvement of road crossing has been completed by March 2001. Four schemes i.e., construction of link road, Bus Stand, development of Camping sites and public toilets were not taken up as per decision of City Monitoring Committee. In another scheme, a Hotel Complex costing Rs 87 lakh was approved without conversion of land from green belt to commercial use. The case of conversion was still pending with the State government (July 2001). Rs 3.59 lakh was incurred on wire fencing of land without provision in the sanctioned project. In the Transport Nagar Scheme (project cost Rs 30 lakh) only 20 plots (shops) out of 232 plots were developed and even developed plots could not be auctioned due to high rates (July 2001). This resulted in non-accrual of revenue. The schemes of widening and lighting of roads (project cost Rs 92 lakh) was also incomplete after an expenditure of Rs 62.78 lakh (March 2001).

Sikkim: In Gangtok town, the car Park and Mandi with 42 shops were constructed in December 1995 at a cost of Rs 98.25 lakh without the approval of the Ministry. Twenty-nine shops were lying vacant since December 1995.

Tripura: A shopping centre at Khowai with an approved cost of Rs 12 lakh remained incomplete after incurring an expenditure of Rs 16.90 lakh including Rs 9.24 lakh spent for purchasing additional land, as of March 2001. This was despite having funds available.

Construction of a bus terminal in Sonamura town was approved in 1996-97 at a cost of Rs 17 lakh, inclusive of Rs 1.67 lakh for earth filling. However, Rs 12.80 lakh was spent on earth filling and temporary structures were created at a cost of Rs 0.83 lakh (March 2001) the bus terminal was made functional in April 2000. In the absence of essential facilities, functioning of bus terminal was not smooth.

West Bengal: Guskara Municipality completed a Cattle Market in July 1996 at a cost of Rs 8.55 lakh. Against the projected fee of Rs 10 per sale transaction of each animal, the Municipality actually realised lower fees at the rate of Re 1 to Rs 5 per animal and collected rupees 8.93 lakh, 8.81 lakh and 10.07 lakh in 1998-99, 1999-2000 and 2000-2001 respectively.

Pondicherry: A market complex at Kurumbapet was completed in March 1992 at a cost of Rs 2.32 lakh and handed over to Villianur Commune Panchayat in September 1992. For the last five years, the local body had not leased out/let out the market complex, which could house 45 vendors. The building was stated to be without a roof and had deteriorated in condition due to poor maintenance by the Panchayat. As the department failed to make the

Report No. 2 of 2002 (Civil)

market complex a durable public remunerative asset, the expenditure of Rs 2.32 lakh incurred on the scheme was rendered unfruitful.

5.21 Unutilised Assets

Assets created at Rs 22.33 crore remained unutilised.

Assets created such as shops, booths, restaurant, cycle stand etc., at a cost of Rs 22.33 crore remained unutilised in 9 states due to delays in allotment, poor response from public, non-finalisation of offers, high rates of deposits/rents fixed by Municipal Councils, non-turning up of bidders etc. This resulted in revenue loss of Rs 2.59 crore, as shown in **Annex-XIII**.

5.22 Maintenance of assets

Maintenance of assets was not monitored.

One of the real deficiencies of the Scheme is that Ministry have not issued specific guidelines for maintenance of assets created under the IDSMT. The negligent attitude in this respect is reflected by the fact that even assets register was not maintained except by Nadiad Municipality in Gujarat and by seven implementing agencies in Orissa viz. Berhampur, Bari pada Municipality, Gopalpur NAC, Special Planning Authority Balasore, Baripada & Jharsuguda and Regional Improvement Trust Dhenkanal, These agencies also incurred Rs 30.83 lakh on repair and maintenance of assets during the period 1985-86 to 1990-91. The ULB in Tamil Nadu incurred Rs 1.02 crore on maintenance of assets in 26 towns covered during 1979-80 to 1991-92. Maintenance of assets was thus not monitored at any level. The Ministry stated in November 2001 that State Governments reported that generally municipal councils were maintaining the assets created from their own funds.

5.23 Training and Capacity building

The Central and State Governments were to make continuous efforts for training and up gradation of the skills of personnel dealing with the preparation of the Project Reports and implementation of the IDSMT scheme. Such efforts were not made by Haryana, Rajasthan and Pondicherry.

5.24 Utilisation Certificates

Utilisation certificates of Rs 3.61 crore relating to 1992-2000, (Assam; Rs 276.19 lakh, Gujarat: Rs 18.07 lakh, Madhya Pradesh: Rs 14.82 lakh, Manipur: Rs 0.94 lakh, Orissa: Rs 5.91 lakh, Punjab: Rs 0.14 lakh, Tamil Nadu: Rs 16.33 lakh, Utter Pradesh: Rs 24.70 lakh, Rajasthan: Rs 0.73 lakh and Pondicherry: Rs 2.77 lakh were awaited as of March 2001.

5.25 Other points of interest

Orissa: Executive Officer, Nabarangpur drew Rs 0.30 lakh in August 1999 and had not entered it in the cash book as of June 2001.

Sikkim: The project for development of Lal market at of Rs 132 lakh was approved in 1986, which was inclusive of Rs 76 lakh being the cost of re-construction of Lal market. The State Government, however, appointed a consultant for preparing a project report for reconstruction of Lal market at an

estimated cost of Rs 3.38 crore. The GOI rejected the re-development plan in January 1992. The State Government had incurred Rs 11.22 lakh as consultancy charges. The appointment of a consultant was unjustified in view of specific approval of GOI accorded in 1986.

5.26 Monitoring and Evaluation

During the period 1992-2001, 30 States/UTs were to send 1064 Quarterly Progress Reports (QPRs). Of this, 961 QPRs (90 *per cent*) were not received. Progress reports received were generally used only for assessing the extent of assistance to be released.

The Scheme also envisaged periodical inspection of the projects by the officers of the GOI. The Ministry/TCPO did not maintain any schedule of Inspection relating to the field visits of its officers to different projects in the country. No status/appraisal reports of the visiting officials highlighting status of implementation of different components of the Scheme constraint being faced in the progress of work and suggestions for remedial measures were available with the Ministry. The coverage of towns in various states in nine years was only 2 *per cent* and was not uniform in all the states such as that out of 1058 towns covered upto March 2001, 1039(98 *per cent*) were not visited by central team even once during the period of nine years (1992-93 to 2000-2001). All the 19 towns visited were only in three States viz. Karnataka, (10 out of 83), Maharashtra (6 out of 78) and during July and Sept 1994 Madhya Pradesh (3 out of 102).

5.27 Regional Review Meetings

During 1998-99, The Ministry held six Regional Review Meetings at Kolkatta, Guwahati, Hyderabad, Chandigarh, Bhopal and Mumbai covering almost all the States in the country wherein the secretary in charge of IDSMT of all the States and the associated nodal agencies were involved. The feedback gathered from the Regional Review Meetings revealed that the implementation of the Scheme was constrained by the following aspects:

- ◆ Land acquisition was the major problem.
- ◆ Local bodies were reluctant to raise loans since they found it difficult to adhere to the terms of lending from Financial Institutions and since guarantees from the State Government were not forthcoming.
- ◆ Delay in release of central assistance alongwith the state share to the implementing agencies was also a major impediment in the progress of the work.
- ◆ Lack of technical staff in local bodies led to constraints in implementation of the Scheme.
- ◆ At the instance of the Planning Commission, the Ministry of UD had also undertaken a review of the scheme during 1999-2000. The Ministry found that with the present funding pattern, resources were too meagre to make significant impact on the development of towns as envisaged. Only Rs 25.30 lakh reach each town per annum, since the Central Government

Report No. 2 of 2002 (Civil)

released Rs 25 - 35 crore annually. However, the scheme covered 4656 towns. The project mix was also felt to be rigid and towns were unable to follow it. Towns were also reluctant to raise institutional finance since repayment was difficult. However, the Ministry felt that the scheme should continue since it was the only scheme for addressing the issues of infrastructure/civic amenities in small and medium towns.

5.28 Evaluation

The Society for Development Studies (January 1998) had carried out an evaluation of the scheme in 8 towns of Sikkim, Meghalaya and Madhya Pradesh. They noticed, *inter alia*, deficiencies in project appraisal/planning and management; poor monitoring and inadequate expertise. Another evaluation studies was carried out by the Centre for Symbiosis of Technology, Environment and Management (STEM) covering 10 selected towns of Uttar Pradesh and Karnataka. The study highlighted certain difficulties like land acquisition, lack of technical expertise, and inadequate monitoring at Central and State levels.

5.29 Conclusion

The overall result of execution of the programme is that out of 4656 small and medium towns, projects were sanctioned in only 1058 towns in the two decades ending March 2001. Out of 3870 projects spread over 541 small and medium towns approved during 1992-2001, only 812 projects were completed. Out of the total Central, State releases and institutional finance of Rs 802.92 crore, Rs 671.42 crore were incurred as of March 2001 on the projects approved since 1979-2001. Private sector participation was not forthcoming. The Ministry/State Governments sanctioned/ released funds without ensuring creation of Revolving Fund and State urban/municipal development fund. This resulted in failure to systematically channelize funds for infrastructure development so as to give effect to state/town development plans.

