

Annexures

List of Annexures

- Annexure 1:** Office Memorandum approving Indian Institute of Public Administration (IIPA) as the collaborating National Professional Institution and Prof. Aasha Kapur Mehta as the focal point in IIPA.
- Annexure 2:** Office Memorandum: Constitution of Technical Advisory Committee for the M/o Women and Child Development- UNDP project of 'Preparation of Gender Development Index/Gender Empowerment Measure'
- Annexure 3:** Office Memorandum; Extension of Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) for the M/o Women and Child Development – UNDP project of 'Preparation of Gender Development Index/Gender Empowerment Measure'
- Annexure 4:** First Technical Advisory Committee Workshop: A Report
- Annexure 5:** Second Technical Advisory Committee Workshop: A Report
- Annexure 6:** Third Technical Advisory Committee Workshop: A Report
- Annexure 7:** Technical Note on Computation of Indices - HDI, GDI and GEM

**No. 12-1/2006/Stat
M/o Women and Child Development
Government of India**

**Room No. 001-002, Jeevan Deep Building,
Parliament Street, New Delhi
Ph. 23362945/23362946(f)
Email:sa.wcd@nic.in
5/12/06**

To

Ms.Seeta Prabhu
Head, HDRC
UNDP India
Lodi Estate, PO Box No. 3059
New Delhi-110003

Ref: M/o WCD letter No. 1-20/2006-WD dated 8/11/2006 (communication of the approval of the GOI-UNDP Project 'Promoting Gender Equality').

Madam,

This is to inform you that, for the GOI – UNDP sub project 'Preparation of Gender Development Index/Gender Empowerment Measure', Secretary, M/o Women and Child Development, has duly approved the Indian Institute of Public Administration (IIPA) as the collaborating National Professional Institution. Prof. Aasha Kapur Mehta (Prof. of Economics, IIPA) will be the focal point in IIPA.

Sd/-

5.12.06

**(S. Jeyalakshmi)
Statistical Adviser**

Copy to: JS (Parul Debi Das)/Director (R. Savithri), M/o Women and Child Development for information and records.

F. no. 12-1/Stat/2006
M/o Women and Child Development
Government of India

Room no. 001-002, Jeevan Deep Building,
Parliament Street, New Delhi.
Ph. 23362945/ fax.23362945
E mail: sa.wcd@nic.in
15/01/07

Office Memorandum

Sub: Constitution of Technical Advisory Committee for the M/o Women and Child Development – UNDP project of ‘Preparation of Gender Development Index/Gender Empowerment Measure’

M/o Women and Child Development will be undertaking the activity of ‘Preparation of Gender Development Index/Gender Empowerment Measure’ under the GOI – UNDP project ‘Promoting Gender Equality’. The Indian Institute of Public Administration will be functioning as the collaborating National professional institution in this activity. In order to provide technical guidance, a Technical Advisory Committee has been constituted as follows:

A. Chairperson: Smt. S. Jeyalakshmi, Statistical Adviser, M/o WCD

Members:

Government Representatives:

1. Representative of M/o Health and Family Welfare
2. Representative of D/o School Education and Literacy, M/o Human Resource Development
3. Representative of M/o Urban Development
4. Representative of D/o Rural Development
5. Representative of M/o Labour and Employment
6. Representative of Adviser, WCD, Planning Commission
7. JS (Women Development), M/o WCD
8. Economic Adviser, M/o WCD
9. Representative of Social Statistics division, Central Statistical Organisation, M/o Statistics and Programme Implementation
10. Sh. G.C. Manna, Deputy Director General, Survey Design Research Division, NSSO, M/o Statistics and Programme Implementation
11. Representative of Registrar General of India

Experts:

12. Prof. Devaki Jain, Former Director ISST
13. Prof. Indira Hirway, Director and Prof. of Economics, Centre for Development Alternatives, Ahmedabad
14. Prof. Amita Majumdar, Economic Research Unit, ISI, Kolkata
15. Dr. P.N. Mari Bhat, Director, IIPS, Mumbai
16. Prof. K. Seeta Prabhu, Head, HDRC, UNDP

Member Secretary

17. Prof. Aasha Kapur Mehta, Professor of Economics, Indian Institute of Public Administration, New Delhi.

B. Terms of reference of TAC:-

- a) Develop a methodology for computation of GDI/GEM by deciding
- The list of socio economic and developmental indicators for constituting the basket for computation of GDI and GEM separately.
 - The Base Year i.e. the year from which the index is to be calculated.
 - The weighting diagram for combining the indicators for computation of index.
 - The formula for calculation of index.
- b) Examination and approval of the GDI/GEM prior to its release.

C. This Committee will work for a period of one year.

D. Out station members invited for the TAC meetings/workshops etc will be entitled to Travel Allowance and Dearness Subsistence allowance as per UNDP norms. For local participants, expenditure on conveyance to and fro will be reimbursed as per UNDP norms.

Sd/-
(Sunitha Bhaskar)
Deputy Director

Distribution:

1. All Members
2. Director General, CSO, M/o Statistics and Programme Implementation
3. JS & FA, M/o Women and Child Development
4. Dir. (WW), M/o Women and Child Development
5. Ms. Meenakshi Kathel, Research Associate, HDRC (Gender), UNDP

F. no. 12-1/Stat/2006
M/o Women and Child Development
Government of India

Room no. 001-002, Jeevan Deep Building,
Parliament Street, New Delhi.
Ph. 23362945/ fax.23362945
E mail: sa.wcd@nic.in
14/02/08

Office Memorandum

Sub: Extension of Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) for the M/o Women and Child Development – UNDP project of ‘Preparation of Gender Development Index/Gender Empowerment Measure’

In continuation of this office OM dated 15/1/07, this is to inform that, the tenure of the Technical Advisory Committee Constituted for providing technical guidance for the M/o Women and Child Development- UNDP project of ‘Preparation of Gender Development Index/Gender Empowerment Measure’ is extended till 31st December 2008. Terms of Reference of TAC will remain same as in the OM dated 15/1/07. In the composition of the TAC, in place of Prof. Mari Bhatt, Director, IIPS, Mumbai, who has since expired, the Director IIPS, Mumbai is included; to that extent the composition of TAC has undergone slight change and the revised TAC is as given below:

A. Chairperson: Smt. S. Jeyalakshmi, Statistical Adviser, M/o WCD

Members:

Government Representatives:

1. Representative of M/o Health and Family Welfare
2. Representative of D/o School Education and Literacy, M/o Human Resource Development
3. Representative of M/o Urban Development
4. Representative of D/o Rural Development
5. Representative of M/o Labour and Employment
6. Representative of Sr. Adviser, WCD, Planning Commission
7. JS (Women Development), M/o WCD
8. Economic Adviser, M/o WCD
9. Representative of Social Statistics Division, Central Statistical Organisation, M/o Statistics and Programme Implementation
10. Sh. G.C. Manna, Deputy Director General, Survey Design Research Division, NSSO, M/o Statistics and Programme Implementation
11. Representative of Registrar General of India

Experts:

12. Prof. Devaki Jain, Former Director ISST
13. Prof. Indira Hirway, Director and Prof. of Economics, Centre for Development Alternatives, Ahmedabad
14. Prof. Amita Majumdar, Economic Research Unit, ISI, Kolkata
15. Director, IIPS, Mumbai
16. Prof. K. Seeta Prabhu, Head, HDRC, UNDP

Member Secretary

17. Prof. Aasha Kapur Mehta, Professor of Economics, Indian Institute of Public Administration, New Delhi.

Out station members invited for the TAC meetings/workshops etc. will be entitled to Travel Allowance and Dearness Subsistence allowance as per UNDP norms. For local participants, expenditure on conveyance to and fro will be reimbursed as per UNDP norms.

Sd/-
(Sunitha Bhaskar)
Joint Director

All TAC members as per list

MWCD-UNDP-IIPA Project for Preparation of Gender Development Index/ Gender Empowerment Measure

First Technical Advisory Committee Workshop:A Report

Background and Purpose

The Ministry of Women and Child Development **constituted a Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) for the GDI/GEM project** (vide OM F. no. 12-1/Stat/2006 dated 15.1.07). A workshop **for TAC members was held on 16th March, 2007** at Conference Hall, First Floor, IIPA, Indraprastha Estate, Ring Road, New Delhi 110002. The purpose of the workshop was to:

- i) Appraise the TAC members of the purpose of the project
- ii) Review and critique the existing practice (indicators, methodology, etc) in compiling GDI/GEM
- iii) Identify the indicators that should be used for compiling GDI and GEM in India.
- iv) Determine data availability for these indicators
- v) Identify suitable methodology for compilation of GDI/GEM for India and States/UTs.

The workshop was attended by the following TAC members:

1. Ms. S. Jeyalakshmi, Statistical Adviser, M/o WCD - Chairperson
2. Dr. P.N. Mari Bhat, Director, International Institute of Population Sciences, Mumbai
3. Sh. G.C. Manna, Deputy Director General, Survey Design Research Division, NSSO, M/o Statistics and Programme Implementation, Kolkata
4. Sh. Srikara Naik, Director (WCD), Planning Commission, Yojana Bhawan
5. Sh. S. Chakrabarti, Director, Social Statistics Division, Central Statistical Organisation, M/o Statistics and Programme Implementation
6. Dr. Ranjana Gupta, Director UNDP, M/o of Rural Development
7. Sh. Pravin Srivastava, Director (Stat), M/o Health and Family Welfare
8. Smt. Suman Prasher, Joint Director, O/o Registrar General of India
9. Ms. Kalpana Narain, Dy. Secretary, M/o Urban Development
10. Prof. Amita Majumdar, Professor, Economic Research Unit, ISI, Kolkata
11. Prof. Indira Hirway, Director and Prof. of Economics, Centre for Development Alternatives, Ahmedabad
12. Prof. K. Seeta Prabhu, Head, HDRC, UNDP
13. Prof. Aasha Kapur Mehta, Professor of Economics, IIPA, New Delhi Member Secretary

The following members could not attend the meeting:

Ms. Parul Debi Das, JS (Women Development), M/o WCD

Representative of D/o School Education and Literacy, M/o Human Resource Development

Mrs. Manjula Krishnan, Economic Adviser, M/o WCD

Prof. Devaki Jain, C/o Singamma Sreenivasan Foundation, Tharanga, 10th Cross Raj Mahal Villas Extension, Bangalore-560080

Representative of Secretary, M/o Labour and Employment

Shri K.D. Maiti, Director, M/o Health and Family Welfare

Also present at the meeting were Sh. R.V.P. Singh, RO, WCD, Planning, Ms. Sunitha Bhaskar, Dy. Director, MWCD, Ms. Brotati Biswas, Research Officer, GDI Project, IIPA and Ms. Anjali Rani, Project Associate.

The list of members and officials who attended the workshop is enclosed as Annexure-I, with relevant contact details.

Ms. S. Jeyalakshmi, Chairperson, TAC, presided over the workshop and apprised the TAC members about the GDI/GEM project initiated by Ministry of Women and Child Development (MWCD) in collaboration with United Nations Development Program (UNDP). The Indian Institute of Public Administration (IIPA), New Delhi is the collaborating National Professional Institution for the implementation of the GDI/GEM project. Prof Aasha Kapur Mehta is the focal point in IIPA and is the Member Secretary of the Technical Advisory Committee. This project is planned in two phases:

Phase I (first six months):

Constitution of TAC

Initial groundwork for the project

Organization of the TAC workshop

Finalization of the indicators and methodology

Phase II (next six months):

Collection of data for India and the States

Estimation of GDI and GEM and

Preparation of report

The Chairperson asked TAC members to review the existing indicators which are used for the compilation of GDI and GEM and determine whether they are best suited for the Indian situation, as also the goal posts to be used, and weightage to be given to the different indicators. She also pointed out that only those indicators could be selected for which data was available separately for males and females.

Since the gender development indicator is basically adjusted human development indicator for gender neutrality, she stressed that it would be better to call it gender related development indicator. The Committee

should take a view on whether it was feasible to calculate HDI separately for males and females and then compare the two, instead of the single Gender related Development Index.

Outlining the genesis of the project **Prof. K. Seeta Prabhu** said that in 1995, soon after the global UNDP Report published (for the first time) the Gender related Development Index and Gender Empowerment Measure, a group of economists under the leadership of Prof. Devaki Jain undertook an in-depth analysis of these indices, critiqued them and tried to identify ways in which they could better reflect the Indian situation. The workshop was organized by Singamma Srinivasan Foundation at Bangalore in 1996, and the papers presented at that workshop were published in *The Economic and Political Weekly* in October 1996. Efforts were also made to try to extend it to the district level with the support of the Department of Women and Child Development. Four of the Technical Advisory Committee members were part of the group that conducted the research a decade ago. However, the initiative could not progress much because of absence of a project that could facilitate systematic collaboration based on the necessary institutional and financial support required to sustain it. A decade later, there is support from MWCD and UNDP and with the institutional support of IIPA and the Technical Advisory Committee, this initiative is being taken forward and will build on the ground work that has already been done.

A decade ago the indicators were critiqued because it was felt that these had been developed from a northern perspective, and did not incorporate the perspective of the south. For instance, work participation rate was considered to be an unqualified “good”, whereas it was argued that women in the south who are poor do not have a choice regarding work participation. They work out of necessity, so participating in the work force alone cannot be empowering in that sense and cannot be taken as an indicator.

While a fresh look needs to be taken at the indicators for discussing modifications, amendments and whether or not it should be a monitoring tool, the indicators should not be changed so completely that these no longer relate to anything that is being done elsewhere in the world. For instance, the GDI and GEM use primarily outcome indicators. The National Human Development Report of the Planning Commission substituted monitorable indicators for outcome indicators in order to use it as a tool for monitoring. This also takes care of the issue of non-availability of data. This is a new dimension that has come in during these ten years.

After the Technical Advisory Committee decides on a course of action, before dimensions and methodology are finalized, these may be presented at a stakeholder workshop for larger ratification.

She also mentioned that Planning Commission and UNDP are working on State Plans and ‘Strengthening State Statistical Systems for District Level Data’ is an active component of this. Recommendations made by the TAC with regard to the list of indicators for which data should be compiled systematically at the district level can be taken to the State Directorate of Economics and Statistics. This will ensure that gender concerns are built into the district level data system.

Prof. Aasha Kapur Mehta made a brief presentation based on a concept paper prepared for the workshop. She briefly:

- Outlined UNDP's HDI, GDI and GEM and the methodology used to estimate them;
- Outlined the background to the 1996 workshop at Bangalore on GDI and GEM,
- Outlined the recommendations made by the workshop for refining GDI and GEM and making them more relevant to India,
- Listed the six papers prepared by the Indian economists that were published in the October 26, 1996 Special Issue of *Economic and Political Weekly*;
- Listed the 18 indicators that were retrieved from UNDP's institutional memory (on which data should be collected at the State and district level with regular periodicity) identified at brainstorming workshops organized by the DWCD, UNDP and Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation;
- Compared the Planning Commission NHDR Gender Equality Index and HDI/GDI.

She noted that the GDI and GEM had been reviewed and critiqued both nationally and internationally. The issues raised in the context of GDI included its misinterpretation as a measure of gender inequality; complexity; problems in the calculation of gender gaps in income; the assumption that gender differences in earned incomes are a good indicator of gender differences in access to nutrition, housing, clothing; data availability and reliability; inability to capture subtle gender inequalities (educational choices, quality of education, access to employment and training, promotion); over-emphasis on income; narrow selection of variables; and omission of variables such as poverty, income and asset inequality, patriarchy, caste and ethnicity crucial for the development of women in developing countries; inability to capture intra-household disparities, differences in ownership of assets and nutritional status.

In the context of GEM it was pointed out that while it was conceptually clearer and more easily interpreted, relevant at the country level and could be disaggregated to the sub-national level, its shortcomings include the complicated calculation of gender gaps; poor availability of data; and the fact that it did not consider empowerment in the personal, household and community domains. GEM should reflect the existing power structures and monitor the efforts made in improving these structures; it needed to capture political participation at local and grassroots levels. It should be a prescriptive tool for change. Indicators such as literacy, access to contraceptives, exercise of right to vote, existence of collective structures and access to resources like land, credit, participation in cooperatives and self-help groups should be included.

Issues Discussed by the Technical Advisory Committee Members

- i) Should outcome indicators or process indicators be used in compiling the indicators?
- ii) It was strongly argued that the index compiled should be simple, easily calculable and easy to interpret. The indicators should be such that they can be understood by the common people easily.

- iii) Attention was drawn to the issue of the spatial dimension for which GDI and GEM should be estimated, i.e., National and State level, or whether districts should also be attempted. It was agreed that the task would be limited to estimating GDI and GEM at the National and State level at present. The exercise can be attempted for two districts to identify data gaps that can then be flagged to States for data collection so that GDI and GEM can be extended to districts in a subsequent exercise.
- iv) A suggestion was made that while the indices should definitely include health, education, etc., they should additionally try to capture macro indicators, such as environmental degradation, pollution and depletion; basic infrastructure and basic services at the State level; structural inequalities; wage disparities; conflict, disaster, security and safety; patriarchy; unequal sharing of unpaid work by men and women, housing and unemployment.

However it was argued that many of these variables should not be included while estimating GDI and GEM for the following reasons:

- a. The need to keep the index simple and easy to interpret. Whatever indicators are compiled should be simple so that we can take them to the common man.
- b. Only those variables can be included for which data is available separately for males and females. For example, if we consider infant mortality rate for male child and female child and total IMR, the comparative picture emerges.
- c. Infrastructure and environmental degradation cannot be measured separately or disaggregated for males and females. The concern is with disparities and comparisons.
- d. Micro details like whether households have separate bedrooms, or big kitchen or small kitchen, or some abstract areas like the environmental degradation, etc. may not be included in trying to measure gender empowerment or calculate gender development indices.
- e. A core minimum set of variables should be identified and based on this the indicators can be compiled
- v) It was generally opined that for computation of GDI and GEM, the UNDP framework of three dimensions, health, education and standard of living may be used to avoid controversies that will be created. The existing framework used by UNDP with regard to the three dimensions should be kept intact. UNDP is already calculating GDI and GEM for India in their country-wise table. Comparisons among countries will not be possible if a different methodology is used.
- vi) Even if it is decided to use the UNDP three dimension framework, indicators that are more relevant in the Indian context may be used. However, it is important that the indicators chosen for the different dimensions can be combined meaningfully. For instance, for the health dimension, it may be possible to combine infant mortality rate and child mortality rate. But if one tries to combine enrolment rate in school with the percent of female teachers that will not be a meaningful composite indicator, as the latter is used in the Empowerment Paradigm.
- vii) Since different countries are preparing these indices, in order to maintain international comparability, while one must have national indicators, they must conform to international practice.

- viii) Issues of scaling were raised and it was suggested that ideal (and different) goal posts for males and females should be used.
- ix) There are lots of indicators which capture the importance of providing an enabling environment for women. Lack of access to toilets for example, concerns women because, in the absence of these facilities, they wait for dusk or dark. It was therefore suggested that a few selected indicators of various dimensions be chosen, which can be monitored separately along with the GDI and GEM. These indicators could be tracked in a parallel exercise, with reasonable frequency with the purpose of evaluating social equity.
- x) The methodology of giving weightage to different indicators needed careful selection.
- xi) Choice of indicators would also depend on availability and periodicity of data for the reference period. If the Report is to be brought out in late 2007 then it may be possible to use data for 2004-05 or later year(s) as available.
- xii) It was suggested that gender inequality could be estimated on the basis of a simple measure of disparity:
$$\frac{\text{Female Value} - \text{Male Value}}{\text{Female Value}}$$
- xiii) Another suggestion was that the 'Data Integration Techniques' explained by Prof. Bikas K. Sinha, Member, National Statistical Commission, be used as an alternative methodology for combining indicators to form an index using squared distance from ideal and anti-ideal values of the indicators.
- xiv) One of the alternatives suggested (also suggested in the UNDP review) is that the human development index be calculated separately for males and females and then compared.
- xv) It was suggested that the collection of data for indicators that are needed but for which data is not presently available be recommended.