One of the main objectives of the scheme was to reduce migration of people to urban areas and bigger cities from rural and small urban areas. Neither the Ministry nor the State Governments maintained nor called for the required data to assess the achievement of this objective. However, with only 21 *per cent* of sanctioned projects completed between 1992-93 and 2000-2001, one can safely infer that this program failed in its objective of preventing migration to urban areas. MOUD, stated that no specific study was carried out so far to quantify the number of persons who were stopped from migrating to major urban centres and that with limited funds and very limited coverage of towns it was difficult to achieve this objective. The Parliamentary Standing Committee which considered demand for grants to the MOUD for 2000-2001 called for immediate review of the scheme while commenting on the reply of MOUD that it was not possible to state that the scheme was successful in arresting migration of population to cities/towns.

Test check of records in 21 States/UT, MOUD revealed that there was no evidence of specific plans and programs for spatial and socio-economic planning done in the states or called for by MOUD. No instances of preparation of regional plans for ensuring functional interlinkages with town and city development plans came to notice in the test checked records, though these were required to be ensured by TCPO while appraising various projects. In fact, strategy papers/master/development plans were not even prepared in at least 5 states namely, Andhra Pradesh, Haryana, Manipur, West Bengal, and Pondicherry.

The Mid-Term appraisal of the Ninth Five Year Plan, carried out by the Planning Commission, also found that the implementation of the scheme was not satisfactory. The areas of concern included timely completion of projects, non-augmentation of resources by urban local bodies for continued investment; non-creation/consolidation of Revolving Funds for tie-up of institutional finance, etc.

Even in terms of another important objective of the scheme, namely, the extent of resource generation in the towns/local bodies, hardly 19.53 *per cent* of the expenditure incurred from the VIII plan onwards was raised as institutional finance. No resources for maintenance of the assets created under the program were generated. The programme has therefore failed in achieving its objectives even after two decades of operation and incurring an expenditure of Rs 671.42 crore till 31st March 2001.

The Ministry needs to activate its coordinating and monitoring functions. It also needs to ensure that the Nodal Agencies meet all agreed prerequisites, especially that of the setting up of the Revolving Funds, before any funds are released to them. There is an obvious need to critically evaluate the implementation of the scheme so as to ensure achievement of envisaged objectives.

Annex-I
(Refers to Paragraph 5.5)

List of Test Checked States and Union Territories

Sl. No.	State/UT	No. of towns covered in 8 th and 9 th plan	No. of Towns test checked in audit
01	Andhra Pradesh	47	12
02	Assam	11	05
03	Bihar	16	04
04	Gujarat	29	06
05	Haryana	06	04
06	Himachal Pradesh	10	01
07	Jammu & Kashmir	04	03
08	Karnataka	55	13
09	Kerala	15	05
10	Madhya Pradesh	42	10
11	Maharashtra	58	06
12	Manipur	05	02
13	Orissa	26	06
14	Punjab	16	04
15	Rajasthan	24	05
16	Sikkim	06	03
17	Tamil Nadu	53	07
18	Tripura	07	03
19	Uttar Pradesh	45	11
20	West Bengal	40	10
21	Pondicherry	02	02
Total		517	122

Annex-II
(Refers to Paragraph 5.6)

Planwise cumulative release of Central Assistance, State Share, FIs loan and expenditure reported

(Rs in lakh)

Sl. No.	STATE	6TH PLAN			7TH PLAN			1990 - 91			1991 - 92		
		CA REL	SS REL	EXP	CA REL	SS REL	EXP	CA REL	SS REL	EXP	CA REL	SS REL	EXP
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
01	Andhra Pradesh	624.19	628.76	1712.34	294.45	291.20	588.04	141.00	139.91	196.21	127.68	83.00	110.72
02	Arunachal Pradesh	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	46.00	71.00	49.00
03	Assam	200.00	0.00	439.14	200.25	173.47	273.55	105.00	66.52	174.60	42.11	24.79	50.06
04	Bihar	554.70	705.63	1055.89	292.45	302.36	347.64	47.50	24.00	0.00	15.00	5.00	0.00
05	Goa	65.50	0.00	95.32	35.00	0.00	2.44	10.00	0.00	20.96	20.00	0.00	0.00
06	Gujarat	576.68	306.86	1167.24	368.12	184.06	622.86	117.00	58.50	137.23	80.00	40.00	103.58
07	Haryana	228.00	224.00	828.11	117.50	117.50	64.60	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
08	Himachal Pradesh	34.78	95.00	108.15	26.70	200.67	227.37	0.00	0.00	0.00	40.00	68.00	98.05
09	Jammu & Kashmir	36.58	37.59	72.34	40.00	72.00	118.83	61.00	117.12	144.99	0.00	0.00	0.00
10	Karnataka	616.36	616.45	1165.88	266.62	266.62	485.99	112.33	112.33	134.23	168.00	168.00	265.22
11	Kerala	408.06	349.40	1277.36	189.83	168.50	416.91	108.00	112.67	393.41	62.00	56.50	88.91
12	Madhya Pradesh	673.07	833.14	1586.48	456.00	409.16	743.23	284.54	238.50	346.78	95.00	124.98	108.91
13	Maharashtra	932.21	859.71	2126.80	571.52	259.88	1224.49	341.51	150.07	603.85	248.97	114.20	466.26
14	Manipur	52.02	58.50	105.60	71.58	75.11	142.24	46.00	45.25	91.25	15.00	37.00	34.04
15	Meghalaya	80.00	113.50	184.56	100.10	85.65	149.90	31.00	31.82	62.82	15.00	35.42	50.42
16	Mizoram	79.00	8.50	118.56	46.00	116.95	162.72	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
17	Nagaland	40.00	0.00	99.88	90.99	85.44	199.13	40.00	35.86	75.86	20.00	28.36	48.36
18	Orissa	237.50	112.89	500.70	298.27	298.27	568.15	170.00	210.05	284.16	60.00	68.95	105.25
19	Punjab	410.66	413.50	1162.47	344.71	317.62	792.46	0.00	0.00	0.00	20.00	20.00	16.35
20	Rajasthan	532.35	162.69	1755.17	362.56	130.24	955.04	132.50	63.38	240.49	120.00	60.00	193.02
21	Sikkim	29.14	14.75	79.30	75.75	123.00	192.75	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
22	Tamil Nadu	1192.02	1125.92	2285.42	647.88	645.58	1015.55	315.20	315.20	399.14	152.00	152.00	148.97
23	Tripura	69.40	88.18	157.58	79.75	85.00	105.51	20.00	29.00	7.13	46.00	40.00	50.93
24	Uttar Pradesh	859.81	649.92	1925.50	390.30	277.75	532.79	231.50	219.44	473.36	135.00	135.00	140.12
25	West Bengal	969.76	945.03	1901.09	267.47	255.31	568.86	195.00	220.15	421.98	176.00	175.99	289.95
26	A & N Islands	92.00	0.00	124.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
27	Dadra & Nagar Haveli	95.22	0.00	16.38	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
28	Daman & Diu	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
29	Lakshadweep	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	25.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
30	Pondicherry	74.75	0.00	98.79	58.00	21.76	40.02	28.00	7.00	20.74	20.00	10.00	0.00
	GRAND TOTAL	9763.76	8349.92	22150.05	5691.80	4963.10	10541.07	2562.08	2196.77	4229.19	1723.76	1518.19	2418.12

(Source: TCPO, Ministry of Urban Development and Poverty Alleviation - Status Report for the year 2000-2001)

Report No.2 of 2002 (Civil)

Sl. No.	STATE	8TH PLAN				9TH PLAN				TOTAL			
		CA REL	SS REL	IF AV'LD	EXP	CA REL	SS REL	IF AV'D	EXP	CA REL	SS REL	IF AV'LD	EXP
1	2	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26
01	Andhra Pradesh	2766.78	1240.40	2418.90	4253.70	433.50	0.00	0.00	0.00	4387.60	2383.27	2418.90	6861.01
02	Arunachal Pradesh	36.00	79.00	0.00	118.52	45.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	127.00	150.00	0.00	167.52
03	Assam	149.11	44.41	0.00	128.53	103.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	799.47	309.19	0.00	1065.88
04	Bihar	241.00	175.93	0.00	75.08	50.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1200.65	1212.92	0.00	1478.61
05	Goa	36.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	37.50	0.00	0.00	0.00	204.00	0.00	0.00	118.72
06	Gujarat	1652.57	955.33	888.44	3090.14	416.10	134.93	0.00	90.18	3210.47	1679.68	888.44	5211.23
07	Haryana	180.00	80.00	0.00	189.66	294.60	60.00	0.00	169.99	820.10	481.50	0.00	1252.36
08	Himachal Pradesh	124.94	87.40	0.00	107.66	195.50	95.66	0.00	89.74	421.92	546.73	0.00	630.97
09	Jammu & Kashmir	240.24	193.04	0.00	311.41	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	377.82	419.75	0.00	647.57
10	Karnataka	2429.07	1216.75	0.00	2121.63	356.00	49.98	0.00	44.10	3948.38	2430.13	0.00	4217.05
11	Kerala	892.17	607.19	164.76	1306.04	110.00	115.80	0.00	46.61	1770.06	1410.06	164.76	3529.24
12	Madhya Pradesh	1527.47	542.95	20.63	1170.66	333.00	10.67	0.00	25.80	3369.08	2159.40	20.63	3981.86
13	Maharashtra	3467.18	1959.20	2236.31	6413.02	341.00	96.68	0.00	75.92	5902.40	3439.74	2236.31	10910.34
14	Manipur	193.00	141.97	0.00	202.58	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	377.60	357.83	0.00	575.71
15	Meghalaya	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	61.80	0.00	0.00	0.00	287.90	266.39	0.00	447.70
16	Mizoram	120.40	116.72	0.00	237.12	62.00	40.00	0.00	102.00	307.40	282.17	0.00	620.40
17	Nagaland	79.00	53.68	0.00	76.68	65.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	334.99	203.34	0.00	499.91
18	Orissa	757.34	308.31	5.02	588.98	201.00	27.67	0.00	0.00	1724.11	1026.14	5.02	2047.24
19	Punjab	319.99	115.32	36.61	424.13	244.00	59.33	0.00	87.15	1339.36	925.77	36.61	2482.56
20	Rajasthan	1001.31	582.24	94.01	1359.76	137.00	18.67	0.00	29.62	2285.72	1017.22	94.01	4533.10
21	Sikkim	12.00	75.00	0.00	0.00	74.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	190.89	212.75	0.00	272.05
22	Tamil Nadu	1096.85	681.80	840.05	1514.33	265.15	23.33	112.57	99.07	3669.10	2943.83	952.62	5462.48
23	Tripura	68.56	39.00	0.00	55.03	118.50	50.00	0.00	56.19	402.21	331.18	0.00	432.37
24	Uttar Pradesh	1612.25	718.29	221.00	1734.55	197.00	97.33	0.00	0.00	3425.86	2097.73	221.00	4806.32
25	West Bengal	1237.81	596.01	72.44	1386.19	270.00	86.20	0.00	21.38	3116.04	2278.69	72.44	4589.45
26	A & N Islands	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	92.00	0.00	0.00	124.00
27	Dadra & Nagar Haveli	17.00	60.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	112.22	60.00	0.00	16.38
28	Daman & Diu	23.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	23.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
29	Lakshadweep	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	25.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
30	Pondicherry	30.00	23.42	0.00	0.00	30.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	240.75	62.18	0.00	159.55
GRAND TOTAL		20311.04	10693.36	6998.17	26865.40	4440.65	966.25	112.57	937.75	44493.09	28687.59	7110.74	67141.58

Annex-III
(Refers to Paragraph 5.6)

Unutilised amount exceeding 25 per cent of the funds lying with the implementing agencies

(Rs in crore)

State/UTs	Total funds available	Amount reported as expenditure	Unreported amount	Percentage of unreported amount
Eighth Plan				
Andhra Pradesh	64.26	42.54	21.72	34
Assam	1.94	1.29	0.65	34
Bihar	4.17	0.75	3.42	82
Goa	0.36	0.00	0.36	100
Haryana	2.60	1.90	0.70	27
Himachal Pradesh	2.12	1.07	1.05	49
Jammu & Kashmir	4.33	3.11	1.22	28
Karnataka	36.46	21.22	15.24	42
Madhya Pradesh	20.91	11.71	9.20	44
Manipur	3.35	2.03	1.32	40
Nagaland	1.33	0.77	0.56	42
Orissa	10.71	5.89	4.82	45
Sikkim	0.87	0.00	0.87	100
Tamil Nadu	26.19	15.14	11.05	42
Tripura	1.08	0.55	0.53	49
Uttar Pradesh	25.52	17.35	8.17	32
West Bengal	19.06	13.86	5.20	27
Dadra&Nagar Haveli	0.77	0.00	0.77	100
Daman & Diu	0.23	0.00	0.23	100
Pondicherry	0.53	0.00	0.53	100
Ninth Plan (1997-98 to 2000-2001)				
Andhra Pradesh	4.34	0.00	4.34	100
Arunachal Pradesh	0.45	0.00	0.45	100
Assam	1.03	0.00	1.03	100
Bihar	0.50	0.00	0.50	100
Goa	0.38	0.00	0.38	100
Gujarat	5.51	0.90	4.61	84
Haryana	3.55	1.70	1.85	52
Himachal Pradesh	2.91	0.90	2.01	69
Karnataka	4.06	0.44	3.62	89
Kerala	2.26	0.47	1.79	79
Madhya Pradesh	3.44	0.26	3.18	92
Maharashtra	4.38	0.76	3.62	83
Meghalaya	0.62	0.00	0.62	100
Nagaland	0.65	0.00	0.65	100
Orissa	2.29	0.00	2.29	100
Punjab	3.03	0.87	2.16	71
Rajasthan	1.56	0.30	1.26	81
Sikkim	0.74	0.00	0.74	100
Tamil Nadu	4.01	0.99	3.02	75
Tripura	1.68	0.56	1.12	67
Uttar Pradesh	2.95	0.00	2.95	100
West Bengal	3.56	0.21	3.35	94
Pondicherry	0.30	0.00	0.30	100

(Source: TCPO, Ministry of Urban Development & Poverty Alleviation - Status Report for the year 2000-2001)

Annex-IV
(Refers to Paragraph 5.8)

List of Towns of 8th and 9th Plan where no expenditure was incurred

(Rs in lakh)

Sl. No.	State	Name of the Town	Year	App. Cost	CA Rel	Expd
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1.	Andhra Pradesh	Kuppam	VIII th Plan	122.00	16.00	0.00
2.	do	Machilipatnam	IX th Plan	447.88	58.00	0.00
3.	do	Kareem Nagar	do	484.65	43.00	0.00
4.	do	Macherla	do	134.10	20.00	0.00
5.	do	Gajuwaka	do	429.94	55.00	0.00
6.	do	Ramagundam	do	550.00	70.00	0.00
7.	do	Mahaboobnagar	do	482.13	64.00	0.00
8.	do	Mandapetta	do	267.83	30.00	0.00
9.	do	Tenali	do	454.13	57.00	0.00
10.	do	Nalgonda	do	275.70	36.50	0.00
11.	Arunachal Pradesh	Tezu	do	77.00	12.00	0.00
12.	do	Changlang	do	151.05	23.00	0.00
13.	do	Seppa	do	113.12	10.00	0.00
14.	Assam	Barpeta	do	135.20	21.00	0.00
15.	do	Marigaon	do	93.00	15.00	0.00
16.	do	Hailakandi	do	131.96	20.00	0.00
17.	do	Dhemaji	do	98.00	16.00	0.00
18.	do	Bokakhat	do	100.02	15.00	0.00
19.	do	Digboi	do	100.00	16.00	0.00
20.	Bihar	Garhwa	VIII th Plan	133.60	10.00	0.00
21.	do	Bhagalpur	do	536.32	30.00	0.00
22.	do	Chatra	do	191.16	20.00	0.00
23.	do	Godda	do	199.95	20.00	0.00
24.	do	Supaul	do	167.02	15.00	0.00
25.	do	Sheohar	do	88.35	10.00	0.00
26.	do	Forbesganj	do	188.86	15.00	0.00
27.	do	Lohardaga	do	192.83	15.00	0.00
28.	do	Madhepura	IX th Plan	173.70	10.00	0.00
29.	do	Raxaul	do	158.79	10.00	0.00
30.	do	Araria	do	199.80	15.00	0.00
31.	do	Khagaria	do	190.42	15.00	0.00
32.	Goa	Curchorem Cacora	VIIIth Plan	154.00	12.00	0.00
33.	do	Margao	do	496.57	24.00	0.00
34.	do	Mapusa	IXth Plan	119.10	17.00	0.00
35.	do	Pernem	do	79.72	12.50	0.00
36.	do	Canacona	do	50.18	8.00	0.00
37.	Gujarat	Dhotka	IX th Plan	183.95	27.60	0.00
38.	do	Anjar	do	54.87	30.00	0.00
39.	do	Una	do	216.04	30.00	0.00
40.	do	Umreth	do	216.81	30.00	0.00
41.	do	Gandhi Dham	do	603.04	70.00	0.00
42.	do	Jetpur	do	367.26	50.00	0.00
43.	do	Dhrangadhra	do	336.27	48.00	0.00
44.	do	Kapadwanj	do	227.01	30.00	0.00
45.	Haryana	Bhiwani	do	499.52	60.00	0.00
46.	do	Ambala City	do	516.17	65.00	0.00
47.	Himachal Pradesh	Solan	do	209.65	30.00	0.00
48.	do	Chamba	do	161.30	16.00	0.00

Report No.2 of 2002 (Civil)