The following decisions were taken:

- ❖ Five categories of indices would be attempted at the national level.
 - a. Gender Development Index and Gender Empowerment Measure
 - b. Development Index for males and females separately.
 - c. Empowerment Measure for males and females separately.
 - d. Monitoring or Tracking Indicators to identify certain processes like infrastructure development, housing etc.
 - e. Inequality indicators estimated by Gender Gap Index =
$$\frac{\text{Male Value} - \text{Female Value}}{\text{Male Value}}$$

with a value of 0 indicating no disparity, and a value of 1 indicating maximum disparity.

- ❖ There would be a short-term goal (Phase 1 and 2) and a long-term goal (beyond Phase 2). The current project is confined to dealing with the short-term goal of calculating GDI/GEM at the national level and for the major Indian States. While this exercise would be confined to the national and state level based on available indicators, an attempt would be made to extend it to one or two districts in order to be able to recommend the absolute minimum list of indicators on which data must be collected and be available at the district level.
- ❖ In the long term, compiling GDI/GEM for all districts of India can be considered.
- ❖ The project may recommend the desirable indicators for calculating GDI/GEM at national, state and district levels and identify data gaps.
- ❖ Only those indicators should be included for which data is available separately for males and females so that gender differentials are captured (male/female differences). The indicators used by Planning Commissions (for GEI) will also be considered while finalising the indicators identified for compiling GDI and GEM.
- ❖ The dimensions used could be the same as used by UNDP but the indicators to measure these dimensions could be different, weightage to the indicators and the goal posts could differ from those used by UNDP so as to reflect Indian conditions.
- ❖ When the report is prepared, a section could be included to identify the critical gaps in data in respect of GDI, GEM
- ❖ A tentative list of over 100 indicators was prepared as part of the Concept Note and placed before the Technical Advisory Committee to facilitate identification of the indicators that could be considered in the compilation of GDI, GEM and Tracking Indicators. The tentative list of 50 indicators that could be considered is at **Appendix 4.2**. This list needs to be carefully seen by all TAC members and additions, deletions, modifications may be suggested. It may be ensured by TAC members, especially those from concerned data producing agencies, that for indicators at Annexure-II, sex-wise data is available and the source, levels and periodicity of data availability is checked and corrected.
- ❖ The Central Statistical Organisation (SSD Division) will be collaborating with M/o WCD in this project of national importance.
- ❖ The Chairperson and the Member Secretary were requested to
 - i) Use the discussions at the TAC workshop as the basis for finalising and circulating an initial list of indicators that could be used for (a) compiling GDI and GEM and (b) for tracking
 - ii) Identify if any of the indicators in the list of 18 indicators (**Appendix 4.3**) were not included in the list that has been prepared for consideration of GDI and GEM calculation and tracking. This has been done and is at column 2 in the table at **Appendix 4.3**.

The workshop ended with vote of thanks to the Chair.

**List of TAC Members and Officials Who Attended
the Workshop on 16th March 2007**

S.No	Name & Address	S.No	Name & Address
1	Smt. S. Jeyalakshmi, Chairperson, TAC, Statistical Adviser, M/o Women and Child Development, Room No. 001-002, Jeevan Deep Building, Parliament Street, New Delhi - 110001	8	Ms. Kalpana Narain, Deputy Secretary, Ministry of Urban of Affairs, Nirman Bhavan, New Delhi - 110011
2	Prof. Mari Bhat, Director, International Institute of Population Sciences, Govindi Station Road Deonar, Mumbai - 400088	9	Shri Sirkara Naik, Director (WCD), Room No 229 A, Yojana Bhavan, Sansad Marg, New Delhi - 110001
3	Shri S. Chakrabarti, Director SSD (CSO), MOSPI, West Block-VIII, RK Puram, New Delhi	10	Dr. K. Seeta Prabhu, HDRC, UNDP India, Lodi Estate, New Delhi - 110003
4	Dr. Ranjana Gupta, Director (IC/UNDP), Ministry of Rural Development, Krishi Bhawan, New Delhi	11	Ms. Suman Prashar, JDCO, Registrar General & Census Commissioner India, 2 A Mansingh Road, New Delhi - 110011
5	Prof. Indira Hirway, CFDA E-71, Akash, Near Chief Justice Bungalow, Bodakdev, Ahmedabad - 380054	12	Shri P. Srivastava, Director, Ministry of Health & Family Welfare, Nirman Bhawan, New Delhi - 110011
6	Prof. Amita Majumdar, Economic Research Unit, Indian Statistical Institute, 203, BT Road, Kolkata - 700108	13	Prof. Aasha Kapur Mehta, Member Secretary, TAC, Professor of Economics, Indian Institute of Public Administration, Indraprastha Estate, Ring Road, New Delhi - 110002
7	Shri G.C. Manna, DDG, SDRD, NSSO, 164, G.L.T. Road, Kolkata - 700108		

Tentative List of Indicators Identified for Calculation of GDI/GEM

S. No.	Indicators	Source
1. Education		
1.1 Indicators for GDI/GEM		
1.1.1	Total, male and female literacy rate.	(i) Selected Educational Statistics Report (2004-05), Ministry of Human Resource Development. (ii) Census: Primary Census Abstract, Table A-5, 2001. (iii) NSS: Report No 517: Status of Educational and Vocational Training in India, NSS 61 st Round (2004-05).
1.1.2	Gross Enrolment Rate (Primary) M/F.	(i) Selected Educational Statistics Report (2004-05), Ministry of Human Resource Development. (ii) Census: Educational Level by Age and Sex, Table C-8, 2001.
1.1.3	Gross Enrolment Rate (Secondary) M/F.	(i) Selected Educational Statistics Report (2004-05), Ministry of Human Resource Development. (ii) Census: Educational Level by Age and Sex, Table C-8, 2001.
1.1.4	Gross Enrolment Rate (Tertiary) M/F.	(i) Selected Educational Statistics Report (2004-05), Ministry of Human Resource Development. (ii) Census: Educational Level by Age and Sex, Table C-8, 2001.
1.1.5	Drop Out Rate (Primary) (I – V) M/F.	(i) Selected Educational Statistics Report (2004-05), Ministry of Human Resource Development. (ii) NSS: 439: Attending an Educational Institution in India: Its Level, Nature and Cost, NSS 52 nd Round (1995-96).
1.1.6	Drop Out Rate (Secondary) (I – X) M/F.	(i) Selected Educational Statistics Report (2004-05), Ministry of Human Resource Development. (ii) NSS: 439: Attending an Educational Institution in India: Its Level, Nature and Cost, NSS 52 nd Round (1995-96).
1.1.7	Percentage of students appearing for the 10 th Class Board Exam M/F.	(i) Census: Population Attending Educational Institution by completed educational level, Age & Sex Table C-11, 2001.
1.2 Tracking Indicators		
1.2.1	Percent of female teachers to total teachers.	(i) Census: Table C-10, 2001.
1.2.2	Skills, vocational education and training M/F.	(i) Census: Table C-10, 2001.
2. Employment		
2.1 Indicators for GDI/GEM		
2.1.1	Labour force participation rate M/F.	(i) Census: Primary Census Abstract, Table A-5, 2001. (ii) NSS: Report No 516; Employment and Unemployment Situation among Social Groups in India, NSS 61 st Round (2004-05).
2.1.2	Work force participation rate M/F.	(i) NSS: Report No 516; Employment and Unemployment Situation among Social Groups in India, NSS 61 st Round (2004-05).
2.1.3	Wage rate in agriculture and non-agriculture. M/F.	(i) Wage rate in Rural India, Labour Bureau, Ministry of Labour and Employment (2003-04).
2.1.4	Percent of men and women who are regular salary or wage earners.	(i) NSS: Report No 516; Employment and Unemployment Situation among Social Groups in India, NSS 61 st Round (2004-05).

Contd...

S. No.	Indicators	Source
2.1.5	Incidence of unemployment M/F.	(i) Census: Primary Census Abstract, Table A-5, 2001. (ii) NSS: Report No 516; Employment and Unemployment Situation among Social Groups in India, NSS 61 st Round (2004-05).
2.1.6	Percent of agricultural labourers who are Main workers in agriculture M/F.	(i) Census: Primary Census Abstract, Table A-5, 2001.
2.1.7	Percent of agricultural labourers who are Marginal workers in agriculture M/F.	(i) Census: Primary Census Abstract, Table A-5, 2001.
2.1.8	Share of women in wage employment in non-agricultural sector.	i) Wage rate in Rural India, Labour Bureau, Ministry of Labour and Employment (2003-04).
2.2 Tracking Indicators		
2.2.1	Time spent on Care, Unpaid work M/F.	(i) NSS: Report No 518: Participation of Women in Specific Activities With Domestic Duties, NSS 61 st Round (2004-05).
2.2.2	Access to two square meals a day/hunger.	(i) NSS Report No 512: Perceived Adequacy of Food Consumption in Indian Households, NSS 61 st Round (2004-05).
3. Assets and Control over Use of Income and Assets		
3.1 Tracking Indicators		
3.1.1	Involvement of women in major household decisions e.g. sale of assets, no. of children, etc.	(i) National Family Health Survey II 1998-99.
4. Health		
4.1 Indicators for GDI/ GEM		
4.1.1	Total, male and female life expectancy at birth.	(i) Sample Registration System Bulletin 2001, Office of RGI. (ii) National Family Health Survey II 1998-99.
4.1.2	Under Five Mortality Rate M/F.	(i) Sample Registration System Report No 2 of 2005, Office of RGI. (ii) National Family Health Survey II 1998-99
4.1.3	Child Mortality Rate M/F.	(i) Sample Registration System Report No 2 of 2005, Office of RGI. (ii) National Family Health Survey II 1998-99.
4.1.4	Infant Mortality Rate M/F.	(i) Sample Registration System Report No 2 of 2005, Office of RGI. (ii) National Family Health Survey II 1998-99.
4.1.5	Morbidity Rate M/F.	(i) Sample Registration System Report No 2 of 2005, Office of RGI. (ii) National Family Health Survey II 1998-99.
4.2 Tracking Indicators		
4.2.1	Incidence of Anaemia in women.	(i) National Family Health Survey II 1998-99.
4.2.2	Maternal Mortality Rate.	(i) "Maternal Mortality in India (1997-2003), Trend, Causes & Risk Factors" Sample Registration System, Office of RGI.
4.2.3	Births attended by trained personnel.	(i) National Family Health Survey II 1998-99.

Contd...

S. No.	Indicators	Source
4.2.4	Percent of men marrying at the age of 21 and above and women at the age of 18 and above.	(i) Census: Marital Status by Age Sex, Table C-2, 2001. (ii) NSS Report No 445; Maternal and Child Health Care in India, NSS 52 nd Round 1995-96.
5. Participation in the Political and Administrative Domain		
5.1 Indicators for GDI/GEM		
5.1.1	Percentage of IAS and Allied Civil Servants M/F.	(i) Ministry of Personnel and Public Grievances.
5.1.2	Percent of seats in Parliament held M/F.	(i) Lok Sabha and Rajya Sabha Secretariat.
5.1.3	Percentage of men and women elected in State Assemblies M/F.	(i) Secretary Election Commission of India.
5.1.4	Proportion of men and women electors casting their votes.	(i) Secretary Election Commission of India, General Elections 2004.
5.1.5	Percent of men and women elected representatives at Panchayat level.	(i) Ministry of Panchayati Raj.
6 Demographic Indicators		
6.1 Tracking Indicators		
6.1.1	Sex ratio.	(i) Census: Primary Census Abstract, Table A-5, 2001.
6.1.2	Child sex ratio (0-6)	(i) Census: Primary Census Abstract, Table A-5, 2001.
7. Social Indicators and Violence		
7.1 Tracking Indicators		
7.1.1	Total incidence of Crimes against Women.	(i) National Crime Records Bureau, Ministry of Home Affairs 2004.
7.1.2	Crimes against Women as a proportion of crimes registered under IPC	(i) National Crime Records Bureau, Ministry of Home Affairs 2004.
7.1.3	Incidence of Dowry Deaths.	(i) National Crime Records Bureau, Ministry of Home Affairs 2004.
7.1.4	Number of Accidental or Unnatural Deaths M/F.	(i) National Crime Records Bureau, Ministry of Home Affairs 2004.
8. Basic Amenities and Relative Impact on Drudgery		
8.1 Tracking Indicators		
8.1.1	Percent of households with access to safe drinking water.	(i) Census: Housing tables, Census of India 2001.
8.1.2	Percent of households with access to toilets.	(i) Census: Housing tables, Census of India 2001.
8.1.3	Percent of households with access to electricity	(i) Census: Housing tables, Census of India 2001.

Contd...

S. No.	Indicators	Source
8.1.3	Percent of households with access to water for household tasks.	(i) Census: Housing tables, Census of India 2001.
8.1.4	Percent of households with the access to PHC.	(i) Census: Housing tables, Census of India 2001.
8.1.5	Percent of households with access to road connectivity.	(i) Census: Housing tables, Census of India 2001.
8.1.6	Percent of households using polluting fuels	(i) Census: Housing tables, Census of India 2001.

List of 18 Indicators Identified for Tracking in the Past

S. No.	Serial No. in Appendix 4.2	Indicators	Source
1	Same as 6.1.1	Sex Ratio	(i) Census: Primary Census Abstract, Table A-5, 2001.
2	Same as 6.1.2	Sex Ratio in the Age Group 0-6 Years	(i) Census: Primary Census Abstract, Table A-5, 2001
3	Same as 4.1.2	Under Five Mortality Rate.	(i) Sample Registration System Report No. 2 of 2005. Office of RGI. (ii) National Family Health Survey II 1998-99
4	Not in table in Appendix 4.2	Age Specific Mortality Rate in the Age Group 15-34 Years.	(i) Sample Registration System Report No. 2 of 2005, Office of RGI. (ii) National Family Health Survey II 1998-99
5	Same as 2.1.3	Work Participation Rates.	(i) Census: Primary Census Abstract, Table A-5, 2001. (ii) NSS: Report No. 516; Employment and Unemployment situation among social groups in India, NSS 61 st Round (2004-05).
6	Not in table in Appendix 4.2	Percentage of Non Farm Workers among Workers.	(i) Census: Primary Census Abstract Table A-5, 2001.
7	Same as 2.1.7	Percentage of Agricultural Labourers among Marginal/ Subsidiary Workers.	(i) Census: Primary Census Abstract, Table A-5, 2001.
8	Same as 2.1.2	Agricultural Wage Rate M/F.	(i) Wage Rate in Rural India, Labour Bureau Ministry of Labour and Employment (2003-04).
9	Same as 1.1.1	Literacy Rate for the Age Group 6-14 Years.	(i) Selected Educational Statistics Report (2004-05), Ministry of Human Resource Development (ii) Census: Primary census Abstract, Table A-5, 2001. (iii) NSS: Report No 517: Status of Educational and Vocational Training in India, NSS 61 st Round (2004-05).
10	Not in table in Appendix 4.2	Percentage of Population Completed Middle Level.	(i) Census: Educational Level by Age and Sex, Table C-8, 2001.
11	Not in table in Appendix 4.2	School Attendance Rate for Age Group 6-14 Years.	(i) NSS: Report .516; Employment and Unemployment Situation among Social Groups in India, NSS 61 st Round 2004-05.
12	Same as (5.1.2) (5.1.3) (5.1.4) (5.1.5)	Percentage of Persons Voting, Contesting, and Elected in Central and State General Elections.	(i) Lok Sabha and Rajya Sabha Secretariat. (ii) Secretary Election Commission of India.
13.	Same as 1.7.4	No. of Unnatural Deaths per Lakh Population.	(i) National Crime Records Bureau, Ministry of Home Affairs 2004.
14	Not in table in Appendix 4.2	Percentage of Sterilisations.	(i) Department of Family Welfare, Ministry of Health & Family Welfare 1999.
15.	Not in table in Appendix 4.2	Percentage of Employment in Central/State Government and Local Bodies.	(i) Director General of Employment & Training, Ministry of Labour 2004.

S. No.	Serial No. in Appendix 4.2	Indicators	Source
16	Not in table in Appendix 4.2	Percentage of Non Death Crimes against Women.	(i) National Crime Records Bureau, Ministry of Home Affairs 2004.
17.	Not in table in Appendix 4.2	Percentage of women with land and assets registered in their own names.	
18.	Same as 1.1.7	Percentage of Students Appearing for the 10 th Class Board Examinations.	(i) Census: Population Attending Educational Institutional by Completed Educational Level, Age & Sex, Table C-11, 2001.

MWCD-UNDP-IIPA Project for Preparation of Gender Development Index/ Gender Empowerment Measure

Second Technical Advisory Committee Workshop: A Report

The Second Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Workshop for GDI and GEM was held on 24 June, 2008 in the Conference Hall, Indian Institute of Public Administration (IIPA). The workshop was organized by Ministry of Women and Child Development and Indian Institute of Public Administration, in collaboration with United Nations Development Programme.

The purpose of the workshop was to:

- i) Finalize Dimensions and Indicators for GDI and GEM
- ii) Discuss the methodology for compilation of GDI and GEM
- iii) Determine Data Sources

The TAC Workshop Programme is at **Appendix 5.1**.

The workshop was attended by the following TAC members and Special Invitees:

- 1) Smt. S. Jeyalakshmi, Statistical Adviser, MWCD, Chairperson TAC
- 2) Prof. Devaki Jain, C/o Singamma Sreenivasan Foundation, Tharanga, 10th Cross Raj Mahal Villas Extension, Bangalore-560080
- 3) Prof. Amita Majumdar, Economic Research Unit, Indian Statistical Institute, 203, BT Road, Kolkata-700108
- 4) Dr K. Seeta Prabhu, UNDP
- 5) Shri Srikara Naik, Director (WCD), Planning Commission, Yojana Bhawan
- 6) Ms. Achala Mediratta, TCPO, M/o Urban Development
- 7) Dr. Suraj Kumar, UN System (Special Invitee)
- 8) Ms. Ritu Mathur, Programme Officer, UNDP
- 9) Ms. Govind Kelkar, UNIFEM (Special Invitee)
- 10) Ms. Pratima Gupta, Dy. Director, MWCD
- 11) Prof. Aasha Kapur Mehta, Member Secretary, TAC, Professor of Economics, Indian Institute of Public Administration

The following TAC members did not attend the meeting:

Dr. Kiran Chadha, Joint Secretary, MWCD

Ms. Manjula Krishnan, Economic Adviser, MWCD

Prof. Ram, Director, International Institute of Population Sciences, Mumbai

Prof. Indira Hirway, Director and Prof. of Economics, Centre for Development Alternatives, Ahmedabad

Sh. G.C. Manna, Deputy Director General, Survey Design Research Division, NSSO, M/o Statistics and Programme Implementation, Kolkata

Sh. S. Chakarbarti, Director, Social Statistics Division, Central Statistical Organisation, M/o Statistics and Programme Implementation

Representative of M/o of Rural Development

Sh. Pravin Srivastava, Director (Stat), M/o Health and Family Welfare

Smt. Harjot Kaur, Director, M/o Labour and Employment

Smt. Suman Prasher, Joint Director, O/o Registrar General of India

Ms. Richa Sharma, Deputy Secretary, D/o School Education and Literacy, M/o Human Resource Development

Also present at the meeting were Shri. R.V.P. Singh, Research Officer, Planning Commission, Dr. Swapna Bist Joshi, Project Officer, GB, MWCD and Ms. Parma Adhikari, Research Officer, GDI GEM Project, IIPA.

Director IIPA welcomed the TAC members. Ms. Jeyalakshmi, Chairperson, TAC also welcomed the TAC members and presided over the meeting.

At the outset, the Member Secretary apprised the TAC members of the reason for the delay in holding the Second TAC workshop. The project budget was prepared before the Technical Advisory Committee was constituted and did not provide for airfares for five outstation members. Additionally, it was felt that at least three TAC meetings/workshops were needed while the budget provided only for two. Therefore the budget needed to be revised. The revised budget has since been approved by M/o WCD.