Sl. No.	State	Name of the Town	Year	App. Cost	CA Rel	Expd
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
49.	Himachal Pradesh	Theog	do	82.60	12.00	0.00
50.	do	Kullu	do	126.25	16.00	0.00
51.	do	Palampur	do	107.89	16.00	0.00
52.	do	Nalagarh	do	145.79	16.00	0.00
53.	Karnataka	Hoskote	do	200.00	30.00	0.00
54.	do	Gundlupet	do	194.40	15.00	0.00
55.	do	Navalgund	do	89.54	13.00	0.00
56.	do	Manvi	do	175.50	26.00	0.00
57.	do	Davangeri	do	592.86	70.00	0.00
58.	do	Gulbarga	do	692.30	83.00	0.00
59.	do	Athani	do	103.34	15.00	0.00
60.	do	Aland	do	203.70	30.00	0.00
61.	do	Birur	do	200.00	30.00	0.00
62.	do	Devanhalli	do	92.20	14.00	0.00
63.	Kerala	Ottapalam	do	267.62	30.00	0.00
64.	do	North Peravur	do	208.00	30.00	0.00
65.	Madhya Pradesh	Astha	IXth Plan	200.84	30.00	0.00
66.	do	Khajuraho	do	127.95	16.00	0.00
67.	do	Bhatapara	do	208.89	30.00	0.00
68.	do	Jhabua	do	201.21	30.00	0.00
69.	do	Khurai	do	201.40	30.00	0.00
70.	do	Dhanpuri	do	111.69	16.00	0.00
71.	do	Nagod	do	103.17	16.00	0.00
72.	do	Nowgong	do	204.92	30.00	0.00
73.	do	Sonkutch	do	83.29	13.00	0.00
74.	do	Raipur	do	750.39	90.00	0.00
75.	Maharashtra	Satana	do	200.00	30.00	0.00
76.	do	Roha	do	119.77	16.00	0.00
77.	do	Umerkhed	do	211.15	30.00	0.00
78.	do	Faizpur	do	247.38	30.00	0.00
79.	do	Raver	do	147.28	30.00	0.00
80.	do	Jintur	d	200.00	30.00	0.00
81.	Meghalaya	Shillong	do	485.41	61.80	0.00
82.	Nagaland	Dimapur	do	471.00	50.00	0.00
83.	do	Kiphire	do	100.00	15.00	0.00
84.	Orissa	Bhanjanagar	VIII th Plan	60.00	7.00	0.00
85.	do	Pattamundai	IX th Plan	200.00	30.00	0.00
86.	do	Anandpur	do	176.73	26.00	0.00
87.	do	Soro	do	181.16	27.00	0.00
88.	do	Barpali	do	112.04	16.00	0.00
89.	do	Balasore	do	628.29	70.00	0.00
90.	do	Aska	do	122.94	16.00	0.00
91.	do	Banki	do	118.56	16.00	0.00
92.	Punjab	Nakodar	do	200.96	30.00	0.00
93.	do	Jagraon	do	222.55	30.00	0.00
94.	do	Dasuya	do	118.06	16.00	0-00
95.	Rajasthan	Bundi	VIII th Plan	271.93	23.00	0.00
96.	do	Salumber	IX th Plan	68.34	11.00	0.00
97.	do	Hanumangarh	do	399.12	50.00	0.00
98.	do	Balotra	do	220.36	30.00	0.00
99.	do	Didwana	do	223.28	30.00	0.00
100.	Sikkim	Rangpo	VIII th Plan	100.00	12.00	0.00
101.	do	Jorethang	do	156.00	15.00	0.00
102.	do	Pakyong	do	156.00	15.00	0.00

Report No.2 of 2002 (Civil)

Sl. No.	State	Name of the Town	Year	App. Cost	CA Rel	Expd
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
103.	Sikkim	Geyzing	do	104.00	16.00	0.00
104.	do	Soreng	do	105.29	16.00	0.00
105.	Tamil Nadu	Usilampatti	VIIIth Plan	128.56	15.00	0.00
106.	do	Kotagiri	do	49.63	6.00	0.00
107.	do	Kulittalai	do	69.97	6.00	0.00
108.	do	Vandavasi	do	72.16	6.00	0.00
109.	do	Wallajapet	do	22.28	13.37	0.00
110.	do	Pallikonda	do	26.48	15.89	0.00
111.	do	Devakottai	do	108.00	16.20	0.00
112.	do	Vellore	do	217.81	28.00	0.00
113.	do	Kanyakumari	do	108.50	16.00	0.00
114.	do	Kinathukadvu	do	99.73	16.00	0.00
115.	do	Vilathikulam	do	99.02	16.00	0.00
116.	do	Peravoorani	do	98.90	16.00	0.00
117.	do	Chengam	do	95.32	16.00	0.00
118.	Tripura	Teliamura	IXth Plan	174.37	25.50	0.00
119.	do	Sabroom	do	55.31	13.00	0.00
120.	do	Ranirbazar	do	150.78	16.00	0.00
121.	Uttar Pradesh	Barhalganj	do	85.69	14.00	0.00
122.	do	Kushinagar	IXth Plan	103.42	16.00	0.00
123.	do	Ujhani	do	262.85	30.00	0.00
124.	do	Nanauta	do	72.20	12.00	0.00
125.	do	Nawabganj	do	107.31	16.00	0.00
126.	do	Jalalabad	do	55.80	9.00	0.00
127.	do	Kunda	do	83.44	13.00	0.00
128.	do	Kemari	do	108.76	16.00	0.00
129.	do	Chitrakoot-Dham	do	291.46	30.00	0.00
130.	do	Hariharpur	do	62.33	10.00	0.00
131.	do	Maharajganj	do	95.80	15.00	0.00
132.	do	Kakori	do	102.69	16.00	0.00
133.	do	Niyotani	do	85.80	14.00	0.00
134.	West Bengal	Dainhat	do	100.00	15.00	0.00
135.	do	Taki	do	150.00	23.00	0.00
136.	do	Egra	do	170.00	25.50	0.00
137.	do	Durgapur	do	570.00	68.00	0.00
138.	do	Bangaon	do	350.00	50.00	0.00
139.	do	Ramjibanpur	do	100.00	16.00	0.00
140.	do	Kharar	do	84.57	13.50	0.00
141.	do	Khirpai	do	90.00	14.00	0.00
142.	D & N Haveli	Silvassa-I	VIII th Plan	170.09	17.00	0.00
143.	Daman & Diu	Diu	do	153.93	23.00	0.00
144.	Pondicherry	Ariankuppam	do	92.92	30.00	0.00
145.	do	Oulgaret	IX th Plan	149.60	30.00	0.00
TOTAL				28638.79	3661.36	0.00

(Source: TCPO, Ministry of Urban Development and Poverty Alleviation - Status Report for the year 2000-2001)

Annex-V
(Refers to Paragraph 5.9)

List of Towns of 8th and 9th Plan where expenditure was up to 25 per cent

(Rs in lakh)

Sl. No.	State	Town	Year	App. Cost	CA Rel.	Expd.	%age
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1.	Andhra Pradesh	Jaggayyapeta	VIIIth Plan	5347.63	48.00	44.76	12.88
2.	do	Kurnool	do	347.28	62.51	53.96	15.54
3.	do	Cuddapah	do	1005.27	110.00	199.00	19.80
4.	do	Nidadavole	do	195.75	20.00	15.87	8.11
5.	do	Madanapalle	do	500.69	52.50	67.15	13.41
6.	do	Chairala	do	325.04	49.00	42.42	13.05
7.	do	Ponnur	do	625.25	80.00	149.56	23.92
8.	do	Srikalahasti	do	555.14	80.00	106.29	19.15
9.	do	Nizamabad	do	1025.00	120.00	196.74	19.19
10.	do	Vicarabad	do	222.90	48.00	40.71	18.26
11.	do	Chilakaluripet	do	331.48	52.00	67.43	20.34
12.	do	Sangareddy	do	321.61	52.50	37.63	11.70
13.	do	Hindupur	do	532.90	64.00	79.75	14.97
14.	do	Warangal	do	797.00	180.00	154.25	19.35
15.	do	Tirupati-I	do	414.17	105.00	92.00	22.21
16.	do	Nellore	do	510.90	84.00	47.50	9.30
17.	Assam	Kokrajhar	do	134.28	24.00	15.11	11.25
18.	do	Goalpara	do	200.00	35.00	28.25	14.12
19.	do	Rangia	do	120.57	25.00	18.75	15.55
20.	Bihar	Munger	do	999.19	36.00	35.94	3.60
21.	do	Muzaffarpur	do	513.30	30.00	15.61	3.04
22.	do	Rajgir	do	149.70	20.00	10.82	7.23
23.	do	Gaya	do	477.89	20.00	12.71	2.66
24.	Gujarat	Dhoraji	do	91.36	21.93	10.85	11.88
25.	do	Dabhoi	do	114.96	13.50	3.89	3.38
26.	do	Bardoli	do	231.85	60.00	52.33	22.57
27.	do	Mandvi	do	192.80	57.50	47.35	24.55
28.	do	Dakor	do	104.40	16.00	14.57	13.96
29.	Haryana	Yamunanagar	do	475.82	120.00	116.99	24.59
30.	do	Pehowa	do	223.30	49.60	53.00	23.73
31.	J & K	Jammu	do	1051.59	125.00	155.17	14.76
32.	Karnataka	Saundatti	do	187.50	20.00	38.70	20.64
33.	do	Karwar	do	280.00	42.00	54.15	19.34
34.	do	Bidar	do	278.72	50.16	30.38	10.90
35.	do	Bellary	do	578.00	104.04	141.66	24.51
36.	do	Madhugiri	do	95.94	12.00	20.00	20.85
37.	do	Ilkal	do	184.58	22.00	37.69	20.42
38.	do	Nippani	do	262.12	62.90	65.31	24.91
39.	do	Doddaballapur	do	231.22	55.50	41.69	18.03
40.	do	Bailhongal	do	199.95	71.98	41.81	20.91
41.	do	Mudalgi	do	202.50	72.00	48.42	23.91
42.	do	Mulbagal	do	192.80	22.00	40.03	20.76
43.	do	Lingsugur	do	184.82	22.00	36.67	19.84
44.	do	Mandya	do	958.20	172.47	96.18	10.04
45.	do	Bijapur	do	705.33	126.95	64.53	9.14
46.	do	Lakshmeshwar	do	163.65	58.91	31.83	19.45
47.	do	Shiggaon	do	83.50	30.06	16.66	19.95
48.	do	Savanur	do	154.60	55.65	26.60	17.21

Report No.2 of 2002 (Civil)

Sl. No.	State	Town	Year	App. Cost	CA Rel.	Expd.	%age
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
49.	Karnataka	Gadag-Betageri	do	945.13	170.12	91.67	9.70
50.	do	Kotturu	do	100.00	36.00	16.80	16.80
51.	do	Malur	do	199.50	71.82	43.13	21.61
52.	do	Kundapura	do	194.29	69.94	38.32	19.72
53.	Do	Hunsur	Do	187.63	84.43	46.63	24.85
54.	do	Gajendragarh	do	201.91	30.00	36.96	18.30
55.	do	Sira	do	200.00	90.00	49.78	24.89
56.	do	Chincholi	do	110.67	16.00	13.95	12.61
57.	do	Harapanahalli	do	207.45	30.00	46.14	22.24
58.	do	Chennagiri	do	127.80	16.00	21.60	16.90
59.	do	Ron	do	111.94	16.00	20.00	17.87
60.	do	Hassan	do	471.48	60.00	103.11	21.86
61.	do	Shimoga	IX th Plan	271.68	30.00	30.00	16.23
62.	Kerala	Alappuzha	VIIIth Plan	590.60	105.00	49.93	8.45
63.	do	Kollam	do	1040.60	110.00	190.39	18.29
64.	do	Cherthala	do	166.00	13.00	20.85	12.56
65.	do	Thiruvalla	do	500.00	60.00	84.37	16.87
66.	do	Moovattupuzha	IXth Plan	162.93	20.00	32.80	20.13
67.	MP	Sagar	VIIIth Plan	876.76	75.00	49.52	5.65
68.	do	Mandsaur	do	155.95	37.42	23.55	15.10
69.	do	Tikamgarh	do	538.00	60.00	38.75	7.20
70.	do	Mandla	do	206.48	72.00	28.00	13.56
71.	do	Multai	do	89.86	32.35	13.12	14.60
72.	do	Pandhurna	do	191.59	45.00	43.01	22.45
73.	do	Sausar	do	90.78	22.00	19.81	21.82
74.	do	Khandwa	do	502.45	90.44	85.50	17.02
75.	do	Jaora	do	414.32	66.00	73.86	17.82
76.	do	Dalli-Rajhara	do	237.77	28.50	33.90	14.25
77.	do	Banmore	do	112.05	18.00	15.09	13.46
78.	do	Chitrakoot	do	100.09	36.00	15.21	15.20
79.	do	Pithampur	do	228.09	14.00	21.39	9.38
80.	do	Kawardha	do	125.26	28.00	20.73	16.55
81.	do	Narsinghpur	do	170.68	37.00	20.73	12.14
82.	do	Ajaigarh	do	124.19	22.00	9.65	7.77
83.	do	Narsingarh	do	182.18	81.98	35.77	19.63
84.	do	Sihora	do	202.02	60.00	35.90	17.77
85.	do	Umariya	do	203.14	30.00	42.81	21.07
86.	do	Maihar	do	179.96	54.00	31.55	17.53
87.	do	Champa	do	202.39	60.00	47.83	23.63
88.	do	Janjgeer	do	208.15	60.00	50.00	24.02
89.	do	Balod	IXth Plan	103.70	32.00	25.80	24.87
90.	Maharashtra	Latur	VIIIth Plan	744.32	60.00	160.90	21.61
91.	do	Sangamner	do	175.64	42.00	42.23	24.04
92.	do	Dhule	do	892.12	100.00	123.94	13.89
93.	do	Mukhed	do	105.51	12.00	7.09	6.72
94.	do	Dondaicha-Warwade	do	193.00	35.00	25.90	13.41
95.	do	Gangakhed	IX th Plan	194.20	25.00	39.15	20.15
96.	do	Sillod	do	200.00	30.00	32.61	16.30
97.	do	Dhamangaon	do	199.66	30.00	0.68	0.34
98.	do	Kolhapur	do	800.00	90.00	3.48	0.43
99.	Manipur	Mayang-Imphal	VIIIth Plan	104.00	48.00	25.03	24.06
100.	do	Moreh	do	102.00	16.00	2.00	1.96
101.	Mizoram	Champhai	Ixth Plan	200.00	30.00	50.00	25.00
102.	Nagaland	Phek	do	97.00	31.00	19.90	20.52

Report No.2 of 2002 (Civil)

Sl. No.	State	Town	Year	App. Cost	CA Rel.	Expd.	%age
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
103.	Orissa	Jajapur	do	167.90	52.74	34.54	20.57
104.	do	Basudebpur	do	200.00	25.00	38.06	19.03
105.	do	Jharsuguda	do	500.00	35.00	52.45	10.49
106.	do	Digapahandi	do	97.39	12.00	16.38	16.82
107.	do	Titlagarh	do	200.00	24.00	10.95	5.47
108.	do	Umarkote	do	105.53	24.00	17.10	16.20
109.	do	Choudwar	do	134.72	32.00	21.71	16.11
110.	do	Tarbha	do	114.22	24.00	22.02	15.27
111.	do	Chhatrapur	do	99.41	22.60	21.35	21.48
112.	do	Parlakhemundi	do	200.00	36.00	5.78	2.89
113.	do	Kamakshyanagar	do	100.00	36.00	11.08	11.08
114.	do	Nabarangapur	do	200.01	72.00	31.93	15.96
115.	do	Konark	do	111.01	16.00	12.22	11.00
116.	do	Puri	do	438.00	45.00	53.53	12.22
117.	do	Nilgiri	do	110.60	16.00	13.00	11.75
118.	do	Athamallik	do	110.00	32.00	25.68	23.35
119.	Punjab	Mansa	do	422.89	101.49	41.24	9.75
120.	do	Patti	do	201.00	14.00	15.80	7.86
121.	do	Muktsar	do	365.00	50.00	63.00	17.26
122.	do	Sultanpur-Lodhi	do	110.31	16.00	21.90	19.85
123.	do	Kapurthala	do	335.00	40.00	22.15	6.61
124.	Rajasthan	Jhunjhunu	VIIIth Plan	401.89	63.00	89.24	22.20
125.	do	Rattangarh	do	295.94	20.00	44.06	14.89
126.	do	Deoli	do	87.11	10.00	5.94	6.82
127.	do	Deogarh	do	75.84	9.00	18.13	23.90
128.	do	Sardarshahar	do	427.47	62.00	36.65	8.57
129.	do	Beawar	do	694.00	25.00	8.51	1.23
130.	Tamil Nadu	Adhirampattinam	VIIIth Plan	75.13	10.00	10.56	14.06
131.	do	Sattuvacheri	do	89.25	10.00	6.02	6.75
132.	do	Manamadurai	do	130.40	47.00	19.00	14.57
133.	do	Tiruvallur	do	91.50	9.00	0.50	0.55
134.	do	Ponneri	do	66.56	23.97	9.70	14.57
135.	do	Vaniyambadi	do	95.67	16.32	12.00	12.54
136.	do	Dindigul	do	557.79	70.00	30.20	5.00
137.	Tripura	Sonamura	IX th Plan	125.00	32.00	29.19	23.35
138.	Uttar Pradesh	Pilkhua	VIIIth Plan	500.00	40.00	54.83	10.97
139.	do	Thanabhavan	do	136.87	16.00	8.18	5.98
140.	do	Kotdwara	do	118.87	14.00	5.85	4.92
141.	do	Kandhla	do	100.67	12.00	16.05	15.94
142.	do	Sirsaganj	do	119.65	15.00	18.52	15.48
143.	do	Basti	do	498.20	119.57	57.40	11.52
144.	do	Firozabad	do	366.13	33.00	21.36	5.83
145.	do	Baraut	do	300.00	36.00	35.90	11.97
146.	do	Rampur	do	392.20	35.00	12.18	3.11
147.	do	Budhana	do	192.20	42.00	28.93	15.05
148.	do	Akbarpur	do	204.10	30.00	34.86	17.08
149.	do	Farrukhabad-Fate	do	283.27	27.00	1.14	0.40
150.	do	Tanda	do	179.19	27.00	30.65	17.10
151.	do	Gola Gokarannath	do	334.13	30.00	26.20	7.84
152.	do	Utraula	do	186.29	28.00	2.82	1.51
153.	do	Haridwar	do	670.94	70.00	71.23	10.62
154.	do	Bilsa	do	118.56	16.00	3.11	2.62
155.	do	Maghar	do	88.52	26.75	16.77	18.94
156.	do	Bansi	do	174.47	54.25	42.37	24.28

Report No.2 of 2002 (Civil)

Sl. No.	State	Town	Year	App. Cost	CA Rel.	Expd.	%age
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
157.	Uttar Pradesh	Phaphund	do	108.90	16.00	17.14	15.73
158.	do	Pallia Kalan	do	113.07	18.00	22.81	20.17
159.	do	Saharanpur	do	686.00	164.00	133.37	19.44
160.	do	Faizabad	do	335.47	86.55	72.90	21.73
161.	do	Ayodhya	do	226.87	30.00	24.05	10.60
162.	do	Tundla	do	95.89	15.00	10.38	10.62
163.	do	Mankapur	do	110.83	16.00	3.08	2.78
164.	do	Malihabad	do	85.63	15.00	15.01	17.52
165.	West Bengal	Rampur Hat	do	97.60	23.50	20.00	20.49
166.	do	Gobar Danga	do	109.50	39.18	19.29	17.61
167.	do	Sainthia	do	140.00	21.00	34.38	24.55
168.	do	Joy nagar	Ixth Plan	183.00	22.50	10.00	5.46
169.	do	Dubrajpur	do	185.00	22.50	11.38	6.15
170.	do	Dhulian	do	143.00	55.00	32.97	23.05
TOTAL				53446.93	7849.58	6856.17	12.95

(Source: TCPO, Ministry of Urban Development and Poverty Alleviation – Status Report for the year 2000-2001)

Annex-VI
(Refers to in Paragraph 5.10)

Delay in release of Central Assistance

(Rs in Lakh)