Decisions taken at the TAC Workshop:

- Only two indices would be calculated: (i) GDI and (ii) GEM.
- GDI and GEM would be calculated at the national or All-India level, for States and for two Districts.
- The estimates would be prepared at two time points: 1991 and 2001.
- The same three Dimensions used in UNDP's GDI and GEM would be maintained with one marginal change: Dimension 2 of GEM would be 'Economic and Social Participation and Decision-making' instead of just 'Economic Participation and Decision-making'.
- The same dimension ordering or listing would be used as for UNDP's GDI and GEM.
- The basket of indicators used to compile the index for each dimension would be changed as needed and enlarged.
- The title for the Report suggested by Prof. Devaki Jain was "Gendering Human Development Indices: Recasting the GDI and GEM for India." This was agreed to.
- Data sources would be examined by the IIPA Technical team and, where required, TAC members would be requested to facilitate procurement of data and provide suggestions.

Dimensions and Indicators of GDI and GEM were decided by the TAC members. The list may be further pruned based on data availability/suggestions.

Dimensions and Indicators for GEM

Dimension (1) Political Participation and Decision-making Power

Indicators

- i) % Share of Parliamentary Seats
- ii) % Seats of Legislature, *Zilla Parishads, Panchayat Samiti, Gram Panchayats*, Urban Local Bodies
- iii) % Representation in Parliamentary Committees
- iv) % Candidates in Electoral Process
- v) % Central and State Council of Ministers
- vi) % Participation in Governance Structures of Political Parties
- vii) % Electors exercising the right to vote
- viii) % Membership of Trade Unions

Dimension (2) Economic and Social Participation and Decision-making Power

Indicators

- i) % Share in All India Civil Services
- ii) % Participation in National Commissions
- iii) % Participation in State Planning Boards and District Planning Committees
- iv) % Senior Managers in the Corporate Sector
- v) % Participation in Banks, Co-operative Banks and Financial Institutions
- vi) % Share of Professionals (Judges, Lawyers, Doctors, Engineers, Journalists)
- vii) % Participation in Decision-making Bodies of Journalists, Lawyers, etc.

Dimension (3) Power over Economic Resources

Indicators

- i) Female/Male Ownership of Assets such as land, dwelling, livestock, and productive assets
- ii) Female/Male who Availed of Credit
- iii) Female/Male Estimated Earned Income

Dimensions and Indicators for GDI

Dimension (1) A Long and Healthy Life

Indicators

- i) IMR (Girls/Boys)
- ii) Life Expectancy at age 1 (Girls/Boys)
- iii) % Children underweight (Girls/Boys)

Dimension (2) Knowledge

Indicators

- i) 7+ Literacy Rate
- ii) Primary, Secondary and Tertiary Combined Gross Enrolment Ratio
- iii) Use of ICT (Internet + Radio + TV + Mass Communication)

Dimension (3) A Decent Standard of Living

Indicators

- i) Share of Agricultural Income
- ii) Share of Income in the Non-Agricultural Informal Sector

Way Forward

The TAC Chairperson and Member Secretary were requested to:

- Assign weights to the indicators used for each dimension. Weights suggested at the TAC workshop for the 'Long and Healthy Life' and 'Knowledge' dimensions were 50% for the first and 25% each for the second and third indicators.
- Suggest the goal posts to be used.
- Discuss the framework, suggested dimensions, choice of indicators, indicators identified, weights and goal posts with four experts and request them for their expert comments and suggestions. The experts were Dr. P. Sen, Secretary and Chief Statistician GOI; Prof. Amitabh Kundu, JNU; Dr S.K. Nath, DG Central Statistical Organisation, M/o S&PI and Dr. J. Dash, Addl. DG, Social Statistics Division, M/o S&PI.

Subsequently, the indices would be compiled and a draft report prepared and presented to TAC and at a Multi-stakeholder Workshop.

The meeting ended with a vote of thanks to the Chair.

**MWCD-UNDP-IIPA Project for Preparation of Gender Development Index/
Gender Empowerment Measure
Technical Advisory Committee Workshop**

**Workshop Programme
24th June, 2008**

10.30 to 10.35: Welcome to TAC Members	B.S Baswan Director IIPA
10.35 to 11.00: Project Status Presentation	Chair: S. Jeyalakshmi (Chairperson TAC) Aasha Kapur Mehta Parma Adhikari
11.00 to 12.00: Finalising dimensions and indicators for GEM	Chair: Devaki Jain TAC Members
12.00 to 13.00: Finalising dimensions and indicators for GDI	Chair: Seeta Prabhu TAC Members
13.00 to 14.00: Lunch	
14.00 to 16.00: GDI/GEM: Discussion on Methodology	Chair: S. Jeyalakshmi TAC Members
16.00 to 16.15: Tea	
16.15 to 17.15: Data Sources for finalized indicators	Chair: S. Jeyalakshmi TAC Members
17.15 to 17.25: Way forward	MWCD and UNDP
17.25 to 17.30: Vote of Thanks	Pratima Gupta, MWCD Aasha Kapur Mehta (Member Secretary TAC)

MWCD-UNDP-IIPA Project for Preparation of Gender Development Index and Gender Empowerment Measure

Third Technical Advisory Committee Workshop: A Report

The Third Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Workshop for GDI and GEM was held on 28th November, 2008 in the Conference Hall, Indian Institute of Public Administration (IIPA). The workshop was organised by the Ministry of Women and Child Development and the Indian Institute of Public Administration, in collaboration with United Nations Development Programme (UNDP).

The purpose of the workshop was to finalise the indicators and methodology for compilation of GDI and GEM and modalities for a multi-stakeholder workshop. The TAC Workshop Programme is at **Appendix 6.1**.

The Workshop was attended by the following members and special invitees:

Smt. Vijayalakshmy K. Gupta, Additional Secretary, MWCD, New Delhi, Chair

Smt. S. Jeyalakshmi, Statistical Adviser, MWCD, New Delhi, Co-Chair

Prof. Devaki Jain, C/o Singamma Sreenivasan Foundation, Tharanga, 10th Cross Raj Mahal Vilas Extension, Bangalore

Dr. K. Seeta Prabhu, UNDP, New Delhi

Prof. Indira Hirway, Director and Professor of Economics, Centre for Development Alternatives, Ahmedabad

Sh. G.C. Manna, Deputy Director General, Survey Design Research Division, NSSO, M/o Statistics and Programme Implementation, Kolkata

Sh. S. Chakarbarti, Director, Social Statistics Division, Central Statistical Organisation, M/o Statistics and Programme Implementation, New Delhi

Ms. Suman Prasher, Joint Director, O/o Registrar General of India

Prof. Amita Majumdar, Economic Research Unit, Indian Statistical Institute, 203, BT Road, Kolkata

Ms. Ritu Mathur, Programme Officer, UNDP, New Delhi

Ms. Govind Kelkar, UNIFEM, New Delhi (Special Invitee)

Ms. Pratima Gupta, Dy. Director, MWCD, New Delhi

Ms. Rashmi Verma, M/o Health and Family Welfare, New Delhi

Prof. Aasha Kapur Mehta, Member Secretary, TAC, Professor of Economics, Indian Institute of Public Administration, New Delhi

The following members did not attend the meeting:

Dr Kiran Chadha, Joint Secretary, MWCD, New Delhi

Ms. Manjula Krishnan, Economic Adviser, MWCD, New Delhi

Prof. Ram, Director, International Institute of Population Sciences, Mumbai

Dr. Suraj Kumar, UN System, New Delhi

Smt. Harjot Kaur, Director, M/o Labour and Employment, New Delhi

Sh. Srikara Naik, Director (WCD), Planning Commission, New Delhi

Dr. Achala Mediratta, M/o Urban Development, New Delhi

Also present at the meeting were Shri Sanjay Pratap, Ms. Parma Adhikari and Shri Saikat Banerjee, Research Officers, IIPA, New Delhi.

- 1) The Chairperson, Ms. Jeyalakshmi and Member Secretary, Prof. Aasha Kapur Mehta welcomed the TAC members.
- 2) Ms. Jeyalakshmi, Chairperson, TAC, proposed that Ms. Vijayalakshmy Gupta, Additional Secretary, MWCD, Chair the meeting and the Committee. This was seconded by Prof. Amita Majumdar.
- 3) The Draft Report of Second TAC workshop held on 24th June 2008, including the list of potential indicators for each of the three dimensions finalised for GDI and GEM at the workshop, was circulated for comments to all TAC members on 8th July 2008.

Meetings were held with the following experts identified by the TAC:

- i) Dr. P. Sen, Secretary M/o S&PI and Chief Statistician, GOI, on 28th July, 2008;
- ii) Dr. S.K. Nath, DG Central Statistical Organisation, M/o S&PI, on 6th August, 2008.
- iii) Prof. Amitabh Kundu, JNU, on 11th August, 2008.

Discussions with Dr. Sen and Dr. Nath were primarily with reference to suggested dimensions and choice of indicators, while those with Prof. Kundu focused primarily on the method for constructing the index and weights and goal posts.

Comments received from TAC members till 25th July 2008 were incorporated in the dimension-wise list of indicators for GDI and GEM and discussed with Secretary, MOSPI on 28th July, 2008. The suggestions made by Secretary MOSPI were entitled Attachment 2 and circulated on 29th July 2008 to all TAC members for comments. TAC members' comments on Attachment 2 and suggestions made by DG CSO regarding additional indicators were included in the note entitled Attachment 3 and circulated together with some of the indicator-related suggestions made by DG CSO as Attachment 3 and emailed to TAC members on 4th August, 2008. The Final Report of the Second TAC workshop was emailed to TAC members on 17th August, 2008.

- 4) Data has now been collected on most of the indicators recommended by TAC members. However, despite the help extended by many of the data providing agencies and Ministries and Departments, several data gaps remain. Most important among these are:
 - i) Female/Male Estimated Earned Income Share and the wage rates on which the estimates were based.
 - ii) Access to credit below Rs. 2 lakh for both time points, 2006 and 1996 and access to credit above Rs. 2 lakh for 1996.

5) The following decisions were taken at the TAC workshop:

The final list of Indicators within the dimensions of GDI and GEM was decided by the TAC members (see Tables 1 and 2).

- The number of indicators for measuring each dimension should be small.
- Overlapping should be avoided as far as possible.
- There will be a strong relationship between some of the finalised indicators. While indicators may be used despite this, justification for use will be needed. The report should clearly state the reasons for the selection of the final list of indicators. Correlation matrices can be used to curtail the number of indicators where the number is large.
- Data on indicators that have been dropped in the TAC workshop dated 28th November 2008 should be included in the explanations segment of the report.
- The income indicator estimated for GDI would also be used in estimating GEM.
- Equal weights would be assigned to all the indicators.
- The value to be used for epsilon (ϵ) = 2.
- It would be desirable to estimate income earned share based on NSS Rural and Urban Wage Rate for agricultural and non-agricultural sector (combined) and (ii) Rural and Urban (Principal + Subsidiary workers) in the agricultural and non-agricultural sector (combined). Before the workshop concluded a request was sent by MWCD to DG NSS for urgent provision of the data.

Table 1: Gendering Human Development Indices: Recasting GDI for India Dimensions and Indicators

Dimension 1: A Long and Healthy Life	
S.No.	Indicators
i)	Infant Mortality Rate
ii)	Life Expectancy at age 1
Dimension 2: Knowledge	
S.No.	Indicators
i)	7+ Literacy rate
ii)	Combined Gross Enrolment ratio (I-VIII) or Mean Years of Education (15+ age group)
Dimension 3: A Decent Standard of Living	
S.No.	Indicators
i)	Female/Male Estimated Earned Income Share per capita per annum

Table 2: Gendering Human Development Indices: Recasting GEM for India Dimensions and Indicators

Dimension 1: Political Participation & Decision-making Power	
S.No.	Indicators
i)	% Share of Parliamentary Seats (elected)
ii)	% Share of Seats in Legislature (elected)
iii)	% Share of Seats in <i>Zilla Parishads</i> (elected)
iv)	% Share of Seats in <i>Gram Panchayats</i> (elected)
v)	% Candidates in Electoral Process in National Parties
vi)	% Electors Exercising the Right to Vote
Dimension 2: Economic and Social Participation & Decision-making Power	
S.No.	Indicators
i)	% Share of Officials in Service in IAS, IPS and Indian Forest Service
ii)	% Share of Enrolment in Medical and Engineering Colleges
iii)	Work Force Participation Rate (WFPR) in Non-agricultural Sector (if data available)

Contd...

- Indicators such as percentage of children underweight; use of ICT; percentage of central and state council of ministers; percentage of representation in Lok Sabha and Rajya Sabha Committees; etc. would not be used in estimating the index but would be used in the explanations section of the report.
- Data gaps identified would be highlighted.
- Estimates of GDI and GEM would be compiled for two periods of time, 2006 and 1996.

Issues: Dates for Submission of Report and Multi-stakeholder Workshop

- UNDP requires that the Multi-stakeholder Workshop be held before 18th December, 2008 and the Concept Note/Report be submitted by 8th December, 2008.
- The third TAC workshop was held at IIPA on 28th November, 2008. This was the earliest possible after completion of administrative arrangements with UNDP on 18th November, 2008 for the additional TAC workshop and was based on availability of TAC members.
- Despite the help extended by data providing agencies and Ministries and Departments of Government of India and the two chosen districts, data gaps remain.

Table 2 (Contd.)

Dimension 3: Power over Economic Resources	
S.No.	Indicators
i)	% of Operational Land Holdings and Area Operated
ii)	Number of Females/Males with Bank Accounts in Scheduled Commercial Banks (credit limit above Rs. 2 lakh)
iii)	Female/Male Estimated Earned Income Share per capita per annum as estimated for GDI

- In view of the constraints on timelines it was decided that:
 - The Multi-stakeholder Workshop would be held on or before 17th December, 2008 depending on the availability of the Conference Hall.
 - Efforts were being made by MWCD to procure the data required for the two critical gaps (wage rates for estimating Income and data on credit at least for amounts over Rs. 2 lakh for 1996).
 - MWCD and UNDP would provide a list of names and addresses of officers and a few others to be invited to the Workshop.
 - In view of the timeline requirements of UNDP, a Concept Paper/Report would be circulated at the earliest possible but no later than 12th December, 2008.

The meeting ended with a vote of thanks to the Chair.

MWCD-UNDP-IIPA Project for Preparation of Gender Development Index and Gender Empowerment Measure

Technical Advisory Committee Workshop:

Agenda

28th November, 2008

10.15 to 10.30: Tea

10.30 to 10.35: Welcome to TAC Members: Smt. S. Jeyalakshmi, Prof. Aasha Kapur Mehta

10.35 to 14.00: Compilation of GDI and GEM: Status and Discussion on Issues

14.00: Lunch

14.45 to 15.00: Planning the Multi-stakeholder Workshop

Technical Note on Computation of Indices - HDI, GDI and GEM¹

Computation of Human Development Index (HDI)

The HDI measures human development in India, States and UTs in three basic dimensions:

Dimension 1: 'A Long and Healthy Life'

Indicators: i) Infant Mortality Rate and ii) Life Expectancy at age 1.

The negative index for infant mortality rate was converted to a positive index by subtracting the value of the index from 1.

Dimension 2: 'Knowledge'

Indicators: i) 7+ Literacy Rate and ii) Mean Years of Education for 15+ age group.

Dimension 3: 'A Decent Standard of Living'

Indicator: i) Estimated Earned Income per capita per annum.

The indicators identified for measuring each of the three dimensions, viz., 'a long and healthy life', 'knowledge' and 'a decent standard of living', are made scale free and performance on each of them is expressed as a value between 0 and 1 by applying the following standard formula:

$$\text{Index Scale Free Value} = \frac{\text{Actual Value} - \text{Minimum Value}}{\text{Maximum Value} - \text{Minimum Value}}$$

The maximum and minimum values or goal posts are selected for each indicator used for estimating HDI. Table A.1 lists the maximum and minimum goal posts that were applied to make each selected indicator scale free for estimating HDI.

The Index Scale Free Value for indicator "Estimated Earned Income per capita per annum" is calculated using logarithm values.

Table A.1: Goal Posts for HDI

	Maximum	Minimum
'A Long and Healthy Life'		
Infant Mortality Rate	105 per 1000 live births	0 per 1000 live births
Life Expectancy at age 1	85 years	25 years
'Knowledge'		
7+ Literacy rate	100 percent	0 percent
Mean Years of Education (15+ age group)	25 years	1 year
'A Decent Standard of Living'		
Estimated Earned Income per capita per annum	Rs. 1,50,000	Rs. 100

¹ This Technical Appendix is adapted on the basis of the Technical Appendix to the UNDP Human Development Reports

The weights used for combining the three dimensions as well as the indicators within each dimension are presented in Tables A.2 for HDI.

Table A.2: Weights for Dimensions and Indicators - HDI

Dimensions/Indicators	Weights
Dimension 1: 'A Long and Healthy Life'	One - third
Infant Mortality Rate	Half for each indicator within the dimension
Life Expectancy at age 1	
Dimension 2: 'Knowledge'	One - third
7+ Literacy rate	Two thirds within the dimension
Mean Years of Education for 15+ age group	One third within the dimension
Dimension 3: 'A Decent Standard of Living'	One - third
Estimated Earned Income Share per capita per annum	

The HDI is then calculated as a simple average of three dimension indices.

BOX 1

Calculating the HDI: An Illustration Based on Data for Andhra Pradesh

1. Long and Healthy Life Index

The Long and Healthy Life Index measures relative achievement based on combining two scale free indices:

- The scale free index for IMR subtracted from 1 and
- Index for Life Expectancy at age 1

In 2006, Andhra Pradesh had an IMR of 56 and Life Expectancy at age 1 was 67.6 years. The Long and Healthy Life Index for Andhra Pradesh is calculated as follows:

Step 1: The Goal Posts listed in Table A.1 are used to make the indicators scale free:

$$\text{IMR index} = (56 - 0)/(105 - 0) = 0.533$$

$$\text{IMR index converted to a positive index} = 1 - 0.533 = 0.467$$

$$\text{LE at 1 index} = (67.6 - 25)/(85 - 25) = 0.710$$

Step 2: The Weights listed in Table A.2 are used to combine the indices:

$$\text{Therefore the Long and Healthy Life Index} = 1/2(0.467 + 0.710) = \mathbf{0.588}$$

Contd...

2. Knowledge Index

The Knowledge Index measures relative achievement based on combining two scale free indices:

- (a) The 7+ literacy index and
- (b) Index for Mean Years of Education for 15+ age group.

In 2006, the 7+ Literacy Rate for Andhra Pradesh was 59.1% and Mean Years of Education were 3.8 years.

The Knowledge Index for Andhra Pradesh is calculated as follows:

Step 1: The Goal Posts listed in Table A.1 are used to make the indicators scale free:

$$7+ \text{ literacy index} = (59.1 - 0)/(100 - 0) = 0.591$$

$$\text{Mean Years of Education} = (3.8 - 1)/(25 - 1) = 0.119$$

Step 2: The Weights listed in Table A.2 are used to combine the indices:

$$\text{Knowledge Index} = 2/3(0.591) + 1/3(0.119) = \mathbf{0.434}$$

3. A Decent Standard of Living Index

The Decent Standard of Living Index measures relative achievement based on Income per capita.

NSDP for Andhra Pradesh for 2005-06, at constant 1999 prices was Rs 17146200 lakh.

Projected Population was 804.30 lakh.

Therefore NSDP per capita for Andhra Pradesh for 2005-06, at constant 1999 prices, was estimated at Rs. 21318.16.

$$\text{Income index} = \{\log(21318.16) - \log(100)\} / \{\log(150000) - \log(100)\} = \mathbf{0.733}$$

4. Human Development Index (HDI)

HDI is calculated as a simple average of the three Indices estimated above (Long and Healthy Life, Knowledge and Decent Standard of Living)

$$\text{HDI for Andhra Pradesh in 2006} = 1/3(\mathbf{0.588} + \mathbf{0.434} + \mathbf{0.733}) = \mathbf{0.585}$$

Computation of Gender-related Development Index (GDI)

While GDI and GEM are also computed by combining the three dimension indices on the basis of equal weights, the gender based indices apply a penalty for disparities between men and women, i.e., the value of epsilon is taken as 2, which is moderate penalty.