State	Period of release	Amount of CA Released late (Rs in lakh)	Period of Delay in Months	Remarks
Andhra Pradesh	1992-93	70.00	12	3/93 to 3/94
	1997-98	40.00	14	11/97 to 2/99
	1998-99	501.00	23	3/99 to 3/2001
Assam	1994-95	24.00	18	9/94 to 2/96
	1996-97	26.25	13	10/96 to 10/97
	1996-97	8.75	54	10/96 to 3/2001 (Still awaiting its release)
	1996-97	18.75	13	10/96 to 10/97
	1996-97	6.25	54	10/96 to 3/2001 (Still awaiting its release)
	1997-98	21.00	12	3/98 to 3/2001 (Still awaiting its release)
	1998-99	15.00	25	3/99 to 3/2001 (Still awaiting its release)
	1999-2000	21.57	13	3/2000 to 3/2001 (Still awaiting its release)
	1999-2000	22.54	13	3/2000 to 3/2001 (Still awaiting its release)
	1999-2000	16.00	13	3/2000 to 3/2001 (Still awaiting its release)
Bihar	1994-95	46.00	17	3/95 to 7/96
	1995-96	120.00	61	3/96 to 3/2001 (Still awaiting its release)
	1996-97	75.00	49	3/97 to 3/2001 (Still awaiting its release)
	1998-99	20.00	25	3/99 to 3/2001 (Still awaiting its release)
Gujarat	1993-94	24.00	14	1/94 to 3/95
	1994-95	12.00	13	12/94 to 12/95
	Do	5.50	13	-do-
Haryana	1998-99	36.67	20	7.98 to 3.2001
Kerala	1992-93	35.00	13	3/93 to 3/94
	1992-93	5.00	25	3/93 to 3/95
	1992-93	25.00	13	3/93 to 3/94
	1994-95	15.00	20	3/95 to 10/96
	1994-95	30.50	13	3/95 to 3/96
Punjab	1995-96	21.00	25	3/96 to 3/98
	1995-96	24.00	25	3/96 to 3/98
	1996-97	16.00	12	2/97 to 1/98
Rajasthan	1997-98	21.50	24	3/98 to 3/2001
Tamil Nadu	1993-94	31.42	54	5/94 to 10/98
	1995-96	18.00	58	5/96 to 2/2001
	1998-99	9.17	18	10/98 to 3/2001

Report No.2 of 2002 (Civil)

State	Period of release	Amount of CA Released late (Rs in lakh)	Period of Delay in Months	Remarks
Manipur	1992-93	20.65	21	2/93 to 10/94
	-do-	4.35	58	2/93 to 11/97
	-do-	6.00	13	3/93 to 6/94
	1995-96	6.00	13	3/96 to 3/97
Manipur	-do-	2.00	22	3/96 to 12/97
	-do-	2.00	22	3/96 to 12/97
	1996-97	15.75	35	3/97 to 1/2001
	-do-	2.62	20	3/97 to 10/98
	-do-	7.88	34	3/97 to 12/99
	-do-	2.50	49	3/97 to 3/2001 (Still awaiting its release)
	-do-	5.00	37	3/97 to 3/2001
	-do-	7.00	33	3/97 to 11/99
	1997-98	11.00	37	3/98 to 3/2001 (Still awaiting its release)
	-do-	9.00	38	2/98 to 3/2001 (Still awaiting its release)
	1998-99	10.50	31	9/98 to 3/2001 (Still awaiting its release)
West Bengal	1993-94	2.00	85	2/94 to 3/2001 (Still awaiting its release)
	1993-94	5.00	15	2/94 to 6/95
	1993-94	3.00	85	2/94 to 3/2001 (Still awaiting its release)
	1993-94	3.00	14	2/94 to 5/95
	1993-94	3.00	20	2/94 to 11/95
	1993-94	3.00	85	2/94 to 3/2001 (Still awaiting its release)
	1993-94	3.00	85	2/94 to 3/2001 (Still awaiting its release)
	1993-94	3.00	20	3/94 to 11/95
	1993-94	5.00	84	3/94 to 3/2001 (Still awaiting its release)
	1993-94	4.00	20	3/94 to 11/95
	1995-96	15.00	17	3/96 to 8/97
		8.00	29	3/96 to 8/98
	1995-96	8.00	45	3/96 to 12/99
	1995-96	6.00	24	3/96 to 3/98
	1995-96	4.00	22	3/96 to 1/98
	1997-98	2.00	21	11/97 to 9/99
Pondicherry	1993-94	1.14	13	3/94 to 3/95
	-do-	15.92	13	-do-
	-do-	30.00	13	-do-
	1999-2000	30.00	12	4/2000 to 3/2001
Total		1668.18		

Annex-VII
(Refers to Paragraph 5.12)

Delay in release of state matching share

(Rs in Lakh)

State	Period of release	Amount released late (Rs in lakh)	Period of delay in months	Remarks
Andhra Pradesh	1999-2000	334.00	12	State Grant awaiting disbursement.
Karnataka	1999-2000	111.44	12	Against the release of Central Assistance of Rs 333.95 lakh in March 2000 for 11 towns, the State Govt. instead of releasing its matching share of Rs 222.61 lakh had released Rs 111.17 lakh in respect of 5 towns.
Madhya Pradesh	1998-99	28.05	16	Against Rs 58 lakh sanctioned to Ganj Basoda town on 30.3.99 as Central Assistance, State Government instead of releasing matching share of Rs 38.66 lakh released only Rs 10.61 lakh in March 1999. Balance amount of Rs 28.05 lakh was released in Aug. 2000.
	1994-95	20.00	2	These amounts were kept in Civil deposit on 29.3.95 and released in 6/95 (20.00), 7/95 (36.33), and 8/96 (7.00)
		22.00	3	
		7.33	3	
		7.00	3	
	7.00	16		
Maharashtra	1992-93	48.48	48	Amount released in 1997-98
	-do-	57.09	60	Amount released in 1998-99
	-do-	38.52	72	Amount released in 1999-2000
	1993-94	181.67	60	-do-
	1994-95	222.71	48	-do-
	1995-96	100.29	36	-do-
	1996-97	15.03	24	-do-
	2000-01	158.93	12	(Rs. 277.37 lakh is yet to be released as on 31.3.2001)
Orissa	1992-00	14.66	43 to 46	
	do	25.60	12	
	do	37.00	9	
	do	68.00	6 to 8	
Tamil Nadu	1993-94	20.90	62	5/94 to 6/99
	1995-96	11.04	47	5/96 to 3/2000
	1995-96	12.00	62	5/96 to 3/2001
	1996-97	3.60	35	5/97 to 3/2000
	1998-99	6.11	17	11/98 to 3/2000
West Bengal	1993-94	8.00	15	2/94 to 6/95
	1993-94	3.00	14	2/94 to 5/95
	1993-94	6.00	20	2/94 to 11/95
	1993-94	8.00	20	2/94 to 11/95
	1993-94	5.00	14	2/94 to 6/95
	1993-94	8.00	21	3/94 to 12/95
	1993-94	3.00	20	3/94 to 11/95
	1993-94	3.00	17	3/94 to 8/95
	1993-94	4.00	12	3/94 to 3/95
	1993-94	4.66	20	3/94 to 11/95
	1995-96	12.00	29	3/96 to 8/98
	1995-96	8.67	45	3/96 to 12/99
	1995-96	4.00	24	3/96 to 3/98
1995-96	2.66	22	3/96 to 1/98	
1997-98	1.33	22	11/97 to 9/99	
Total		1639.77		

Annexure - VIII
(Refers to Paragraph 5.14)

Misutilisation of funds on activities not covered under the Scheme

(Rs in lakh)

Sl. No.	State	Town	Year/Period	Amount	Remarks
1	Andhra Pradesh	Nizamabad Municipality	February 2000	24.98 <u>5.74</u> <u>30.72</u>	(i) Building Regulation Account not connected with IDSMT - Rs 18.42 (ii) Development charges not connected with IDSMT - <u>Rs 12.30</u> <u>Rs 30.72</u>
2	Assam	Kokrajhar	1998-99	6.00	Staff salary paid by Municipal Board, Kokrajhar.
		Goalpara	1998-99	0.30	Office furniture purchased by DD/TCP Goalpara.
3	Gujarat	Bhavnagar	1998-99 to 1999-2000	0.75	TA Bill, Octroi refund and interest. Gujarat Electricity Board. .
		Jamnagar	1996-97	17.79	
		Mandvi	1999-2000	1.38	Publicity and Income tax
4	Himachal Pradesh	Mandi	1995-96	3.75	Donation for Shivaratri fair.
5	Jammu & Kashmir	Sopore	1996-97 to 1999-2000	8.90	TA and Office expenditure incurred in the admn deptt.
6	Karnataka	Kadur Harapanahalli, Badami		1.25 1.50 10.00	Donation for construction of Ranga Madira (Kadur), construction of compound wall for town panchayat building (Harapanahalli)town under ground drainage scheme (Badami)(met from interest earned.)
7	Kerala	Alappuzha	1997-98 to 1998-99	115.72	Other activities.
8	Madhya Pradesh	Director, TCP	1997-98 1999-2000	18.73 10.81	The amount was deducted by the Director TCPO from the State share of 12 towns (Amarpathan, Ashok Nagar, Astha, Balod, Berasia, Baora, Ganj Basoda, kasrawad, kanker, Narsingarh, Rajgarh, Umaria) and paid to MP Vikas Pradhikaran Sangh, Bhopal for providing architectural assistance to them whereas these charges were to be borne by the local bodies from their own sources.
		Khandwa, Mandla and Pandhurna	1995-96 to 1997-98	3.32	Amount paid to private architects for preparing estimates and designs out of scheme funds which were to be borne by them.
		Khandwa	1995-96	25.65	Rs 25.65 lakh spent by Nagar Palika Nigam, Khandwa on 3 schemes proposed in the project prior to approval of the project by G.O.I in Nov 1994, were adjusted irregularly from the scheme funds.
9	Orissa	Puri-Konark Development Authority, Puri	1998-99	1.50	Amount was paid to Tehsildar, Puri towards purchase of land for Tourist Housing Complex at Banki Muhan.
		Basudevpur NAC, Puri Municipality	1994-95 to 1999-2000	0.80	Unauthorisedly utilised the materials of the value of Rs 0.80 lakh purchased from out of IDSMT fund for different works not covered under the scheme.
		Digapahandi	1996-97	3.38	Set off loan amount by SBI towards purchase of canter bus.
		Bhanjanagar NAC	1995-96	9.00	Diverted/misutilised towards payment of wages, salaries and contingencies.
		SPA Titilagarh	1994-95 and 1995-96	0.32	-do-
		Titilagarh NAC	Prior to 7/96	3.45	-do-
		SPA Jharsuguda	Prior to 9/95	1.22	-do-

Report No.2 of 2002 (Civil)

Sl. No.	State	Town	Year/Period	Amount	Remarks
10	Punjab	MC Anandpur Sahib	3/1999 to 6/2000	17.14	Sale proceeds of shops were irregularly utilised on construction of Community Centre in contravention of the guidelines of the scheme.
		-do-	March-Aug.99	49.16	Sale proceeds of shops were irregularly diverted towards sanitation arrangements
		Mansa	2/98 to 5/98	5.97	Expenditure was incurred on construction of stadium at Mansa, which was outside the component of the scheme.
		-do-	Dec.99	1.73	Earth work (1.42) and auction notice charges (0.31) of land.
		Rajpura	1997-98	2.20	Spent on purchase of stationery (1.70 and dustbin 0.50)
11	Rajasthan	Jaisalmer	1995-96 to 1999-00	10.13	Cases of expenditure on unapproved works/activities not covered under the scheme.
		Nimbahera	1992-93	6.08	
		Udaipur	7/2000	100.00	Interest free loan to Urban Improvement Trust, Udaipur.
		Nimbahera		1.20	Bitumen purchased from IDSMT fund was utilised on works other than this scheme
12	Tamil Nadu	Commissioner of DTCP Chennai	1996-97	7.54	Evaluation of project.
13	West Bengal	Burdwan	1997-98 & 1998-99	0.50	Hire charges of vehicles.
		Gobardanga	1995-96	1.67	Legal charges.
		Tamluk	1993-00	5.97	
TOTAL				485.53	

Annex-IX
(Refers to Paragraph 5.15)

Cases of advances treated as final expenditure

(Rs in lakh)

Sl. No.	State	Town	Year/period	Amount of CA including State Share	Remarks
1	Assam	Nalbari	1994-95 to 1999-2000	41.48	Amounts released to executing agencies as final payments by Director T&CP and no subsequent adjustment bills/vouchers obtained herefore. No detailed records maintained in this regard.
		Mangaldoi		37.89	
		Kokrajhar	1995-96 to 1997-98	27.27	
		Goalpara	1997-98 to 2000-2001	36.45	
		Rangia	1996-97 to 2000-2001	36.00	
		Goalpara	1998-99	12.25	Advance payment made to contractors by EE, PWD ®, Goalpara against road scheme. Adjustment bill awaiting till date (7/2000).
2	Jammu & Kashmir	Sopore	1996-97 to 1999-2000	30.80	32 (11+5+16) cases of advances/release of funds to executing agencies.
		R.S.Pura	1995-96 to 1997-98	39.10	
		Samba	1997-98	42.68	
3	Karnataka	Gauribidanur	10/94 to 6/95	5.00	4 cases of advances given to suppliers/contractors for supply of materials etc.
		Badami	1992-93	51.90	37 (13+9+4+5+6) cases of advances/release of funds to executing agencies.
		Bellary	1993-94	136.20	
		Nippani	1993-94	13.00	
		Gadag-Betagiri	1994-95	77.49	
		Bangarapet	1995-96	43.00	
4	Madhya Pradesh	Raigarh (CG)	1992-93	40.00	Cases of advances/ release of funds to executing agencies.
		Rajgarh	1996-97	10.66	
		Mandsour	1992-93	10.00	
			1993-94	10.00	
			1998-99	22.42	
			1999-2000	14.94	
		Shivpuri	1992-93	25.00	
		Datiya		10.00	
		Khargone	1992-93	20.00	
			1994-95	20.00	
			1995-96	40.00	
		Khajuraho	1992-93	10.67	
			1999-2000	20.67	
		Hosangabad	1992-93	9.00	
		Chatarpur		7.19	
				25.10	
		Shahdol		1.00	
		Gadarwada		7.99	
				1.38	
		Bamore	1994-95	18.00	
		Amarkantak	Do	1.00	
		Neemuch	Do	2.50	
		Do	1995-96	18.50	
		Vidisha	1992-93	3.00	
		Do	1997-98	70.00	
		Panna	1992-93	6.01	
		Mandideep	Do	1.98	
		Bhind	Do	9.00	
		Dhamoh	Do	0.71	
		Sihora	Do	7.58	
		do	1994-95	30.00	
		do	2000-2001	30.00	
		Jagdulpur	1994-95	30.00	
Khandwa	Do	20.00			
do	1998-99	5.50			
do	2000-2001	7.50			
		22.94			

Report No.2 of 2002 (Civil)

Sl. No.	State	Town	Year/period	Amount of CA including State Share	Remarks
		Multai	1994-95	7.33	
		Do	1999-2000	35.70	
		Mandla	1994-95	16.00	
		Do	1998-99	48.00	
		Do	1999-2000	32.00	
		Chattarpur	1994-95	4.00	
		Do	1997-98	40.00	
		Morena	1994-95	0.15	
		Betul	1994-95	7.00	
		Do	1997-98	22.00	
		Tikamgarh	1995-96	66.67	
		Pithampur	Do	9.34	
		Dalli-Rajhara	Do	19.00	
		Baiora	1996-97	20.00	
		Narsingharh	1995-96	27.00	
		Do	1996-97	18.00	
		Do	2000-2001	54.98	
		Ashok Nagar	1995-96	25.00	
		Do	1996-97	16.66	
		Do	2000-2001	25.00	
				23.78	
		Ganj Basoda	Do	20.00	
		Do	1998-99	58.00	
		Do	1999-2000	10.61	
		Bhilai-Durg	1997-98	25.50	
		Sagar	Do	83.33	
		Amar Patan	1997-98	4.66	
		Do	1998-99	31.00	
		Do	1999-2000	20.67	
		Umariya	1997-98	8.00	
		Kasrawad	Do	3.34	
		do	1998-99	22.00	
		do	1999-2000	14.66	
		Maihar	1997-98	8.00	
		do	2000-2001	27.00	
		Champa	Do	8.67	
		Janjgir	Do	9.27	
		Garoth	1998-99	9.25	
		do	Do	10.00	
		do	1999-2000	23.41	
		Jaora	1999-2000	44.99	
			1998.99	10.00	
		Narsinghpur	Do	41.68	
		Chitrakoot	1999-2000	28.00	
		Bhatapara (CG)	Do	30.00	
		Jhabua	Do	30.00	
		Khurai	Do	30.00	
		Baora	Do	20.00	
		Berasia	Do	10.66	
		Kawardha (CG)	1998-99	18.00	
		Do	1999-2000	12.00	
		Sausar	1998-99	11.00	
		Do	1999-2000	7.33	
		Pandhurna	1998-99	22.00	
		Do	1999-2000	14.66	
		Ajaygarh	1998-99	14.00	
		Do	1999-2000	9.33	

Report No.2 of 2002 (Civil)

Sl. No.	State	Town	Year/period	Amount of CA including State Share	Remarks
		Kanker (CG)	1998-99	53.00	
		Do	1999-2000	35.33	
		Rajgarh	1998-99	31.00	
		Do	1999-2000	20.67	
		Balod (CG)	1998-99	16.00	
		Do	1999-2000	10.67	
		Astha	1998-99	30.00	
		Do	1999-2000	20.00	
		Dhanpuri	2000-2001	16.00	
		Nagod	Do	16.00	
		Nugaon	Do	30.00	
		sonkutch	Do	13.00	
5	Orissa	Nabarangpur Municipality	1997-98	0.05	Advance to different officials, executants and contractors for execution of different works.
		Puri	3/2000 to Jun-00	5.00	
		Titlagarh	1994-95	1.70	
6	Rajasthan	Chaksu	1995-96	14.00	8 cases (2+2+1+2+1) of advances to the working agencies being booked as final expenditure.
		Jhunjhunu	1998-99	5.72	
		Deoli	--	5.89	
		Rajasmand	1993-94 1998-99	11.00	
7	Tripura	Khowai	1993-94	14.25	12 cases (2+1+3+2+1+2+1) of advance/release of funds made to the executing agencies being booked as final expenditure.
		Kumarghat	1996-97	3.86	
		Sonamura	1996-97	31.03	
		Kamalpara	1997-98	17.09	
		Teliamura	1997-98	18.17	
		Sabroom	1999-2000	20.83	
8	West Bengal	Dhulian	1995-2000	6.50	Cases of advances/ release of funds made to the executing agencies being booked as final expenditure
		Diamond Harbour	1994-2000	0.22	
9	Pondicherry	Pondicherry	1992-93 to 1994-95	20.03	23 cases of advances/release of funds made to the executing agencies being booked as final expenditure.
		Mahe	1995-96	10.00	
			1999-2000	20.00	
		Oulgaret	1997-98 to 1999-2000	70.00	
		Villianur	1992-93	14.95	
			1998-99	7.12	
		Ariankuppam	1994-95	30.00	
1995-96	13.42				
Total				3123.88	