GDI is estimated on the basis of the same three dimensions as the HDI but adjusts the average achievement in respect of these three dimensions to reflect the inequalities between men and women. Each dimension is made scale free based on goal posts specified in Table A.3. The scale free indices are calculated separately for females and males for IMR, LE at age 1, Literacy 7+ and Mean Years of Education for 15+ age group. Estimation of Female/Male Earned Income Share is more complex and is based on relative female and male wage rates for casual labourers applied to all female and male workers in principal plus subsidiary status using NSS work force participation rates and Census population projections. Scaling is based on the log of earned income share adjusted by the maximum and minimum goal posts for men and women.

Table A.3: Goal Posts for GDI

	Maximum	Minimum
'A Long and Healthy Life'		
Infant Mortality Rate	105 per 1000 live births	0 per 1000 live births
Life Expectancy at age 1	87.5 years for females and 82.5 for males	27.5 years for females and 22.5 for males
'Knowledge'		
7+ Literacy rate	100 percent	0 percent
Mean Years of Education (15+ age group)	25 years	1 year
'A Decent Standard of Living'		
Female/Male Estimated Earned Income share per capita per annum	Rs. 1,50,000	Rs. 100

After estimating the scale free indices, equally distributed indices are computed for each of the dimensions of GDI. As the value of epsilon is taken as 2, the equally distributed index becomes the weighted harmonic mean of the scale free index, the weights being the population share.

The weights used for combining the three dimensions as well as the indicators within each dimension are presented in Tables A.4 for GDI.

Table A.4: Weights for Dimensions and Indicators - GDI

Dimensions/Indicators	Weights
Dimension 1: 'A Long and Healthy Life'	One - third
Infant Mortality Rate	Half for each indicator within the dimension
Life Expectancy at age 1	
Dimension 2: 'Knowledge'	One - third
7+ Literacy rate	Two thirds within the dimension
Mean Years of Education for 15+ age group	One third within the dimension
Dimension 3: 'A Decent Standard of Living'	One - third
Female/Male Estimated Earned Income Share per capita per annum	

The calculation of GDI is done in three steps:

Step 1

$$\text{Index Scale Free Value} = \frac{\text{Actual value} - \text{Minimum Value}}{\text{Maximum Value} - \text{Minimum Value}}$$

The maximum and minimum values or goal posts are selected for each indicator used for estimating GDI. Table A.3 lists the maximum and minimum goal posts that were applied to make each selected indicator scale free for estimating HDI.

Step 2

The female and male indices in each dimension are combined in a way that penalises disparities in achievement between men and women. The resulting index referred to as the equally distributed index is calculated according to the general formula.

Equally distributed index

$$= \{[\text{female population share} (\text{female index}^{1-\varepsilon})] + [\text{male population share} (\text{male index}^{1-\varepsilon})]\}^{1/1-\varepsilon}$$

ε measures the aversion to inequality. The value of ε is taken as 2. Thus the equation becomes

Equally distributed index

$$= \{[\text{female population share} (\text{female index}^{-1})] + [\text{male population share} (\text{male index}^{-1})]\}^{-1}$$

Step 3

The GDI is calculated by computing the simple average of three equally distributed indexes.

BOX 2

Calculating the GDI: An Illustration based on Data for Andhra Pradesh

Dimension 1: A Long and Healthy Life Index

The Long and Healthy Life Index for the GDI is based on combining two scale free indices:

- (a) the scale free index for IMR subtracted from 1 and
- (b) index for Life Expectancy at age 1

In 2006, Andhra Pradesh had an IMR for females of 58 and Life Expectancy at age 1 was 68.7 years. IMR for males was 55 and Life Expectancy at age 1 was 66.2 years.

The Long and Healthy Life Index for Andhra Pradesh is calculated as follows:

Step 1: The Goal Posts listed in Table A.3 are used to make the indicators scale free:

$$\text{IMR index for females} = (58 - 0)/(105 - 0) = 0.552$$

$$\text{IMR index for females converted to a positive indicator} = 1 - 0.552 = 0.448$$

Contd...

Similarly,

$$\text{IMR index for males} = (55 - 0)/(105 - 0) = 0.524$$

$$\text{IMR index for males converted to a positive indicator} = 1 - 0.524 = 0.476$$

$$\text{Female life expectancy index} = (68.7 - 0)/(87.5 - 27.5) = 0.687$$

$$\text{Male life expectancy index} = (66.2 - 0)/(82.5 - 22.5) = 0.728$$

Step 2: The Weights listed in Table A.4 are used to combine the IMR and Life Expectancy at age 1 indices separately for females and males:

$$\text{Female Long and Healthy Life Index} = 1/2(0.448 + 0.687) = 0.567$$

$$\text{Male Long and Healthy Life Index} = 1/2(0.476 + 0.728) = 0.602$$

Step 3: Calculating the Equally Distributed Long and Healthy Life Index

Equally Distributed Long and Healthy Life Index

$$= \{[\text{female population share (female index}^{-1})] + [\text{male population share (male index}^{-1})]\}^{-1}$$

$$\text{Female Population Share} = 0.495$$

$$\text{Male Population Share} = 0.505$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Equally Distributed Long and Healthy Life Index} &= \{[0.495 (0.567)^{-1}] + [0.505 (0.602)^{-1}]\}^{-1} \\ &= \mathbf{0.584} \end{aligned}$$

Dimension 2: Knowledge Index

The Knowledge Index measures the relative achievement based on combining two scale free indices:

- (a) the 7+ literacy rate index and
- (b) index for Mean Years of Education for 15+ age group.

In 2006, 7+ Literacy Rate was 68.6% for males and 50% for females while Mean Years of Education was of 3.8 years. The Knowledge Index for Andhra Pradesh is calculated as follows:

Step 1: The Goal Posts listed in Table A.3 are used to make the indicators scale free:

$$\text{Female Literacy Rate (7+) Index} = (50 - 0)/(100 - 0) = 0.500$$

$$\text{Male Literacy Rate (7+) Index} = (68.6 - 0)/(100 - 0) = 0.686$$

$$\text{Female Mean Years of Education Index} = (2.8 - 1)/(25 - 1) = 0.076$$

$$\text{Male Mean Years of Education Index} = (4.9 - 1)/(25 - 1) = 0.163$$

Contd...

Step 2: The Weights listed in Table A.4 are used to combine the 7+ Literacy Rate and Mean Years of Education Indices separately for females and males:

$$\text{Knowledge Index} = 2/3\{\text{Literacy Rate (7+)} \text{ Index}\} + 1/3\{\text{Mean Years of Education Index}\}$$

$$\text{Female Knowledge Index} = 2/3(0.500) + 1/3(0.076) = 0.359$$

$$\text{Male Knowledge Index} = 2/3(0.686) + 1/3(0.163) = 0.512$$

Step 3: Calculating the Equally Distributed Knowledge Index

Equally Distributed Knowledge Index

$$= \{[\text{female population share (female index}^{-1})] + [\text{male population share (male index}^{-1})]\}^{-1}$$

$$\text{Female Population Share} = 0.495$$

$$\text{Male Population Share} = 0.505$$

$$\text{Equally Distributed Knowledge Index} = \{[0.495 (0.359)^{-1}] + [0.505 (0.512)^{-1}]\}^{-1} = \mathbf{0.422}$$

Dimension 3: A Decent Standard of Living Index

The Decent Standard of Living Index measures relative achievement based on Income shares. NSDP for Andhra Pradesh for 2004-05, at constant 1999 prices was estimated at Rs. 171462 crore. Estimation of female and male earned incomes requires the following steps.

Step 1: Estimate the female share of the wage bill based on

$$\text{Female share of wage bill} = \frac{\{(W_f / W_m) * EA_f\}}{\{(W_f / W_m) * EA_f\} + EA_m}$$

Or in other words,

$$\text{Female share of wage bill} = \frac{(W_f * EA_f)}{(W_f * EA_f) + (W_m * EA_m)}$$

where W_f = female wage rate

W_m = male wage rate

EA_f = Proportion of females who are economically active

EA_m = Proportion of males who are economically active

Applying this we have the following:

The ratio of female to male casual wage per day for Andhra Pradesh is estimated at 0.599

The proportion of the female population that is economically active in Andhra Pradesh is 0.408 while the proportion of the male population that is economically active in Andhra Pradesh is 0.592

$$\begin{aligned} \text{The share of the female wage bill is} &= (0.599 * 0.408) / \{(0.599 * 0.408) + 0.592\} \\ &= 0.292 \text{ (or more accurately, 0.2918)} \end{aligned}$$

The share of the male wage bill is $1 - 0.292$.

Contd...

Step 2: Female Earned Income is estimated as:

$$\{(\text{female share of the wage bill}) * (\text{NSDP at constant prices})\} / \text{Female Population}$$

NSDP for Andhra Pradesh for 2005-06, at constant 1999 prices was Rs 17146200 lakh.

Projected Population was 804.30 lakh in 2006.

Projected Female Population was 398.38 lakh in 2006.

Therefore Female Earned Income for Andhra Pradesh = $(0.292 * 17146200) / 398.38 = 12561$.

Projected Male Population was 405.92 lakh

Therefore Male Earned Income for Andhra Pradesh = $\{17146200 - (0.292 * 17146200)\} / 405.92 = 29913$.

Step 3: The Income Index is now calculated separately for females and males. Income is adjusted by taking the log of estimated earned income and applying the goal posts listed in Table A.3 to make the indicators scale free:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Female Income Index is then estimated as } & \frac{\{\log(12561) - \log(100)\}}{\{\log(150000) - \log(100)\}} \\ & = 0.661 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Male Income Index is then estimated as } & \frac{\{\log(29913) - \log(100)\}}{\{\log(150000) - \log(100)\}} \\ & = 0.780 \end{aligned}$$

Step 4: Calculating the Equally Distributed Standard of Living Index

Equally Distributed Standard of Living Index

$$= \{[\text{female population share} (\text{female index}^{-1})] + [\text{male population share} (\text{male index}^{-1})]\}^{-1}$$

Female Population Share = 0.495

Male Population Share = 0.505

$$\text{Equally Distributed Standard of Living Index} = \{[0.495 (0.661)^{-1}] + [0.505 (0.780)^{-1}]\}^{-1} = \mathbf{0.716}$$

Gender Development Index (GDI)

GDI is calculated as a simple average of the three Indices estimated above (Long and Healthy Life, Knowledge and Decent Standard of Living)

$$\text{GDI for Andhra Pradesh in 2006} = 1/3(\mathbf{0.584} + \mathbf{0.422} + \mathbf{0.716}) = \mathbf{0.574}$$

The Gender Empowerment Measure (GEM)

GEM captures gender inequality in three dimensions:

Dimension 1: 'Political Participation and Decision-making Power'

Dimension 2: 'Economic Participation and Decision-making Power'

Dimension 3: 'Power Over Economic Resources'

Focusing on women's opportunities rather than their capabilities, the GEM captures gender inequality between women and men in three key areas:

Political participation and decision-making power, as measured by the following indicators:

- i. % Share of Parliamentary Seats (elected);
- ii. % Share of Seats in Legislature (elected);
- iii. % Share of Seats in *Zilla Parishads* (elected);
- iv. % Share of Seats in *Gram Panchayats*
- v. % Candidates in Electoral Process in National Parties
- vi. % Electors exercising the right to vote

Economic participation and decision-making power, as measured by the following indicators:

- i. % Share of officials in service in Indian Administrative Service, Indian Police Service and Indian Forest Service
- ii. % Share of enrolment in medical and engineering colleges

Power over economic resources as measured by the following indicators:

- i. % Female/Male operational land holdings (due to data gaps in assets)
- ii. % Females/Males with Bank Accounts in Scheduled Commercial Banks (with credit limit above Rs. 2 lakh)
- iii. Female/Male Estimated Earned Income Share per capita per annum.

For each of these three dimensions, an equally distributed equivalent percentage (EDEP) is calculated, as a population-weighted average, according to the following general formula (see also Box 3 for an illustration):

$$\text{EDEP} = \left\{ \left[\text{female population share} (\text{female index}^{-1-\varepsilon}) \right] + \left[\text{male population share} (\text{male index}^{-1-\varepsilon}) \right] \right\}^{1/1-\varepsilon}$$

ε measures the aversion to inequality. In the GEM (as in the GDI), $\varepsilon = 2$, which places a moderate penalty on inequality. The formula is thus:

$$\text{EDEP} = \left\{ \left[\text{female population share} (\text{female index}^{-1}) \right] + \left[\text{male population share} (\text{male index}^{-1}) \right] \right\}^{-1}$$

For political and economic participation and decision-making, the EDEP is then indexed by dividing it by 50. The rationale for this indexation: in an ideal society, with equal empowerment of the sexes, the GEM

variables would equal 50%, that is, women's share would equal men's share for each variable.

Where a male or female index value is zero, the EDEP according to the above formula is not defined. However, the limit of EDEP, when the index tends towards zero, is zero. Accordingly, in these cases the value of the EDEP is set to zero.

Female and Male Earned Income are estimated using following data:

- Ratio of male and female wage
- Male and female share of economically active population
- GDP/NSDP at constant prices

The weights used for combining the three dimensions as well as the indicators within each dimension are

Table A.5: Weights for Dimensions and Indicators - GEM

Dimensions/Indicators	Weights
Dimension 1: 'Political Participation & Decision-making Power'	One - third
% Share of Parliamentary Seats (elected)	One sixth for each indicator within the dimension
% Share of Seats in Legislature (elected)	
% Share of Seats in <i>Zilla Parishads</i> (elected)	
% Share of Seats in <i>Gram Panchayats</i> (elected)	
% Candidates in Electoral Process in National Parties in the Parliamentary election.	
% Electors exercising the right to vote in the Parliamentary election	
Dimension 2: 'Economic Participation and Decision-making Power'	One - third
% Share of officials in service in IAS, IPS and Indian Forest Service	Half for each indicator within the dimension
% Share of enrolment in medical and engineering colleges	
Dimension 3: 'Power over Economic Resources'	One - third
% Share of operational land holdings	One third for each indicator within the dimension
% Females/Males with Bank Accounts in Scheduled Commercial Banks (with credit limit above Rs. 2 lakh)	
Female/Male Estimated Earned Income Share per capita per annum	

BOX 3

Calculating the GEM: An Illustration based on Data for Andhra Pradesh

Dimension 1: 'Political Participation & Decision-making Power' Index

The 'Political Participation & Decision-making Power' Index for GEM is based on combining the following six indicators:

- % Share of Parliamentary Seats (elected)
- % Share of Seats in Legislature (elected)

Contd...

- iii. % Share of Seats in *Zilla Parishads* (elected)
- iv. % Share of Seats in *Gram Panchayats* (elected)
- v. % Candidates in Electoral Process in National Parties
- vi. % Electors exercising the right to vote

In 2006, Andhra Pradesh had:

- 42 Parliamentary Seats and 3 women and 39 men were elected to these seats.
- 294 seats in the Legislature and 26 women and 268 men were elected to these seats.
- 21807 *Gram Panchayats* with 225276 elected representatives, of which 80518 were women and 144758 were men.
- 22 *Zilla Parishads* with 1097 elected representatives, of which 368 were women and 729 were men.
- 71 candidates from national parties participating in the election, of which 7 were women and 64 were men.
- 35776275 voters of which 18391831 are male and 17384444 female.

The 'Political Participation & Decision-making Power' Index for Andhra Pradesh is calculated as follows:

Step 1: Estimate the percentage share of women and men for each of the six indicators. The estimates are:

- i. 7.14% women and 92.86% men were elected to Parliament
- ii. 8.84% women and 91.16% men were elected to the Legislature
- iii. 33.55% women and 66.45% men were elected to the *Zilla Parishads*
- iv. 35.74% women and 64.26% men were elected to the *Gram Panchayats*
- v. 9.86% women and 90.14% men candidates from National Parties were in the Electoral Process.
- vi. 48.59% women and 51.41% men exercised the right to vote

Step 2: Calculating the Equally Distributed Equivalent Percentage for each of these Indicators

The Equally Distributed Equivalent Percentage for the given indicator

$$= \{[\text{female population share (female index}^{-1})] + [\text{male population share (male index}^{-1})]\}^{-1}$$

$$\text{Female Population Share} = 0.495$$

$$\text{Male Population Share} = 0.505$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Equally Distributed Equivalent Percentage of Parliamentary Seats} &= \{[0.495 (7.14)^{-1}] + [0.505 (92.86)^{-1}]\}^{-1} \\ &= 13.37. \end{aligned}$$

Contd...

Similarly,

Equally Distributed Equivalent Percentage of Seats in Legislature

$$= \{[0.495 (8.84)^{-1}] + [0.505 (91.16)^{-1}]\}^{-1} = 16.25.$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Equally Distributed Equivalent Percentage of Seats in ZP} &= \{[0.495 (33.55)^{-1}] + [0.505 (66.45)^{-1}]\}^{-1} \\ &= 44.72. \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Equally Distributed Equivalent Percentage of Seats in GP} &= \{[0.495 (35.74)^{-1}] + [0.505 (64.26)^{-1}]\}^{-1} \\ &= 46.06. \end{aligned}$$

Equally Distributed Equivalent Percentage of Candidates in Electoral Process in national parties

$$= \{[0.495 (9.86)^{-1}] + [0.505 (90.14)^{-1}]\}^{-1} = 17.91.$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Equally Distributed Equivalent Percentage of Exercising Right to Vote} &= \{[0.50 (48.59)^{-1}] + [0.50 (51.41)^{-1}]\}^{-1} \\ &= 49.95. \end{aligned}$$

(In the case of index (vi) or exercising the right to vote, the weights used were share of the electorate instead of population share).

Step 3: The EDEP for each of the above Indicators is then indexed by dividing it by 50.

The Indexed EDEP for Parliamentary Seats is $13.37/50 = 0.27$

The Indexed EDEP for Seats in Legislature is $16.25/50 = 0.32$

The Indexed EDEP for Seats in ZP is $44.72/50 = 0.89$

The Indexed EDEP for Seats in GP is $46.06/50 = 0.92$

The Indexed EDEP for Candidates in Electoral Process in national parties is $17.91/50 = 0.36$

The Indexed EDEP for Exercising Right to Vote is $49.95/50 = 1.00$

Step 4: The Indexed EDEP values obtained above for each of the six indicators are added and divided by 6 or equal weights are given to all the 6 indicators and the Indexed EDEP for 'Political Participation & Decision-making Power' is obtained as

$$(0.27+0.32+0.89+0.92+0.36+1.00)/6 = \mathbf{0.628}$$

If data was available for only 4 or 5 of the 6 indicators, the total of the 4 or 5 Indexed EDEP values is obtained and divided by 4 or 5 respectively.

Dimension 2: 'Economic Participation and Decision-making Power' Index

The 'Economic Participation & Decision-making Power' Index for GEM is based on combining the following two indicators:

- i. % Share of officials in service in Indian Administrative Service, Indian Police Service and Indian Forest Service
- ii. % Share of enrolment in medical and engineering colleges

Contd...

In 2006, Andhra Pradesh had:

- 642 officials in service in Indian Administrative Service, Indian Police Service and Indian Forest Service of which 56 were women and 586 were men.
- 210464 persons were enrolled in medical and engineering colleges, of which 67240 were women and 143224 were men.

The 'Economic Participation & Decision-making Power' Index for Andhra Pradesh is calculated as follows:

Step 1: Estimate the percentage share of women and men for each of the two indicators. The estimates are:

- i. 8.72% women and 91.28% men were in Indian Administrative Service, Indian Police Service and Indian Forest Service
- ii. 31.95% women and 68.05% men were enrolled in medical and engineering colleges

Step 2: Calculating the Equally Distributed Equivalent Percentage for each of these Indicators

The Equally Distributed Equivalent Percentage for the given indicator

$$= \{[\text{female population share (female index}^{-1})] + [\text{male population share (male index}^{-1})]\}^{-1}$$

$$\text{Female Population Share} = 0.495$$

$$\text{Male Population Share} = 0.505$$

Equally Distributed Equivalent Percentage of officials in service in IAS, IPS and IFS

$$= \{[0.495 (8.72)^{-1}] + [0.505 (91.28)^{-1}]\}^{-1} = 16.05.$$

Equally Distributed Equivalent Percentage of enrolment in medical and engineering colleges

$$= \{[0.495 (31.95)^{-1}] + [0.505 (68.05)^{-1}]\}^{-1} = 43.63.$$

Step 3: The EDEP for each of the above Indicators is then indexed by dividing it by 50.

The Indexed EDEP for officials in service in IAS, IPS and IFS is $16.05/50 = 0.321$.

The Indexed EDEP for enrolment in medical and engineering colleges is $43.63/50 = 0.873$

Step 4: The Indexed EDEP values obtained above for each of the two indicators are added and divided by 2 or equal weights are given to both indicators and the Indexed EDEP for 'Economic Participation & Decision-making Power' is obtained as

$$(0.321 + 0.873)/2 = \mathbf{0.597}$$

If data was available for only 1 of the 2 indicators, the value for only 1 Indexed EDEP is used.

Dimension 3: 'Power over Economic Resources' Index

The 'Power over Economic Resources' Index for GEM is based on combining the following three indicators:

- i. % Female/Male operational land holdings
- ii. % Females/Males with Bank Accounts in Scheduled Commercial Banks (with credit limit above Rs. 2 lakh)
- iii. Female/Male Estimated Earned Income Share per capita per annum

Contd...

In 2006, Andhra Pradesh had:

- (based on 2001 data), 11527000 operational holdings of which 2347000 were operated by women and 9180000 by men.
- 486721 credit accounts above 2 lakh in scheduled commercial banks of which 60062 were in the name of women and 426659 in the name of men.
- Earned Income for females and males is estimated as described for GDI above and Female Earned Income for Andhra Pradesh = 12561 and Male Earned Income = 29913.

Step 1: Estimate the percentage share of women and men for the first two indicators. The estimates are:

- 20.36% women and 79.64% men had access to operational holdings
- 12.34% women and 87.66% men had credit accounts above 2 lakh.

Step 2: Calculating the Equally Distributed Equivalent Percentage for each of these Indicators

The Equally Distributed Equivalent Percentage for the given indicator

$$= \{[\text{female population share (female index}^{-1})] + [\text{male population share (male index}^{-1})]\}^{-1}$$

$$\text{Female Population Share} = 0.495$$

$$\text{Male Population Share} = 0.505$$

Equally Distributed Equivalent Percentage of men and women with operational holdings

$$= \{[0.495 (20.36)^{-1}] + [0.505 (79.64)^{-1}]\}^{-1} = 32.61.$$

Equally Distributed Equivalent Percentage of men and women with credit accounts above 2 lakh

$$= \{[0.495 (12.34)^{-1}] + [0.505 (87.66)^{-1}]\}^{-1} = 21.79.$$

Step 3: The EDEP for each of the above Indicators is then indexed by dividing it by 50.

The Indexed EDEP for Operational Holdings is $32.61/50 = 0.652$.

The Indexed EDEP for credit accounts above 2 lakh is $21.79/50 = 0.436$

Steps for Estimating the Female/Male Estimated Earned Income Share or Index for Income:

Estimate the Scale Free Income Index separately for females and males by applying the Goal Posts listed in Table A.3 (without taking logs).

$$\text{Female Income Index is then estimated as } \frac{12561 - 100}{150000 - 100} = 0.083$$

$$\text{Male Income Index is then estimated as } \frac{29913 - 100}{150000 - 100} = 0.199$$

Contd...

Estimate the Equally Distributed Income Index by applying the formula

$$= \{[0.495 (0.083)^{-1}] + [0.505 (0.199)^{-1}]\}^{-1} = 0.165$$

Step 4: The Indexed EDEP values obtained above for all three indicators are added and divided by 3 or equal weights are given to all 3 indicators and the Indexed EDEP for 'Power over Economic Resources' is obtained as

$$(0.652 + 0.436 + 0.165) / 3 = \mathbf{0.418}$$

Gender Empowerment Measure (GEM)

GEM is calculated as a simple average of the three Dimension Indices mentioned above, 'Political Participation and Decision-making Power', 'Economic Participation and Decision-making Power' and 'Power Over Economic Resources.'

$$\text{GEM for Andhra Pradesh in 2006} = 1/3(\mathbf{0.628} + \mathbf{0.597} + \mathbf{0.418}) = \mathbf{0.547}$$

Technical Notes

1. All the reported numbers are estimated figures (sub round multipliers are provided with the data and the method of computing the final multipliers is given in the layout) computed from the unit level data of NSSO 50th round (1993-94) and 61st round (2004-05) Employment and Unemployment Survey.

2. Methodology for computing Mean Years of Education (15+ age group)

For calculating Mean Years of Education the variable used is 'General Level of Education – col 7 of block 4'. Mean years of Education is calculated for population in the 15+ age group.

To compute the mean years of education, years of education has been recorded as follows:

- Illiterate - 0
- Literate below primary - 1
- Primary - 4
- Middle - 8
- Secondary - 10
- Higher Secondary - 12
- Diploma/Certificate course - 14
- Graduate - 15
- Postgraduate and above - 17

Distribution of male/female population according to completed education is estimated from the unit level data and a weighted average is taken to get Mean Years of Education (for 15+ age group).

3. Methodology for computing Workforce Participation Rate

Workforce Participation rates are computed for 5+ age group

Workforce Participation Rate = Distribution of UPSS Workers per 1000 population

Worker: Persons who were engaged in any economic activity or who, despite their attachment to economic activity (activity status codes 11 - 51), abstained from work for various reasons (activity status codes 61 - 72) are considered as workers.

UPSS: The usual status, determined on the basis of the usual principal activity and usual subsidiary economic activity of a person taken together, is considered as the usual activity status of the person and is written as usual status (ps+ss). According to the usual status (ps+ss), workers are those who perform some work activity either in the principal status or in the subsidiary status. Thus, a person who is not a worker in the usual principal status is considered as worker according to the usual status (ps+ss), if the person pursues some subsidiary economic activity for 30 days or more during 365 days preceding the date of survey.

Population and Persons thus classified as UPSS workers are estimated applying multipliers.

Data from levels 4, 5 (blocks 5.1 & 5.2 respectively) are used for computing UPSS workforce for the 50th round (for 1996) and 61st round (for 2006).

4. Methodology for Computing Wages

Wages reported are for Casual Labour (activity status codes 41, 51) and in current (2004-05) prices.

Data from level 6 – block 5.3 is used for computing wages. The variable 'status' is used to classify a person as casual labour, variable 'Wage & Salary Earnings-Total' is used to compute total wage received by a worker in a week and the variable 'Total no. of days in each activity' is used to compute number of days worked in a week.

Wage per day = total wage received/total days worked

Statistical Tables

List of Statistical Tables for HDI and GDI

Infant Mortality Rate, 1996 and 2006

Life Expectancy at age 1, 1992-1996 and 2002-06

7+ Literacy Rate, 1995-96 and 2005-06

Mean Years of Education 1993-94 and 2004-05

NSDP/NDP factor cost 1996 and 2006

Work Force Participation Rates and Wage Rates, 1993-94 and 2004-05

List of Statistical Tables for GEM

Performance of Candidates in Parliamentary Election, 1996, 2004

Performance of Candidates in State Assemblies, 1996, 2006

Elected Representatives in *Gram Panchayats* and *Zilla Parishads*, 1996, 2006

Candidates Contesting in Parliamentary Election in States (from Major National Parties), 1996 and 2004

Electors and Voters in Lok Sabha Elections, 1996 and 2004

Number of IAS, IPS and IFS Officials in Service, 1996 and 2006

Enrolment in M.B.B.S. and B.E./B.Sc.(Engg)/B.Arch., (Single Indicator) 1995-96 and 2004-05

Number of Operational Land Holdings During Agriculture Census, 1995-96 and 2000-01 (in '000)

Number of Credit Accounts for All Scheduled Commercial Banks in India as on 31st March, 1996 and 2006

Statistical Tables for Districts

Indicators and Source of Data used to Estimate HDI, GDI and GEM for the Districts

Statistical Tables for HDI and GDI for Mahbubnagar and Jodhpur

Statistical Tables for GEM for Mahbubnagar

Statistical Tables for HDI and GDI

Dimension 1: A Long and Healthy Life

Infant Mortality Rate, 1996

S.No.	States/Union Territories	Male	Female	Total
1	Andhra Pradesh	67	63	65
2	Arunachal Pradesh	39.2	37.9	38.6
3	Assam	73	77	74
4	Bihar	68	75	71
5	Goa	23.6	25.9	24.8
6	Gujarat	57	66	61
7	Haryana	67	70	68
8	Himachal Pradesh	57	70.5	63.3
9	Jammu & Kashmir ¹
10	Karnataka	55	52	53
11	Kerala	13	14	14
12	Madhya Pradesh	97	96	97
13	Maharashtra	50	47	48
14	Manipur	19.8	27.8	23.6
15	Meghalaya	44.7	50.5	47.7
16	Mizoram ²
17	Nagaland	0.1	70.4	32.8
18	Orissa	100	92	96
19	Punjab	47	57	51
20	Rajasthan	84	86	85
21	Sikkim	56	49.8	52.9
22	Tamil Nadu	54	53	53
23	Tripura	56.7	39.9	48.5
24	Uttar Pradesh	80	90	85
25	West Bengal	60	50	55
26	Chhattisgarh	86.0	85.3	85.8
27	Jharkhand	69.8	67.5	68.7
28	Uttarakhand	62.8	71.9	66.8
29	Andaman & Nicobar Islands	41.8	15.6	29.5
30	Chandigarh	29.1	24.6	27
31	Dadra & Nagar Haveli	59.6	54.4	57.2
32	Daman & Diu	83.3	26	60.6
33	Delhi	46.7	33.6	40.7
34	Lakshadweep	25.2	5.9	16.3
35	Puducherry	10.9	18.1	14.6
	All India	71	73	72

Note: (i) .. Data Not Available (ii) ¹The value of Himachal Pradesh has been applied to Jammu & Kashmir. ²The average of the value for Assam, Manipur and Tripura has been applied to Mizoram.

Source: *Compendium of India's Fertility and Mortality Indicators 1971-1997, SRS, RGI 1999 & Office of the Registrar General of India, Ministry of Home Affairs.*

Infant Mortality Rate, 2006

S.No.	States/Union Territories	Male	Female	Total
1	Andhra Pradesh	55	58	56
2	Arunachal Pradesh	38	43	40
3	Assam	67	68	67
4	Bihar	58	63	60
5	Goa	16	14	15
6	Gujarat	52	54	53
7	Haryana	57	58	57
8	Himachal Pradesh	45	55	50
9	Jammu & Kashmir	51	53	52
10	Karnataka	46	50	48
11	Kerala	14	16	15
12	Madhya Pradesh	72	77	74
13	Maharashtra	35	36	35
14	Manipur	10	13	11
15	Meghalaya	53	52	53
16	Mizoram	24	25	25
17	Nagaland	17	23	20
18	Orissa	73	74	73
19	Punjab	39	50	44
20	Rajasthan	65	69	67
21	Sikkim	26	40	33
22	Tamil Nadu	36	37	37
23	Tripura	31	41	36
24	Uttar Pradesh	70	73	71
25	West Bengal	37	40	38
26	Chattisgarh	59	62	61
27	Jharkhand	46	52	49
28	Uttarakhand	42	44	43
29	Andaman & Nicobar Islands	27	36	31
30	Chandigarh	20	27	23
31	Dadra & Nagar Haveli	28	44	35
32	Daman & Diu	28	28	28
33	Delhi	36	39	37
34	Lakshadweep	29	21	25
35	Puducherry	20	36	28
	All India	56	59	57

Source: Volume 42 No.1, 10/1/2007, SRS Bulletin, Sample Registration System, Registrar General, India, Vital Statistics Division, West Block 1, Wing 1, 2nd Floor, R.K. Puram, New Delhi-110066

Life Expectancy at age 1, 1992-1996

S.No.	States/Union Territories	Male	Female	Total
1	Andhra Pradesh	64.3	65.9	65.2
2	Arunachal Pradesh ³
3	Assam	60.6	61	60.6
4	Bihar	64	62	63.2
5	Goa ⁴
6	Gujarat	63.9	66.3	65.1
7	Haryana	66.9	68.4	67.6
8	Himachal Pradesh ¹
9	Jammu & Kashmir ²
10	Karnataka	64.9	68.1	66.6
11	Kerala	70.3	75.8	73.2
12	Madhya Pradesh	61.5	60.5	61.2
13	Maharashtra	66.8	68.9	68.1
14	Manipur ³
15	Meghalaya ³
16	Mizoram ³
17	Nagaland ³
18	Orissa	62.6	62.2	62.6
19	Punjab	69.2	72.2	70.5
20	Rajasthan	63.7	64.9	64.6
21	Sikkim ³
22	Tamil Nadu	65.1	67.3	66.1
23	Tripura ³
24	Uttar Pradesh	62.5	61.6	62.2
25	West Bengal	65.2	66.4	65.8
26	Chattisgarh ⁵
27	Jharkhand ⁶
28	Uttarakhand ⁷
29	Andaman & Nicobar Islands ⁸
30	Chandigarh ⁹
31	Dadra & Nagar Haveli ⁸
32	Daman & Diu ⁸
33	Delhi ¹⁰
34	Lakshadweep ⁸
35	Puducherry ¹¹
All India		64.3	65.6	64.9

Note: (i) .. Data Not Available (ii) ¹The average of the value for Punjab and Haryana has been applied to Himachal Pradesh. ²The all India average value has been applied to Jammu and Kashmir. ³The value of Assam has been applied to all North Eastern States, Arunachal Pradesh, Manipur, Meghalaya, Mizoram, Nagaland, Sikkim and Tripura. ⁴The average value of Karnataka and Maharashtra has been applied to Goa. ⁵The value of Madhya Pradesh has been applied to Chhattisgarh. ⁶The value of Bihar has been applied to Jharkhand. ⁷The value of Uttar Pradesh has been applied to Uttarakhand. ⁸The All India average value has been applied to the Union Territories, Andaman & Nicobar Islands, Dadra & Nagar Haveli, Daman & Diu, and Lakshadweep. ⁹The average value of Punjab and Haryana has been applied to Chandigarh. ¹⁰The average value of Haryana and Uttar Pradesh has been applied to Delhi. ¹¹The value of Tamil Nadu has been applied to Puducherry.

Source: *Compendium of India's Fertility and Mortality Indicators 1971-1997 based on the SRS, RGI, 1999.*

Life Expectancy at age 1, 2002-06

S.No.	States/Union Territories	Male	Female	Total
1	Andhra Pradesh	66.2	68.7	67.6
2	Arunachal Pradesh ²
3	Assam	62.5		
4	Bihar	64.9		
5	Goa ³	..		
6	Gujarat	65.8	68.7	67.2
7	Haryana	69.1	70.7	70
8	Himachal Pradesh	69.1	70.0	69.6
9	Jammu & Kashmir ¹
10	Karnataka	66.4	70.1	68.3
11	Kerala	71.2	76.2	73.9
12	Madhya Pradesh	62.5	62.6	62.6
13	Maharashtra	67.5	70.3	68.9
14	Manipur ²
15	Meghalaya ²
16	Mizoram ²
17	Nagaland ²
18	Orissa	63.7	63.6	63.6
19	Punjab	70.4	73.6	70
20	Rajasthan	65.9	66.9	66.5
21	Sikkim ²
22	Tamil Nadu	66.8	69.1	68
23	Tripura ²	64.5	64.1	64.4
24	Uttar Pradesh	66.2	67.6	66.9
25	West Bengal
26	Chattisgarh ⁴
27	Jharkhand ⁵
28	Uttarakhand ⁶
29	Andaman & Nicobar Islands ⁷
30	Chandigarh ⁸
31	Dadra & Nagar Haveli ⁷
32	Daman & Diu ⁷
33	Delhi ⁹
34	Lakshadweep ⁷
35	Puducherry ¹⁰
	All India	65.7	67.6	66.8

Note: (i) .. Data Not Available (ii) ¹The all India average value has been applied to Jammu and Kashmir. ²The value of Assam has been applied to all North Eastern States - Arunachal Pradesh, Manipur, Meghalaya, Mizoram, Nagaland, Sikkim and Tripura. ³The average value of Karnataka and Maharashtra has been applied to Goa. ⁴The value of Madhya Pradesh has been applied to Chhattisgarh. ⁵The value of Bihar has been applied to Jharkhand. ⁶The value of Uttar Pradesh has been applied to Uttarakhand. ⁷The All India average value has been applied to the Union Territories of Andaman & Nicobar Islands, Dadra & Nagar Haveli, Daman & Diu, and Lakshadweep. ⁸The average value of Punjab and Haryana has been applied to Chandigarh. ⁹The average value of Haryana and Uttar Pradesh has been applied to Delhi. ¹⁰The value of Tamil Nadu has been applied to Puducherry.

Source: SRS Based Abridged Life tables, 2002-06, Office of RGI, India

Dimension 2: Knowledge**7+ Literacy Rate, 1995-96 (percent)**

S.No.	States/Union Territories	Male	Female	Total
1	Andhra Pradesh	61	41	51
2	Arunachal Pradesh	56	45	51
3	Assam	81	65	73
4	Bihar	58	29	44
5	Goa	92	77	84
6	Gujarat	77	52	66
7	Haryana	72	50	62
8	Himachal Pradesh	80	62	71
9	Jammu & Kashmir	70	45	58
10	Karnataka	67	47	57
11	Kerala	94	88	91
12	Madhya Pradesh	65	37	52
13	Maharashtra	82	61	72
14	Manipur	78	58	68
15	Meghalaya	84	76	80
16	Mizoram	87	82	85
17	Nagaland	87	79	83
18	Orissa	68	45	57
19	Punjab	73	58	66
20	Rajasthan	65	29	48
21	Sikkim	83	67	75
22	Tamil Nadu	76	56	66
23	Tripura	83	68	76
24	Uttar Pradesh	63	34	50
25	West Bengal	76	56	66
26	Chattisgarh ¹
27	Jharkhand ²
28	Uttarakhand ³
29	Andaman & Nicobar Islands	88	73	82
30	Chandigarh	87	77	82
31	Dadra & Nagar Haveli	78	62	70
32	Daman & Diu	76	50	65
33	Delhi	89	77	83
34	Lakshadweep	99	78	87
35	Puducherry	85	68	77
	All India	70	47	59

Note: (i) .. Data Not Available (ii) ¹The value of Madhya Pradesh has been used in place of Chhattisgarh. ²The value of Bihar has been used in place of Jharkhand. ³The value of Uttar Pradesh has been used in place of Uttarakhand

Source: NSSO 52nd Round (July 1995- June 1996)

7+ Literacy Rate, 2005-06 (percent)

S.No.	States/Union Territories	Male	Female	Total
1	Andhra Pradesh	68.6	50	59.1
2	Arunachal Pradesh ¹
3	Assam	88.9	77.9	83.6
4	Bihar	67.7	42.8	55.7
5	Goa	92.1	78.5	85.0
6	Gujarat	84.1	60.5	72.8
7	Haryana	80.3	60.2	70.8
8	Himachal Pradesh	87.4	72.6	79.9
9	Jammu & Kashmir	74.6	52.9	64.3
10	Karnataka	76.7	58.5	67.6
11	Kerala	95.1	88.6	91.7
12	Madhya Pradesh	75.9	52.4	64.7
13	Maharashtra	87.1	69.8	78.8
14	Manipur ¹
15	Meghalaya ¹
16	Mizoram ¹
17	Nagaland ¹
18	Orissa	74.5	52.8	63.6
19	Punjab	79.6	68.4	74.3
20	Rajasthan	71.1	41.7	57.0
21	Sikkim ¹
22	Tamil Nadu	84.1	67.8	75.8
23	Tripura ¹
24	Uttar Pradesh	74.1	49.4	62.4
25	West Bengal	80.3	64.6	72.7
26	Chattisgarh	68.6	48.3	58.4
27	Jharkhand	74.4	47.1	61.4
28	Uttarakhand	88.9	73.5	81.3
29	Andaman & Nicobar Islands ²
30	Chandigarh ²
31	Dadra & Nagar Haveli ²
32	Daman & Diu ²
33	Delhi	95	84.9	90.6
34	Lakshadweep ²
35	Puducherry ²
	All India	78.1	58.1	68.3

Note: (i) .. Data Not Available (ii) ¹Data is given for group of North eastern States and ²Data is given for group of Union Territories. These values have been used for the individual States/UTs.