Annex-X
(Refers to Paragraph 5.18)

Parking of Scheme funds in PLA/Civil deposits by the State Government

(Rs in lakh)

State	Name of Town/City	Year/period	Amount
Bihar	Muzzaffarpur	1995-96	30.00
	Bhagalpur	Do	30.00
	Chatra	Do	20.00
	Rajgir	Do	20.00
	Godda	Do	20.00
	Gaya	1996-97	20.00
	Supaul	Do	15.00
	Forbesganj	Do	15.00
	Lohardaga	Do	15.00
Gujarat	Sheohar	Do	10.00
	Bharuch	1994-95	24.00
	Do	1995-96	24.00
	Do	1996-97	12.00
	Modasa	Do	30.00
	Bharuch	1997-98	14.13
	Modasa	Do	1.19
	Bharuch	1998-99	9.36
	Modasa	Do	4.35
	Mandvi	Do	28.79
	Bharuch	1999-2000	5.76
	Mandvi	Do	11.60
	Modasa	Do	21.47
Nadiad	Do	73.77	
Karnataka	Director Municipal Administration (DMA)	8/95 till date	138.14
Kerala	Kollam	1993-94	5.00
	Sekmai	1996-97	2.27
Orissa	Pattamundai NAC	1999-2000	10.00
	Anandapur NAC	Do	22.00
	Soro NAC	Do	8.00
	Choudwar Municipality	Do	16.00
	Chatrapur NAC	Do	7.60
	Nabarangpur (M)	Do	13.65
Rajasthan	PKDA Puri	Do	9.90
	Chaksu	1999-2000	39.18
	Udaipur	1998-99	39.50
	Pratapgarh	-do-	20.00
	Shahpura	-do-	32.00
jaisalmer	-do-	21.00	
Tamil Nadu		2000-2001	1477.93
Tripura	Kamalpur	1997-98	4.00
Uttar Pradesh	33 towns	1993-94 to 1997-98	1685.61
	12 towns	1998-99 to 2000-2001	197.00
Total			4204.20

ANNEX-XI
(Refers to Paragraph 5.19)

Default in repayment of loan and interest

(Rs in lakh)

Sl. No.	State/UT	Overdue for Repayment	
		Principal	Interest
01	Andhra Pradesh	1924.52	220.45
02	Arunachal Pradesh	68.49	3.14
03	Assam	459.71	0.00
04	Bihar	480.29	42.52
05	Goa	58.08	6.21
06	Gujarat	1103.25	111.82
07	Haryana	173.14	2.71
08	Himachal Pradesh	63.99	7.70
09	Jammu & Kashmir	244.35	0.00
10	Karnataka	2343.95	221.90
11	Kerala	731.05	69.67
12	Madhya Pradesh	1671.21	161.53
13	Maharashtra	3439.81	386.00
14	Manipur	205.35	28.31
15	Meghalaya	160.96	14.93
16	Mizoram	96.33	18.22
17	Nagaland	136.11	11.88
18	Orissa	875.69	93.51
19	Punjab	470.53	37.07
20	Rajasthan	959.60	79.55
21	Sikkim	72.79	8.15
22	Tamil Nadu	1848.57	208.71
23	Tripura	187.69	8.93
24	Uttar Pradesh	7153.89	109.39
25	West Bengal	1323.78	157.55
	Grand Total	26253.13	2009.85

(Source: Pay and Accounts Office, Ministry of Urban Development and Poverty Alleviation)

ANNEX-XII
(Refers to Paragraph 5.6)

Status of Projects

Sl. No.	Name of the State	No. of projects approved during			No. of projects		No. of projects yet to be taken up
		1992-96	1997-2001	Total	Completed	In progress	
1	Andhra Pradesh	248	136	384	78	65	241
2	Arunachal Pradesh	9	3	12	NA	9	3
3	Assam	11	45	56	-	11	45
4	Bihar	74	108	182	02	79	101
5	Goa	7	-	7	NA	NA	7
6	Gujarat	144	127	271	56	61	154
7	Haryana	11	31	42	8	16	18
8	Himachal Pradesh	7	25	32	13	18	1
9	J & K	15	11	26	2	6	18
10	Karnataka	298	72	370	197	-	173
11	Kerala	97	72	169	12	154	3
12	Madhya Pradesh	185	148	333	24	71	238
13	Maharashtra	392	142	534	115	204	215
14	Manipur	30	4	34	15	6	13
15	Meghalaya	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
16	Mizoram	10	3-	13	6	7	-
17	Nagaland	2	3-	5	NA	2	3
18	Orissa	176	91	267	56	43	168
19	Punjab	54	78	132	14	67	51
20	Rajasthan	72	37	109	-	58	51
21	Sikkim	2	6	08	-	1	7
22	Tamil Nadu	183	70	253	117	15	121
23	Tripura	4	24	28	1	15	12
24	Utter Pradesh	202	214	416	66	57	293
25	West Bengal	104	75	179	30	55	94
26	A&N Island	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
27	D&N Haveli	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
28	Daman & Diu	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
29	Lakshadweep	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
30	Pondicherry	8	-	8	NA	NA-	8
Total		2345	1525	3870	812	1020	2038

ANNEX-XIII
(Refers to Paragraph 5.21)

Unutilised Assets

Sl No	Name of State/UT	Details of assets created	Amount (Rs in lakh)	Period assets were created	Period assets remained unused as of 31.3.2001	Loss of revenue (Rs. in lakh)	Blockade of Capital (Rs. in lakh)	Remarks
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
1.	Andhra Pradesh	715 Shops at Chittoor, Eluru, Warangal and Ananthapur Municipalities	1039.00	Between March 1996 and March 2001	5 to 60 months	211.00	1039.00	Lying unoccupied
2.	Gujarat	784 shops at the cost of Rs 1322.19 lakh (Bharuch - 140, Bhavnagar - 172, Jamnagar - 226 and 206 offices, 6 stalls, Mandvi-21, Modasa-113 and Nadiad -112)	Cost not available	Between October 1997 and March 2001	41 months (508 shops)	--	625.00	508 shops were not sold due to lack of demand from public.
		One Shopping Complex (Mandvi town)	23.11	September 1999	6 months	--	23.11	Not disposed off due to lack of demand from public.
3.	Madhya Pradesh	93 shops at Janjgir (now Chhatisgarh State)	91.09	March 1999	More than 24 months	--	91.09	
		18 shops at shopping cum vegetable market - Pandhurna Shops 8.55 Parking and office Complex 18.20 - 26.75	26.75	December 1998	More than 27 months	--	8.55 (cost of 18 shops) 18.20 (spent on works of Parking and Office Complex)	
4.	Maharashtra	30 shops in shopping complex at shahada	40.55	February 1999	12 months	--	40.55	Shops could not be rented out and therefore remained unused due to low demand/offers from prospective buyers.
		203 shops out of 540 shops (16 shopping complexes) in 6 Municipal Councils viz Pachora, Phaltan, Vita, Dhule, Ichhal Karanji and Sangli.	195.48 proportionately of 203 shops	Between November 1995 and December 2000	--	--	195.48	
5.	Manipur	Completed assets of 16 works (shekmai - 10, Nambol - 1 and Thoubal - 5)	141.99	During March 1995 to May 1999	Between 2 and 72 months as on March 2001.	--	141.99	The State Nodal Agency did not transfer the assets/ infrastructure in time to ULBs. The delay still continues.
6.	Punjab	19 booths at shopping centre in old Subzi Mandi, Sirhind	10.00	June 1999	21 months	19.00	--	Estimated selling price Rs.19.00 lakh.

Report No.2 of 2002 (Civil)

Sl No	Name of State/UT	Details of assets created	Amount (Rs in lakh)	Period assets were created	Period assets remained unused as of 31.3.2001	Loss of revenue (Rs. in lakh)	Blockade of Capital (Rs. in lakh)	Remarks
7.	Sikkim	29 shops (out of 42) at Gangtok town.	67.84	December 1995	63 months	9.28	--	Revenue of Rs 9.28 calculated at an average rent of Rs 1000 per shop for the shops let out w.e.f August 1998 to March 2001.
		11 shops each measuring 10x12 sq.ft. for Mandi at Namchi Town.	27.65	1986-97	156 months	--	27.65	Idle investment
8.	Tamil Nadu	95 commercial units (Restaurant, Shops, Cycle Stand etc.) out of 114 units created.	--	--	August 1999 to March 2000 (Cuddalore-8 months and Tenkasi-2 months)	20.15	--	Assets could not be leased out due to litigation in the manner of allotment or fixing rent for allotment of shops and consequent delay in getting approval of the concerned authority to implement the court judgement.
9.	Uttar Pradesh	15 shops (out of 16) at Pilakhuwa town)	22.50	1995	More than 51 months	--	22.50	These shops could not be auctioned as no bidder turned up after three auctions.
		20 shops of Bheli Mandi Commercial Complex Scheme of Khalilabad	30.44	January 1999	14 months	--	--	Shops constructed at a cost of Rs 30.44 lakh were auctioned for Rs 22.06 lakh resulting in Capital loss of Rs 8.38 lakh due to lower rates received.
Total						259.43	2233.12	