Source: NSSO 62nd Round (2005-06)

Mean Years of Education, 1993-94

S.No.	States/Union Territories	Male	Female	Total
1	Andhra Pradesh	3.7	1.7	2.7
2	Arunachal Pradesh	2.9	1.5	2.3
3	Assam	4.9	3.1	4.1
4	Bihar	4.0	1.2	2.7
5	Goa	7.0	5.0	6.0
6	Gujarat	5.0	2.9	4.0
7	Haryana	5.3	2.5	4.0
8	Himachal Pradesh	5.2	3.0	4.0
9	Jammu & Kashmir	5.5	3.3	4.4
10	Karnataka	4.7	2.6	3.7
11	Kerala	6.7	5.8	6.2
12	Madhya Pradesh	3.8	1.6	2.7
13	Maharashtra	5.8	3.4	4.7
14	Manipur	7.0	4.3	5.6
15	Meghalaya	3.9	2.8	3.4
16	Mizoram	6.4	5.2	5.8
17	Nagaland	7.4	5.1	6.4
18	Orissa	3.6	1.7	2.6
19	Punjab	5.0	3.6	4.3
20	Rajasthan	3.8	1.3	2.6
21	Sikkim	4.8	3.1	4.0
22	Tamil Nadu	5.0	3.0	4.0
23	Tripura	5.0	3.3	4.2
24	Uttar Pradesh	4.4	1.7	3.1
25	West Bengal	4.7	2.8	3.8
26	Chattisgarh ¹
27	Jharkhand ²
28	Uttarakhand ³
29	Andaman & Nicobar Islands	5.6	4.7	5.2
30	Chandigarh	7.4	6.7	7.1
31	Dadra & Nagar Haveli	3.6	1.5	2.5
32	Daman & Diu	6.4	4.1	5.3
33	Delhi	7.9	6.7	7.4
34	Lakshadweep	5.4	4.2	4.7
35	Puducherry	6.5	4.4	5.5
	All India	4.6	2.5	3.6

Note: (i) .. Data Not Available (ii) ¹The value of Madhya Pradesh has been applied to Chhattisgarh. ²The value of Bihar has been applied to Jharkhand. ³The value of Uttar Pradesh has been applied to Uttarakhand.

Source: NSSO 50th Round (1993-94); calculated values

Mean Years of Education, 2004-05

S.No.	States/Union Territories	Male	Female	Total
1	Andhra Pradesh	4.9	2.8	3.8
2	Arunachal Pradesh	4.9	3.3	4.2
3	Assam	5.4	3.7	4.6
4	Bihar	4.7	1.8	3.3
5	Goa	8.2	6.4	7.3
6	Gujarat	6.4	4.2	5.3
7	Haryana	6.4	4.2	5.4
8	Himachal Pradesh	6.6	4.8	5.7
9	Jammu & Kashmir	5.9	3.7	4.9
10	Karnataka	5.7	3.9	4.8
11	Kerala	7.5	6.9	7.2
12	Madhya Pradesh	4.9	2.6	3.8
13	Maharashtra	7.1	4.9	6.1
14	Manipur	7.4	5.2	6.3
15	Meghalaya	4.9	4.3	4.6
16	Mizoram	7.3	6.3	6.8
17	Nagaland	7.9	6.3	7.1
18	Orissa	4.7	3.0	3.8
19	Punjab	6.2	5.3	5.7
20	Rajasthan	4.9	2.1	3.5
21	Sikkim	4.9	3.9	4.4
22	Tamil Nadu	6.3	4.4	5.3
23	Tripura	5.3	3.8	4.6
24	Uttar Pradesh	5.4	2.7	4.1
25	West Bengal	5.3	3.7	4.5
26	Chattisgarh	5.1	2.6	3.8
27	Jharkhand	5.0	2.3	3.7
28	Uttarakhand	7.0	4.5	5.7
29	Andaman & Nicobar Islands	6.8	6.0	6.4
30	Chandigarh	9.8	8.9	9.4
31	Dadra & Nagar Haveli	5.7	3.3	4.7
32	Daman & Diu	8.2	6.3	7.3
33	Delhi	9.2	7.5	8.4
34	Lakshadweep	6.1	4.8	5.5
35	Puducherry	7.6	5.2	6.3
	All India	5.7	3.6	4.7

Source: NSSO 61st Round (2004-05); calculated values

Dimension 3: A Decent Standard of Living

NSDP/NDP at Factor Cost and Projected Population, 1996

S.No.	States/Union Territories	NSDP/NDP factor cost 1996 at constant (1999-00) price (in Rs. Lakh)	State-wise Projected Population as on 1 st March, 1996 (in '000)		
			Male	Female	Total
1	Andhra Pradesh	9559822.67	36588	35567	72155
2	Arunachal Pradesh	144488.92	553	481	1034
3	Assam	2998775.53	12861	11866	24726
4	Bihar	3453615.39	48698	44357	93055
5	Goa	371723.16	704	687	1391
6	Gujarat	7474088.50	23546	22002	45548
7	Haryana	3700680.76	9948	8606	18554
8	Himachal Pradesh	926458.88	3009	2974	5983
9	Jammu & Kashmir	1122661.94	4593	4308	8901
10	Karnataka	6260703.72	25181	24164	49344
11	Kerala	4984434.71	15206	15759	30965
12	Madhya Pradesh	5492606.95	38412	35774	74185
13	Maharashtra	17390575.22	44782	41805	86587
14	Manipur	214309.80	1114	1076	2190
15	Meghalaya	242079.64	1076	1041	2117
16	Mizoram ¹
17	Nagaland	228836.43	767	687	1455
18	Orissa	3272731.57	17475	16965	34440
19	Punjab	4975614.90	11886	10481	22367
20	Rajasthan	5658526.69	26037	23687	49724
21	Sikkim	60537.40	257	229	485
22	Tamil Nadu	9567420.48	30119	29333	59452
23	Tripura	307723.85	1682	1607	3288
24	Uttar Pradesh	13206739.21	83393	73299	156692
25	West Bengal	9442924.94	38913	35688	74601
26	Chhattisgarh ²
27	Jharkhand ³
28	Uttarakhand ⁴
29	Andaman & Nicobar Islands	73001.03	183	152	335
30	Chandigarh	261826.06	427	342	770
31	Dadra & Nagar Haveli ⁵	..	84	81	165
32	Daman & Diu ⁵	..	61	60	121
33	Delhi	3496303.58	6363	5373	11736
34	Lakshadweep ⁵	..	32	30	62
35	Puducherry	138716.93	484	480	965
All India (NDP)		126042101.35	484859	449360	934218

Note: (i) .. Data Not Available (ii) ¹The value of Assam has been applied to Mizoram. ²The value of Madhya Pradesh has been applied to Chhattisgarh. ³The value of Bihar has been applied to Jharkhand. ⁴The value of Uttar Pradesh has been applied to Uttarakhand. ⁵The all-India average value has been applied to Dadra & Nagar Haveli, Daman & Diu and Lakshadweep.

Source: (a) Central Statistical Organization, (b) Population Projections for India and States 1996-2016, Census of India 1991, Report of the Technical Group on Population Projections Constituted by the Planning Commission, August 1996, Registrar General, India, Ministry of Home Affairs

NSDP/NDP at Factor Cost and Projected Population, 2006

S.No.	States/Union Territories	NSDP/NDP factor cost 2006 constant (1999-00) price (in Rs. Lakh)	State-wise Projected Population as on 1 st March, 2006 (in '000)		
			Male	Female	Total
1	Andhra Pradesh	17146200	40592	39838	80430
2	Arunachal Pradesh	213900	616	554	1170
3	Assam	4215000	14694	14045	29009
4	Bihar	6099400	47167	43663	90830
5	Goa	742100	782	754	1536
6	Gujarat	13926500	28528	26286	54814
7	Haryana	7572200	12373	10668	23041
8	Himachal Pradesh	1803700	3264	3161	6425
9	Jammu & Kashmir	1749700	6080	5523	11603
10	Karnataka	11683400	28527	27610	56137
11	Kerala	8575900	16313	17256	33569
12	Madhya Pradesh	8100600	34775	32026	66801
13	Maharashtra	29615500	54072	50032	104104
14	Manipur	452200	1295	1266	2561
15	Meghalaya	453700	1253	1220	2473
16	Mizoram ¹	..	493	462	955
17	Nagaland	456600	1117	1015	2132
18	Orissa	5416700	19791	19262	39053
19	Punjab	7649100	13842	12134	25976
20	Rajasthan	9062500	32452	29979	62431
21	Sikkim	119100	310	270	580
22	Tamil Nadu	15784200	32764	32497	65261
23	Tripura	729700	1755	1666	3421
24	Uttar Pradesh	19287600	96369	87487	183856
25	West Bengal	17304700	44244	41536	85780
26	Chhattisgarh	3714900	11526	11333	22859
27	Jharkhand	4294100	15012	14162	29174
28	Uttarakhand	1864500	4692	4523	9215
29	Andaman & Nicobar Islands	118400	211	183	394
30	Chandigarh	738900	571	442	1013
31	Dadra & Nagar Haveli ²	..	142	106	248
32	Daman & Diu ²	..	109	70	179
33	Delhi	7320000	8809	7256	16065
34	Lakshadweep ²	..	34	32	66
35	Puducherry	386400	522	519	1041
All India (NDP)		232658100	575096	538836	1114202

Note: (i) .. Data Not Available (ii) ¹The value of Assam has been applied to Mizoram, ²The All India average value has been applied to Dadra & Nagar Haveli, Daman & Diu and Lakshadweep.

Source: (a) Central Statistical Organization, (b) http://www.censusindia.gov.in/Census_Data_2001/Projected_Population/Projected_population.aspx

Work Force Participation Rates and Wages, 1993-94

S.No.	States/Union Territories	WFPR			Wage per day (Rs.) current prices		
		Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
1	Andhra Pradesh	608	438	523	20.4	13.8	17.5
2	Arunachal Pradesh	499	373	440	32.0	23.3	30.0
3	Assam	517	152	350	27.3	21.3	26.0
4	Bihar	502	160	341	18.1	15.1	17.3
5	Goa	548	241	392	41.4	19.9	34.7
6	Gujarat	561	313	442	24.2	19.3	22.6
7	Haryana	477	241	367	36.7	26.0	34.2
8	Himachal Pradesh	580	497	537	33.6	34.0	33.6
9	Jammu & Kashmir	512	333	424	36.1	20.7	35.2
10	Karnataka	586	360	474	21.7	14.1	18.6
11	Kerala	542	230	380	46.9	26.9	42.1
12	Madhya Pradesh	548	349	453	19.1	14.6	17.5
13	Maharashtra	541	365	455	21.9	12.6	17.5
14	Manipur	465	285	376	40.8	30.0	38.9
15	Meghalaya	603	451	528	32.5	24.7	29.9
16	Mizoram	515	300	413	51.8	39.4	51.1
17	Nagaland ⁴	421	188	314	42.3	..	42.3
18	Orissa	559	297	429	17.4	12.6	16.0
19	Punjab	548	183	376	42.7	34.7	42.0
20	Rajasthan	528	391	463	29.2	20.8	27.2
21	Sikkim	564	187	396	29.9	22.7	28.6
22	Tamil Nadu	592	391	491	27.2	15.0	22.2
23	Tripura	519	128	330	34.4	19.1	31.7
24	Uttar Pradesh	514	196	364	24.8	16.9	23.4
25	West Bengal	556	176	373	24.6	18.2	23.4
26	Chhattisgarh ¹
27	Jharkhand ²
28	Uttarakhand ³
29	Andaman & Nicobar Islands	603	363	490	38.7	30.1	37.4
30	Chandigarh	622	157	414	42.2	33.6	40.5
31	Dadra & Nagar Haveli	559	522	541	25.8	18.0	23.6
32	Daman & Diu	567	213	393	41.0	24.9	37.7
33	Delhi	544	96	353	48.2	43.0	47.2
34	Lakshadweep	474	110	279	47.8	30.0	45.9
35	Puducherry	515	211	365	30.1	21.8	27.7
All India		545	286	420	24.4	15.5	21.5

Note: (i) .. Data Not Available (ii) ¹The value of Madhya Pradesh has been used in place of Chhattisgarh. ²The value of Bihar has been used in place of Jharkhand. ³The value of Uttar Pradesh has been used in place of Uttarakhand. ⁴The value for wage for Assam has been applied to Nagaland.

Source: 1. Computed from NSSO unit records NSSO 50th round, 1993-94,
2. Wages reported are for Casual Labourers and in current prices

Work Force Participation Rates and Wages, 2004-05

S.No.	States/Union Territories	WFPR			Wage per day (Rs.) current prices		
		Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
1	Andhra Pradesh	594	416	505	51.7	31.0	43.2
2	Arunachal Pradesh	495	379	441	87.2	58.7	78.5
3	Assam	551	199	385	62.8	53.2	60.4
4	Bihar	475	132	312	45.6	38.7	44.4
5	Goa	528	188	350	108.1	67.7	99.4
6	Gujarat	588	337	468	56.0	43.3	52.0
7	Haryana	519	269	401	75.4	57.5	72.1
8	Himachal Pradesh	562	485	524	85.0	64.0	83.0
9	Jammu & Kashmir	545	228	394	99.5	56.6	96.7
10	Karnataka	608	374	493	53.2	31.7	45.0
11	Kerala	556	243	393	134.4	65.9	120.0
12	Madhya Pradesh	539	316	433	40.5	31.1	37.4
13	Maharashtra	564	361	466	54.1	29.2	43.3
14	Manipur	508	318	415	79.5	94.1	82.0
15	Meghalaya	557	452	504	73.0	42.5	63.8
16	Mizoram	551	375	466	115.1	105.6	113.7
17	Nagaland	519	429	476	107.0	75.6	96.4
18	Orissa	574	299	436	42.6	30.0	38.8
19	Punjab	556	262	416	75.8	51.8	73.5
20	Rajasthan	509	354	433	64.0	50.2	61.0
21	Sikkim	553	301	434	90.6	73.9	87.7
22	Tamil Nadu	596	377	486	72.4	37.3	58.7
23	Tripura	543	87	320	64.8	43.8	62.0
24	Uttar Pradesh	501	216	363	54.3	39.1	52.0
25	West Bengal	579	172	380	51.5	38.6	49.6
26	Chhattisgarh	559	414	486	38.6	29.0	34.8
27	Jharkhand	524	283	407	51.5	39.9	48.7
28	Uttarakhand	522	357	439	68.9	56.5	67.2
29	Andaman & Nicobar Islands	612	212	420	95.7	67.1	91.1
30	Chandigarh ¹	523	134	348	92.8	..	92.8
31	Dadra & Nagar Haveli	561	445	509	61.8	53.5	58.3
32	Daman & Diu	610	192	407	82.1	58.2	74.9
33	Delhi	534	85	332	81.8	47.9	77.2
34	Lakshadweep	532	81	327	133.7	44.8	130.0
35	Puducherry	547	230	386	81.4	42.6	72.0
	All India	547	287	420	57.4	35.5	50.9

Note: (i) .. Data Not Available (ii) ¹The value of female wage for Punjab has been applied to the female wage for Chandigarh.

Source: 1. Computed from NSSO unit records, NSSO 61st Round 2004-05

2. Wages reported are for Casual Labourers and in current prices

Statistical Tables for GEM

GEM Dimension 1: Political Participation and Decision-making

Performance of Candidates in Parliamentary Election, 1996

S.No.	States/Union Territories	No. of Seats	Elected	
			Female	Male
1	Andhra Pradesh	42	3	39
2	Arunachal Pradesh	2	0	2
3	Assam	14	1	13
4	Bihar	54	3	51
5	Goa	2	0	2
6	Gujarat	26	2	24
7	Haryana	10	1	9
8	Himachal Pradesh	4	0	4
9	Jammu & Kashmir	6	0	6
10	Karnataka	28	1	27
11	Kerala	20	0	20
12	Madhya Pradesh	40	5	35
13	Maharashtra	48	2	46
14	Manipur	2	0	2
15	Meghalaya	2	0	2
16	Mizoram	1	0	1
17	Nagaland	1	0	1
18	Orissa	21	2	19
19	Punjab	13	1	12
20	Rajasthan	25	4	21
21	Sikkim	1	0	1
22	Tamil Nadu	39	0	39
23	Tripura	2	0	2
24	Uttar Pradesh	85	9	76
25	West Bengal	42	4	38
26	Chhattisgarh
27	Jharkhand
28	Uttarakhand
29	Andaman & Nicobar Islands	1	0	1
30	Chandigarh	1	0	1
31	Dadra & Nagar Haveli	1	0	1
32	Daman & Diu	1	0	1
33	NCT Delhi	7	2	5
34	Lakshadweep	1	0	1
35	Puducherry	1	0	1
All India		543	40	503

Note: (i) .. Data Not Available. No data for Chhattisgarh, Jharkhand and Uttarakhand as these were new states. For Chhattisgarh the value of Madhya Pradesh, for Jharkhand the value of Bihar and for Uttarakhand value of Uttar Pradesh has been taken.

Source: Election Commission of India.

Performance of Candidates in Parliamentary Election, 2004

S.No.	States/Union Territories	No. of Seats	Elected	
			Female	Male
1	Andhra Pradesh	42	3	39
2	Arunachal Pradesh	2	0	2
3	Assam	14	0	14
4	Bihar	40	3	37
5	Goa	2	0	2
6	Gujarat	26	1	25
7	Haryana	10	1	9
8	Himachal Pradesh	4	1	3
9	Jammu & Kashmir	6	1	5
10	Karnataka	28	2	26
11	Kerala	20	2	18
12	Madhya Pradesh	29	2	27
13	Maharashtra	48	5	43
14	Manipur	2	0	2
15	Meghalaya	2	0	2
16	Mizoram	1	0	1
17	Nagaland	1	0	1
18	Orissa	21	2	19
19	Punjab	13	2	11
20	Rajasthan	25	2	23
21	Sikkim	1	0	1
22	Tamil Nadu	39	4	35
23	Tripura	2	0	2
24	Uttar Pradesh	80	7	73
25	West Bengal	42	4	38
26	Chhattisgarh	11	1	10
27	Jharkhand	14	1	13
28	Uttarakhand	5	0	5
29	Andaman & Nicobar Islands	1	0	1
30	Chandigarh	1	0	1
31	Dadra & Nagar Haveli	1	0	1
32	Daman & Diu	1	0	1
33	NCT Delhi	7	1	6
34	Lakshadweep	1	0	1
35	Puducherry	1	0	1
All India		543	45	498

Source: Election Commission of India

Performance of Candidates in State Assemblies, 1996

S. No.	States/Union Territories	Elected	
		Female	Male
1	Andhra Pradesh, 1994	8	286
2	Arunachal Pradesh, 1995	1	59
3	Assam, 1996	6	116
4	Bihar, 1995	11	313
5	Goa, 1994	4	36
6	Gujarat, 1995	2	180
7	Haryana, 1996	4	86
8	Himachal Pradesh, 1993	3	65
9	Jammu & Kashmir, 1996	2	85
10	Karnataka, 1994	7	217
11	Kerala, 1996	13	127
12	Madhya Pradesh, 1993	12	308
13	Maharashtra, 1995	11	277
14	Manipur, 1995	0	60
15	Meghalaya, 1993	1	59
16	Mizoram, 1993	0	40
17	Nagaland, 1993	0	60
18	Orissa, 1995	8	139
19	Punjab, 1997	7	110
20	Rajasthan, 1993	9	190
21	Sikkim, 1994	1	31
22	Tamil Nadu, 1996	9	225
23	Tripura, 1993	1	59
24	Uttar Pradesh, 1993	14	408
25	West Bengal, 1996	20	274
26	Chhattisgarh
27	Jharkhand
28	Uttarakhand
29	Andaman & Nicobar Islands
30	Chandigarh
31	Dadra & Nagar Haveli
32	Daman & Diu
33	Delhi, 1993	3	67
34	Lakshadweep
35	Puducherry, 1996	1	29
All India		158	3906

Note: (i) .. Data Not Available. No data for Chhattisgarh, Jharkhand and Uttarakhand as they were new states. For Chhattisgarh the value of Madhya Pradesh, for Jharkhand the value of Bihar and for Uttarakhand the value of Uttar Pradesh has been taken. (ii) Data pertaining to elections to State assemblies is for the year nearest to 1996 as elections were held in different years nearest to 1996. (iii) For Andaman and Nicobar Islands, Chandigarh, Dadra and Nagar Haveli, Daman and Diu and Lakshadweep this indicator was not considered for calculation.

Source: Election Commission of India

Performance of Candidates in State Assemblies, 2006

S.No.	States/Union Territories	Elected	
		Female	Male
1	Andhra Pradesh, 2004	26	268
2	Arunachal Pradesh, 1999	1	59
3	Assam, 2006	13	113
4	Bihar, 2005	25	218
5	Goa, 2002	1	39
6	Gujarat, 2002	12	170
7	Haryana, 2005	11	79
8	Himachal Pradesh, 2003	4	64
9	Jammu & Kashmir, 2002	2	85
10	Karnataka, 2004	6	218
11	Kerala, 2006	7	133
12	Madhya Pradesh, 2003	19	211
13	Maharashtra, 2004	12	276
14	Manipur, 2002	1	59
15	Meghalaya, 2003	2	58
16	Mizoram, 2003	0	40
17	Nagaland, 2003	0	60
18	Orissa, 2004	11	136
19	Punjab, 2002	8	109
20	Rajasthan, 2003	12	188
21	Sikkim, 2004	3	29
22	Tamil Nadu, 2006	22	212
23	Tripura, 2003	2	58
24	Uttar Pradesh, 2002	26	377
25	West Bengal, 2006	37	257
26	Chhattisgarh, 2003	5	85
27	Jharkhand, 2005	3	78
28	Uttarakhand, 2002	4	66
29	Andaman & Nicobar Islands
30	Chandigarh
31	Dadra & Nagar Haveli
32	Daman & Diu
33	Delhi, 2003	7	63
34	Lakshadweep
35	Puducherry, 2006	0	30
All India		282	3838

Note: (i) .. Data Not Available. (ii) Data pertaining to elections to state assemblies is for the year nearest to 2006 as elections were held in different years nearest to 2006. (iii) For Andaman and Nicobar Islands, Chandigarh, Dadra and Nagar Haveli, Daman and Diu and Lakshadweep this indicator was not considered for calculation.

Source: Election Commission of India.

Elected Representatives in *Gram Panchayats* and *Zilla Parishads*, 1996

S.No.	States/Union Territories	Gram Panchayats				Zilla Parishads			
		Number	T	F	M	Number	T	F	M
1	Andhra Pradesh, 1995	21943	230529	78000	152529	22	1093	363	730
2	Arunachal Pradesh, 1992	2012	5733	66	5667	12	77
3	Assam, 1992	2489	24860	7458	17402	21
4	Bihar, No election after 1980	12181	55
5	Goa, 1997	183	1281	468	813	2	50
6	Gujarat, 1995	13316	123470	41180	82290	19	761	254	507
7	Haryana, 1994	5958	54159	17928	36231	16	303	101	202
8	Himachal Pradesh, 1994	2922	18258	6013	12245	12	252	84	168
9	Jammu & Kashmir, No election after 1974	2683	14
10	Karnataka, 1993	5675	80627	35305	45322	20	919	335	584
11	Kerala, 1995	991	10270	3383	6887	14	300	104	196
12	Madhya Pradesh, 1994	30922	474351	156181	318170	45	946	319	627
13	Maharashtra, 1997	27619	303545	100182	203363	29	1762	587	1175
14	Manipur, 1997	166	1556	576	980	3	61	22	39
15	Meghalaya
16	Mizoram
17	Nagaland
18	Orissa, 1997	5261	81077	28595	52482	30	854	294	560
19	Punjab, 1998	12369	87842	31053	56789	17	274	89	185
20	Rajasthan, 1995	9185	119419	38791	80628	31	997	331	666
21	Sikkim, 1997	159	883	87	796	4	92	28	64
22	Tamil Nadu, 1996	12607	97398	32795	64603	28	648	225	423
23	Tripura, 1999	538	5685	1895	3790	4	82	28	54
24	Uttar Pradesh, 1996	58805	682670	174410	508260	83	2551	648	1903
25	West Bengal, 1998	3330	50345	17907	32438	17	723	246	477
26	Chhattisgarh
27	Jharkhand
28	Uttarakhand
29	Andaman & Nicobar Islands, 1995	67	692	261	431	1	30	10	20
30	Chandigarh, 1994	17	109	22	87	1	10	3	7
31	Dadra & Nagar Haveli, 1995	11	135	46	89	1	16	4	12
32	Daman & Diu, 1995	10	63	35	28	2	15	5	10
33	Delhi
34	Lakshadweep, 1997	10	79	30	49	1	22	8	14
35	Puducherry, No election after 1978	10
All India		231429	2455036	772667	1682369	514	12838	4088	8623

Note: (i) .. Data Not Available. (ii) Data for M.P. used for Chhattisgarh; Data for U.P. used for Uttarakhand. Except these, wherever data is not available, the indicator has not been considered in the calculation

Source: *Reviving Democracy: The Emerging Role of Women in Decision Making, A Study of Women's Participation in Governance in South Asia*, 2003.

Elected Representatives in *Gram Panchayats* and *Zilla Parishads*, 2006

S. No.	States/Union Territories	Gram Panchayats				Zilla Parishads			
		Number	T	F	M	Number	T	F	M
1	Andhra Pradesh	21807	225276	80518	144758	22	1097	368	729
2	Arunachal Pradesh	1646	7415	2561	4854	14	136	45	91
3	Assam	2196	22898	8977	13921	20	390	135	255
4	Bihar	8463	124339	58044	66295	38	1162	568	594
5	Goa	189	1509	513	996	2	50	20	30
6	Gujarat	13693	109209	36400	72809	25	819	274	545
7	Haryana	6187	66588	24406	42182	19	384	135	249
8	Himachal Pradesh	3243	22654	8864	13790	12	251	92	159
9	Jammu & Kashmir
10	Karnataka	5628	90748	39318	51430	29	1003	373	630
11	Kerala	999	16139	5701	10438	14	343	119	224
12	Madhya Pradesh	23051	388829	134368	254461	48	855	304	551
13	Maharashtra	27893	223857	74620	149237	33	1961	654	1307
14	Manipur	165	1675	859	816	4	61	22	39
15	Meghalaya
16	Mizoram
17	Nagaland
18	Orissa*	6234	93781	33602	60179	30	854	296	558
19	Punjab	12447	88136	30875	57261	20	196	64	132
20	Rajasthan	9188	113437	40044	73393	32	1008	377	631
21	Sikkim	166	905	352	553	4	100	32	68
22	Tamil Nadu	12618	109308	36824	72484	28	656	227	429
23	Tripura	513	5352	1852	3500	4	82	28	54
24	Uttar Pradesh	52000	703294	273229	430065	70	2698	1122	1576
25	West Bengal	3354	49545	18150	31395	18	720	248	472
26	Chhattisgarh	9820	157250	53145	104105	16	305	103	202
27	Jharkhand	4562	22
28	Uttarakhand	7227	53988	20319	33669	13	360	126	234
29	Andaman & Nicobar Islands	67	758	261	497	1	30	10	20
30	Chandigarh	17	104	34	70	1	6	1	5
31	Dadra & Nagar Haveli	11	114	45	69	1	11	4	7
32	Daman & Diu	14	77	30	47	1	20	7	13
33	Delhi
34	Lakshadweep	10	85	32	53	1	25	9	16
35	Puducherry	98	913	330	583	1
All India		233506	2678183	984273	1693910	543	15583	5763	9820

Note: (i) .. Data Not Available. (ii) Data for Bihar used for Jharkhand. Except these, wherever data is not available, the indicator has not been considered in the calculation. (iii) *2002 election data (2007 election data is not available), (iv) Meghalaya, Mizoram & Nagaland have traditional Councils, (v) J&K has not adopted the Constitutional 73rd Amendment Act 1992, (vi) In Jharkhand, elections to the Rural Local Bodies have not been conducted so far and (vii) NCT of Delhi-Panchayati Raj System is to be revived.

Source: *The State of Panchayats: 2007-08, Volume Three: Supplementary, pp 336.*

**Candidates Contesting in Parliamentary Election in States
(from Major National Parties), 1996**

S.No.	States/Union Territories	AIIC(T)		BJP		CPI		CPM		INC		JD		JP		SAP	
		M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
1	Andhra Pradesh	25	0	38	1	3	0	2	1	38	4	0	0	8	0	2	0
2	Arunachal Pradesh	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3	Assam	11	1	13	1	0	0	2	0	12	2	5	0	0	0	0	0
4	Bihar	38	1	30	2	7	0	3	0	46	8	41	3	2	0	20	0
5	Goa	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6	Gujarat	19	0	25	1	1	0	1	0	25	1	13	2	0	0	10	0
7	Haryana	7	1	6	0	1	0	0	0	9	1	8	0	6	0	9	1
8	Himachal Pradesh	2	0	4	0	1	0	1	0	4	0	1	0	1	0	1	0
9	Jammu & Kashmir	3	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	6	0	5	0	0	0	0	0
10	Karnataka	8	0	28	0	1	0	1	0	26	2	26	1	5	0	0	0
11	Kerala	0	0	17	1	4	0	9	0	16	1	1	1	5	1	1	0
12	Madhya Pradesh	31	2	35	4	3	1	1	0	35	5	8	0	7	0	3	1
13	Maharashtra	32	1	23	2	3	0	3	0	45	3	12	0	15	2	6	1
14	Manipur	1	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	1	1
15	Meghalaya	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
16	Mizoram	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
17	Nagaland	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
18	Orissa	6	2	19	1	1	0	1	0	19	2	18	1	5	0	2	0
19	Punjab	7	0	6	0	2	1	3	0	10	3	1	0	1	0	0	0
20	Rajasthan	14	3	23	2	1	0	1	0	23	2	13	1	0	0	6	0
21	Sikkim	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
22	Tamil Nadu	12	0	37	0	2	0	7	0	28	1	8	0	2	0	5	0
23	Tripura	0	1	2	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
24	Uttar Pradesh	69	7	78	5	3	0	2	1	77	8	15	2	31	1	3	0
25	West Bengal	5	2	39	3	2	1	28	3	37	5	1	0	0	0	4	0
26	Chhattisgarh
27	Jharkhand
28	Uttarakhand
29	Andaman & Nicobar Islands	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
30	Chandigarh	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0
31	Dadra & Nagar Haveli	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
32	Daman & Diu	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
33	NCT Delhi	7	0	6	1	1	0	1	0	6	1	5	0	6	0	3	0
34	Lakshadweep	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
35	Puducherry	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
	All India	299	22	444	27	40	3	70	5	480	49	185	11	97	4	77	4

Note: (i) .. Data Not Available. (ii) Data for M.P. used for Chhattisgarh; Data for U.P. used for Uttarakhand; Data for Bihar used for Jharkhand.

Source: Election Commission of India.

**Candidates Contesting in Parliamentary Election in States
(from Major National Parties), 2004**

S.No.	States/Union Territories	BJP		BSP		CPI		CPM		INC		NCP	
		M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
1	Andhra Pradesh	9	0	24	2	1	0	1	0	29	5	0	0
2	Arunachal Pradesh	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
3	Assam	11	1	0	0	1	0	2	0	13	1	0	0
4	Bihar	16	0	40	0	6	0	1	0	2	2	1	0
5	Goa	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
6	Gujarat	22	4	19	1	0	0	1	0	24	1	1	0
7	Haryana	9	1	9	1	0	0	0	0	9	1	0	0
8	Himachal Pradesh	4	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	0
9	Jammu & Kashmir	6	0	3	0	0	0	1	0	3	0	0	0
10	Karnataka	2	3	19	0	0	0	0	0	26	2	0	0
11	Kerala	18	1	14	0	4	0	11	2	14	3	0	0
12	Madhya Pradesh	26	3	26	2	2	0	1	0	25	4	0	1
13	Maharashtra	24	2	43	3	1	0	3	0	24	2	16	2
14	Manipur	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
15	Meghalaya	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0
16	Mizoram	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
17	Nagaland	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
18	Orissa	8	1	1	20	0	0	0	0	18	3	0	0
19	Punjab	3	0	1	30	0	1	1	0	7	4	0	0
20	Rajasthan	21	4	22	2	1	1	2	0	24	1	2	0
21	Sikkim	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
22	Tamil Nadu	6	0	2	91	2	0	2	0	9	1	0	0
23	Tripura	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	0	0
24	Uttar Pradesh	72	5	76	4	6	0	1	1	67	6	4	0
25	West Bengal	13	0	32	4	3	0	27	5	33	4	0	1
26	Chhattisgarh	10	1	11	0	1	0	1	0	10	1	0	0
27	Jharkhand	12	2	14	0	1	0	1	0	8	1	0	0
28	Uttarakhand	5	0	3	0	0	0	1	0	4	1	0	0
29	Andaman & Nicobar Islands	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1
30	Chandigarh	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
31	Dadra & Nagar Haveli	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0
32	Daman & Diu	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
33	NCT Delhi	5	2	7	0	0	0	0	0	6	1	0	0
34	Lakshadweep	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
35	Puducherry	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	All India	335	29	415	20	32	2	61	8	372	45	27	5

Source: Election Commission of India

Electors and Voters in Lok Sabha Elections, 1996

S.No.	States/Union Territories	No. of Seats	No. of Electors			Voters		
			Men	Women	Total	Men	Women	Total
1	Andhra Pradesh	42	24735268	24766006	49501274	16434650	14762029	31196679
2	Arunachal Pradesh	2	288673	255767	544440	165340	134340	299680
3	Assam	14	6670161	5917498	12587659	5356995	4523994	9880989
4	Bihar	54	31012536	27425781	58438317	20921264	13822823	34744087
5	Goa	2	437202	431891	869093	262737	226810	489547
6	Gujarat	26	14666698	13862396	28529094	6140196	4108454	10248650
7	Haryana	10	6005913	5146943	11152856	4321738	3539125	7860863
8	Himachal Pradesh	4	1776034	1760483	3536517	1050171	986270	2036441
9	Jammu & Kashmir	6	2378717	2076992	4455709	1369602	811992	2181594
10	Karnataka	28	16147681	15662388	31810069	10460509	8694923	19155432
11	Kerala	20	10042379	10631488	20673867	7222521	7478493	14701014
12	Madhya Pradesh	40	22711323	21215929	43927252	13782881	9965441	23748322
13	Maharashtra	48	28669222	26585192	55254414	16328826	12650195	28979021
14	Manipur	2	641232	649758	1290990	489436	479347	968783
15	Meghalaya	2	550148	542605	1092753	342326	331046	673372
16	Mizoram	1	203746	204348	408094	148543	151050	299593
17	Nagaland	1	457901	416617	874518	416305	356097	772402
18	Orissa	21	11764783	10654335	22419118	7461632	5816065	13277697
19	Punjab	13	7634481	6855344	14489825	4829957	4189345	9019302
20	Rajasthan	25	16036429	14351928	30388357	7919653	5268669	13188322
21	Sikkim	1	119757	109403	229160	96634	80806	177440
22	Tamil Nadu	39	21397687	21090335	42488022	14762574	13676311	28438885
23	Tripura	2	844205	803703	1647908	680462	622886	1303348
24	Uttar Pradesh	85	55226430	45599875	100826305	28174821	18710813	46885634
25	West Bengal	42	23998543	21584511	45583054	20223207	17453935	37677142
26	Chhattisgarh
27	Jharkhand
28	Uttarakhand
29	Andaman & Nicobar Islands	1	120578	90648	211226	75536	55382	130918
30	Chandigarh	1	255580	195019	450599	148822	114367	263189
31	Dadra & Nagar Haveli	1	49806	45103	94909	37400	35632	73032
32	Daman & Diu	1	36527	33675	70202	24181	25425	49606
33	NCT Delhi	7	4597944	3460997	8058941	2376319	1702977	4079296
34	Lakshadweep	1	17690	16421	34111	15373	15000	30373
35	Puducherry	1	320502	313133	633635	239146	238291	477437
	All India	543	309815776	282756512	592572288	192279757	151028333	343308090

Note: (i) .. Data Not Available. (ii) number of men voters is calculated by subtracting women voters from total number of voters. (iii) No data for Chhattisgarh, Jharkhand and Uttarakhand as these were new states. For Chhattisgarh value of Madhya Pradesh, for Jharkhand value of Bihar and for Uttarakhand value of Uttar Pradesh has been taken.

Source: Election Commission of India.

Electors and Voters in Lok Sabha Elections, 2004

S.No.	States/Union Territories	No. of Seats	No. of Electors		Voters	
			Men	Women	Men	Women
1	Andhra Pradesh	42	25355118	25791224	18391831	17384444
2	Arunachal Pradesh	2	351564	332470	201537	183909
3	Assam	14	7821591	7193283	5675644	4701710
4	Bihar	40	27053408	23506264	17197393	12134913
5	Goa	2	475847	465320	288171	264934
6	Gujarat	26	17341760	16333302	8670077	6543424
7	Haryana	10	6660631	5659926	4542703	3554361
8	Himachal Pradesh	4	2128828	2053167	1285155	1211994
9	Jammu & Kashmir	6	3468235	2899880	1400240	841489
10	Karnataka	28	19605257	18986838	13176603	11962519
11	Kerala	20	10168428	10957045	7526631	7567329
12	Madhya Pradesh	29	20028161	18361940	11339171	7124280
13	Maharashtra	48	32788476	30223732	18999569	15263748
14	Manipur	2	746054	790456	522862	512834
15	Meghalaya	2	648654	640720	302196	377125
16	Mizoram	1	273454	276505	179799	170000
17	Nagaland	1	547114	494319	509688	446002
18	Orissa	21	13191691	12460298	9015687	7929405
19	Punjab	13	8652294	7963105	5438507	4794658
20	Rajasthan	25	18149028	16563357	10055980	7290569
21	Sikkim	1	145738	136199	116879	102890
22	Tamil Nadu	39	23269301	23982970	15090157	13642797
23	Tripura	2	1023368	954854	722548	604452
24	Uttar Pradesh	80	60328608	50295882	32557624	20720447
25	West Bengal	42	24798089	22639342	19955108	17066370
26	Chhattisgarh	11	6904742	6814700	4045362	3100827
27	Jharkhand	14	8914164	7898175	5561577	3801786
28	Uttarakhand	5	2838204	2724433	1475915	1197917
29	Andaman & Nicobar Islands	1	131502	110143	83557	70284
30	Chandigarh	1	292438	235246	151963	117886
31	Dadra & Nagar Haveli	1	65059	57622	43799	40904
32	Daman & Diu	1	39595	39637	25840	29751
33	NCT Delhi	7	4953925	3809550	2428499	1697944
34	Lakshadweep	1	19880	19153	15698	16122
35	Puducherry	1	310658	326009	240134	244202
All India		543	349490864	321997066	217234104	172714226

Note: Number of men voters is calculated by subtracting women voters from total number of voters.

Source: Election Commission of India.

GEM Dimension 2: Economic Participation and Decision-making Power**Number of IAS, IPS and IFS Officials in Service, 1996**

S. No.	States/Union Territories	IAS			IPS			IFS		
		M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T
1	Andhra Pradesh	296	30	326	168	5	173	114	5	119
2	Arunachal Pradesh, Goa, Mizoram and Union Territories (AGMUTs)	207	35	242	129	6	135	108	3	111
3	Assam & Meghalaya (AM)	200	11	211	118	1	119	88	2	90
4	Bihar	336	34	370	208	7	215	33	0	33
5	Goa	(AGMUTs in 2 above)								
6	Gujarat	211	21	232	124	3	127	88	0	88
7	Haryana	169	29	198	93	1	94	53	2	55
8	Himachal Pradesh	113	17	130	65	0	65	82	3	85
9	Jammu & Kashmir	112	4	116	70	1	71	71	1	72
10	Karnataka	225	35	260	128	4	132	126	9	135
11	Kerala	146	16	162	97	3	100	65	2	67
12	Madhya Pradesh	347	44	391	263	6	269	206	9	215
13	Maharashtra	327	37	364	187	4	191	134	4	138
14	Manipur & Tripura (MT)	156	3	159	92	1	93	71	1	72
15	Meghalaya	(AM in 3 above)								
16	Mizoram	(AGMUTs in 2 above)								
17	Nagaland	43	1	44	36	0	36	24	0	24
18	Orissa	190	12	202	118	2	120	96	4	100
19	Punjab	167	29	196	117	1	118	32	0	32
20	Rajasthan	221	27	248	111	0	111	83	4	87
21	Sikkim	35	6	41	21	0	21	19	1	20
22	Tamil Nadu	279	35	314	161	6	167	113	4	117
23	Tripura	(MT in 14 above)								
24	Uttar Pradesh	496	44	540	354	9	363	132	6	138
25	West Bengal	281	20	301	222	5	227	66	3	69
26	Chhattisgarh
27	Jharkhand
28	Uttarakhand
29	Andaman & Nicobar Islands	(AGMUTs in 2 above)								
30	Chandigarh	(AGMUTs in 2 above)								
31	Dadra & Nagar Haveli	(AGMUTs in 2 above)								
32	Daman & Diu	(AGMUTs in 2 above)								
33	Delhi	(AGMUTs in 2 above)								
34	Lakshadweep	(AGMUTs in 2 above)								
35	Puducherry	(AGMUTs in 2 above)								
All India		4557	490	5047	2882	65	2947	1804	63	1867

Note: (i) .. Data Not Available. (ii) Data for M.P. used for Chhattisgarh; Data for Bihar used for Jharkhand; Data for U.P. used for Uttarakhand. (iii) Data for AGMUTs used for States and Union Territories of Arunachal Pradesh, Goa, Mizoram, Andaman & Nicobar Islands, Chandigarh, Dadra & Nagar Haveli, Daman & Diu, NCT Delhi, Lakshadweep and Puducherry, (iv) Data for AM used for Assam and Meghalaya and (v) Data for MT used for Manipur and Tripura.

Source: (i) Civil List, 1996, IAS, DoPT, Govt. of India. (ii) Civil List, 1996, IPS, MHA, GOI and (iii) Indian Forest Service, Civil List 2008, Min. of Environment and Forest, GOI.

Number of IAS, IPS and IFS Officials in Service in 2006

S.No.	States/Union Territories	IAS			IPS			IFS		
		Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
1	Andhra Pradesh	270	38	308	182	11	193	134	7	141
2	Arunachal Pradesh, Goa, Mizoram and Union Territories (AGMUTs)	180	36	216	129	13	142	129	8	137
3	Assam & Meghalaya (AM)	188	15	203	127	2	129	105	3	108
4	Bihar	221	18	239	150	5	155	41	0	41
5	Goa	(AGMUTs in 2 above)								
6	Gujarat	194	27	221	132	6	138	101	1	102
7	Haryana	169	33	202	108	7	115	63	3	66
8	Himachal Pradesh	96	21	117	64	2	66	99	4	103
9	Jammu & Kashmir	102	5	107	115	2	117	84	3	87
10	Karnataka	199	37	236	132	6	138	150	11	161
11	Kerala	146	20	166	116	3	119	118	3	121
12	Madhya Pradesh	247	44	291	206	10	216	262	10	272
13	Maharashtra	296	44	340	180	8	188	164	7	171
14	Manipur & Tripura (MT)	163	6	169	95	1	96	81	3	84
15	Meghalaya	(AM in 3 above)								
16	Mizoram	(AGMUTs in 2 above)								
17	Nagaland	48	4	52	39	4	43	28	0	28
18	Orissa	156	21	177	94	10	104	109	4	113
19	Punjab	150	21	171	113	5	118	43	4	47
20	Rajasthan	192	28	220	130	11	141	101	7	108
21	Sikkim	39	6	45	29	2	31	40	1	41
22	Tamil Nadu	262	39	301	183	10	193	133	6	139
23	Tripura	(MT in 14 above)								
24	Uttar Pradesh	424	49	473	332	12	344	150	7	157
25	West Bengal	219	25	244	220	4	224	97	7	104
26	Chhattisgarh	78	11	89	63	1	64	115	5	120
27	Jharkhand	111	17	128	76	8	84	125	3	128
28	Uttarakhand	69	6	75	44	7	51	62	7	69
29	Andaman & Nicobar Islands	(AGMUTs in 2 above)								
30	Chandigarh	(AGMUTs in 2 above)								
31	Dadra & Nagar Haveli	(AGMUTs in 2 above)								
32	Daman & Diu	(AGMUTs in 2 above)								
33	Delhi	(AGMUTs in 2 above)								
34	Lakshadweep	(AGMUTs in 2 above)								
35	Puducherry	(AGMUTs in 2 above)								
All India		4219	571	4790	3059	150	3209	2534	114	2648

Note: AGMUTs for states and union territories of Arunachal Pradesh, Goa, Mizoram, Andaman & Nicobar Islands, Chandigarh, Dadra & Nagar Haveli, Daman & Diu, NCT Delhi, Lakshadweep and Puducherry, AM for Assam and Meghalaya and MT for Manipur and Tripura.

Source: (i) Civil List, 2006, DoPT, Govt. of India (ii) Female data provided by MHA, (iii) Indian Police Service, Civil List, 2006, Min. of Home Affairs, GOI (iv) Indian Forest Service, Civil List 2008, Min. of Environment and Forests, GOI.

Enrolment in M.B.B.S. and B.E./B.Sc.(Engg)/B.Arch., 1995-96 (Single Indicator)

S.No.	States/Union Territories	B.E./B.Sc.(Engg)/B.Arch.			M.B.B.S.		
		Boys	Girls	Total	Boys	Girls	Total
1	Andhra Pradesh	24507	5969	30476	4319	3514	7833
2	Arunachal Pradesh	235	27	262
3	Assam	2946	300	3246	1667	631	2298
4	Bihar	5942	330	6272	12565	1547	14112
5	Goa	589	233	822	328	326	654
6	Gujarat	13043	2790	15833	1172	667	1839
7	Haryana	2834	305	3139	1223	986	2209
8	Himachal Pradesh	570	59	629	422	227	649
9	Jammu & Kashmir	712	38	750	836	634	1470
10	Karnataka	64372	9651	74023	5324	1964	7288
11	Kerala	9990	3120	13110	2108	1259	3367
12	Madhya Pradesh	9904	1416	11320	3290	1450	4740
13	Maharashtra	69983	10397	80380	14677	11738	26415
14	Manipur	308	100	408
15	Meghalaya
16	Mizoram
17	Nagaland
18	Orissa	2503	122	2625	2289	517	2806
19	Punjab	2778	383	3161	1654	1710	3364
20	Rajasthan	4425	126	4551	2607	1410	4017
21	Sikkim
22	Tamil Nadu	30805	8212	39017	6563	4753	11316
23	Tripura	402	77	479
24	Uttar Pradesh	13714	515	14229	5318	1592	6910
25	West Bengal	7292	395	7687	2812	958	3770
26	Chhattisgarh
27	Jharkhand
28	Uttarakhand
29	Andaman & Nicobar Islands
30	Chandigarh	21	18	39
31	Dadra & Nagar Haveli
32	Daman & Diu
33	NCT Delhi	3532	415	3947	2245	1853	4098
34	Lakshadweep
35	Puducherry	855	282	1137	612	275	887
All India		271954	45180	317134	72339	38111	110450

Note: (i) .. Data Not Available. (ii) Data for M.P. used for Chhattisgarh; Data for Bihar used for Jharkhand; Data for U.P. used for Uttarakhand. (iii) For Manipur and Chandigarh, available data used. (iv) For States/UTs where data is not available, the indicator has not been considered in the calculation

Source: Selected Educational Statistics (As on 30th September 1995), 1995-96, GOI, Min. of HRD., pp 18-19.

Enrolment in M.B.B.S. and B.E./B.Sc.(Engg)/B.Arch., 2004-05 (Single Indicator)

S. No.	States/Union Territories	B.E./B.Sc.(Engg)/B.Arch.			Medicine, Dentistry, Nursing, Pharmacy, AYUSH		
		Boys	Girls	Total	Boys	Girls	Total
1	Andhra Pradesh	135116	59677	194793	8108	7563	15671
2	Arunachal Pradesh	304	56	360	43	42	85
3	Assam	2941	413	3354	1500	1095	2595
4	Bihar	9189	423	9612	7459	982	8441
5	Goa	2064	1099	3163	305	647	952
6	Gujarat	25919	8909	34828	5948	3601	9549
7	Haryana	29906	9036	38942	1917	744	2661
8	Himachal Pradesh	1586	263	1849	1032	926	1958
9	Jammu & Kashmir	1032	161	1193	1420	665	2085
10	Karnataka	25108	7755	32863	36767	19472	56239
11	Kerala	16690	4172	20862	3514	4745	8259
12	Madhya Pradesh	21120	5430	26550	4897	2863	7760
13	Maharashtra	105085	28059	133144	21521	20422	41943
14	Manipur	390	69	459	95	69	164
15	Meghalaya
16	Mizoram
17	Nagaland
18	Orissa	9410	839	10249	5074	1113	6187
19	Punjab	13439	3625	17064	2969	5775	8744
20	Rajasthan	7292	1509	8801	5868	1448	7316
21	Sikkim	1122	375	1497	168	171	339
22	Tamil Nadu	34771	14695	49466	42950	4735	47685
23	Tripura	502	135	637	61	26	87
24	Uttar Pradesh	18764	3241	22005	6467	5061	11528
25	West Bengal	40070	8616	48686	2952	1005	3957
26	Chhattisgarh	10108	3101	13209	1040	625	1665
27	Jharkhand	7295	1128	8423	409	228	637
28	Uttarakhand	1035	256	1291	342	205	547
29	Andaman & Nicobar Islands
30	Chandigarh	1606	463	2069	386	799	1185
31	Dadra & Nagar Haveli
32	Daman & Diu
33	NCT Delhi	5933	730	6663	3502	3314	6816
34	Lakshadweep
35	Puducherry	3410	1167	4577	982	711	1693
All India		531207	165402	696609	167696	89052	256748

Note: (i) .. Data Not Available. (ii) For States/UTs where data is not available, the indicator has not been considered in the calculation

Source: Selected Educational Statistics, 2004-05, pp 11.

GEM Dimension 3: Power over Economic Resources**Number of Operational Land Holdings
During Agriculture Census, 1995-96, (in '000)**

S.No.	State	Male	Female
1	Andhra Pradesh	8673	1927
2	Arunachal Pradesh	88	15
3	Assam	2677	Neg
4	Bihar	13056	1076
5	Goa	55	16
6	Gujarat	3338	427
7	Haryana	1585	132
8	Himachal Pradesh	810	52
9	Jammu & Kashmir	1281	52
10	Karnataka	5320	894
11	Kerala	4773	1460
12	Madhya Pradesh
	Chhattisgarh + Madhya Pradesh	8952	647
13	Maharashtra	9261	1377
14	Manipur	138	5
15	Meghalaya	160	0
16	Mizoram	59	6
17	Nagaland	138	11
18	Orissa	3909	53
19	Punjab	1085	7
20	Rajasthan	5192	156
21	Sikkim	40	3
22	Tamil Nadu	6681	1322
23	Tripura	277	23
24	Uttar Pradesh
25	West Bengal	6342	205
26	Chhattisgarh
27	Jharkhand
28	Uttarakhand
	Uttar Pradesh + Uttarakhand	20376	1128
29	Andaman & Nicobar Islands	8	2
30	Chandigarh	2	Neg
31	Dadra & Nagar Haveli	12	2
32	Daman & Diu	3	1
33	NCT Delhi	30	4
34	Lakshadweep	7	2
35	Puducherry	26	7
Total		104354	11012

Note: (i) .. Data Not Available. (ii) Bihar and Meghalaya data for 2000-01 was estimated and no Census was conducted in Jharkhand in 2000-01. (iii) Value for combined States has been taken for M.P. and Chhattisgarh and U.P. and Uttarakhand; the value for Bihar has been applied to Jharkhand; the average of values for Punjab and Haryana has been applied to Chandigarh as the value given is negligible. (iv) Neg is Negligible.

Source: All India Report on Agriculture Census, 2000-01, Table No. 6.1, pp 131-133, Agriculture Census Division, Department of Agriculture Census & Cooperation, Ministry of Agriculture.

**Number of Operational Land Holdings
During Agriculture Census, 2000-01, (in '000)**

S.No.	State	Male	Female
1	Andhra Pradesh	9180	2347
2	Arunachal Pradesh	95	11
3	Assam	2656	53
4	Bihar	10436	1119
5	Goa	50	14
6	Gujarat	3747	470
7	Haryana	1371	142
8	Himachal Pradesh	850	63
9	Jammu & Kashmir	1323	116
10	Karnataka	5932	1134
11	Kerala	5202	1374
12	Madhya Pradesh	6874	483
	Chhattisgarh + Madhya Pradesh	9788	824
13	Maharashtra	10190	1878
14	Manipur	145	4
15	Meghalaya	164	50
16	Mizoram	69	7
17	Nagaland	132	11
18	Orissa	3940	125
19	Punjab	988	8
20	Rajasthan	5605	198
21	Sikkim	65	1
22	Tamil Nadu	6422	1417
23	Tripura	429	50
24	Uttar Pradesh	20380	1266
25	West Bengal	6561	226
26	Chhattisgarh	2914	340
27	Jharkhand
28	Uttarakhand	828	60
	Uttar Pradesh + Uttarakhand	21208	1326
29	Andaman & Nicobar Islands	9	3
30	Chandigarh	1	Neg
31	Dadra & Nagar Haveli	12	2
32	Daman & Diu	5	1
33	NCT Delhi	24	3
34	Lakshadweep	6	3
35	Puducherry	29	8
	Total	137630	15137

Note: (i) .. Data Not Available. (ii) Bihar and Meghalaya data for 2000-01 was estimated and no Census was conducted in Jharkhand in 2000-01. (iii) Data for Bihar used for Jharkhand; average of value for Punjab and Haryana used for Chandigarh as the value given is negligible. (iv) Neg is Negligible.

Source: All India Report on Agriculture Census, 2000-01, Table No. 6.1, pp 131-133, Agriculture Census Division, Department of Agriculture Census & Cooperation, Ministry of Agriculture.

**Number of Credit Accounts for All
Scheduled Commercial Banks in India as on 31st March, 1996**

S.No.	State	Male	Female	Total
1	Andhra Pradesh	250324	23299	273623
2	Arunachal Pradesh	463	43	506
3	Assam	44161	1250	45411
4	Bihar	102037	2177	104214
5	Goa	13913	1397	15310
6	Gujarat	192553	11545	204098
7	Haryana	113421	4763	118184
8	Himachal Pradesh	25208	1410	26618
9	Jammu & Kashmir	23367	1234	24601
10	Karnataka	298322	26695	325017
11	Kerala	184772	22931	207703
12	Madhya Pradesh	163912	7659	171571
	Maharashtra	362195	28784	390979
13	Manipur	7413	488	7901
14	Meghalaya	2574	278	2852
15	Mizoram	508	123	631
16	Nagaland	1831	106	1937
17	Orissa	54606	1870	56476
18	Punjab	200589	8372	208961
19	Rajasthan	122732	5315	128047
20	Sikkim	820	42	862
21	Tamil Nadu	275144	32986	308130
22	Tripura	3535	117	3652
23	Uttar Pradesh	271770	10007	281777
24	West Bengal	232694	6058	238752
25	Chhattisgarh
26	Jharkhand
27	Uttarakhand
28	Andaman & Nicobar Islands	664	48	712
29	Chandigarh	11344	895	12239
30	Dadra & Nagar Haveli	492	40	532
31	Daman & Diu	663	28	691
32	Delhi	94139	7334	101473
33	Lakshadweep	95	6	101
34	Puducherry	5296	578	5874
	All India	3061557	207878	3269435

Note: (i) .. Data Not Available. (ii) Data for M.P. used for Chhattisgarh; Data for Bihar used for Jharkhand; Data for U.P. used for Uttarakhand. (iii) The data pertains to BSR-1A i.e. for accounts with credit limit above Rs 2 lakh.

Source: BSR - 1A surveys.

**Number of Credit Accounts for All
Scheduled Commercial Banks in India as on 31st March, 2006**

S.No.	State	Male	Female	Total
1	Andhra Pradesh	426659	60062	486721
2	Arunachal Pradesh	2735	474	3209
3	Assam	61459	7284	68743
4	Bihar	85303	9713	95016
5	Goa	22346	3510	25856
6	Gujarat	226434	22067	248501
7	Haryana	175268	18964	194232
8	Himachal Pradesh	34432	4401	38833
9	Jammu & Kashmir	46315	2965	49280
10	Karnataka	504420	76868	581288
11	Kerala	301558	55129	356687
12	Madhya Pradesh	250587	23120	273707
13	Maharashtra	1457631	174854	1632485
14	Manipur	6740	2247	8987
15	Meghalaya	7169	3363	10532
16	Mizoram	5191	1978	7169
17	Nagaland	2659	545	3204
18	Orissa	131376	10955	142331
19	Punjab	248182	24590	272772
20	Rajasthan	223094	22875	245969
21	Sikkim	6707	879	7586
22	Tamil Nadu	548465	84634	633099
23	Tripura	7411	657	8068
24	Uttar Pradesh	385209	38231	423440
25	West Bengal	226367	25851	252218
26	Chhattisgarh	52702	6557	59259
27	Jharkhand	56314	5987	62301
28	Uttarakhand	45333	5304	50637
29	Andaman & Nicobar Islands	1581	438	2019
30	Chandigarh	44713	4657	49370
31	Dadra & Nagar Haveli	439	62	501
32	Daman & Diu	480	63	543
33	NCT Delhi	258457	77705	336162
34	Lakshadweep	72	3	75
35	Puducherry	8579	1647	10226
	All India	5862387	778639	6641026

Note: The data pertains to BSR-1A i.e. for accounts with credit limit above Rs 2 lakh.

Source: BSR - 1A surveys.

Statistical Tables for Districts

Indicators and Source of Data Used to Estimate HDI, GDI and GEM for the Districts

Indicators and Source of Data Used to Estimate HDI and GDI for the Districts

Indicators for HDI & GDI	Year for which data used to estimate 2001 Index along with the data source	
	Mahabubnagar	Jodhpur
Infant Mortality Rate	2001, Census 2001	2001, Census 2001
Life Expectancy at age 1	NA	NA
7+Literacy Rate	2001, Census 2001	2001, Census 2001
Mean Years of Education for 15+ age group	NA	NA
Work Force Participation Rate (WFPR)	2001, Census 2001	2001, Census 2001
Wage Rate	2004-05 Andhra Pradesh Human Development Report 2007 (AP HDR 2007)	1999 Agricultural Wages in India 1999, Central Ministry of Agriculture
Net District Domestic Product (NDDP)	2004-05 (at 1999-00 prices) AP HDR 2007	2001 (at 2001 prices) http://statistics.rajasthan.gov.in/socio_economic.htm
Population	2001, Census 2001	2001, Census 2001

Indicators and Source of Data Used to Estimate GEM for the Districts

Indicators for GEM	Year for which data used to estimate 2006 Index along with the data source
	Mahabubnagar
% Share of Parliamentary Seats (elected)	2004, Election Commission of India
% Share of Seats in Legislature (elected)	2004, Election Commission of India
% Share of Seats in <i>Zilla Parishads</i> (elected)	2006, DES, Andhra Pradesh
% Share of Seats in <i>Gram Panchayats</i> (elected)	2006, DES, Andhra Pradesh
% Candidates in Electoral Process in National Parties in Parliamentary Election	2004, Election Commission of India
% Electors exercising the right to vote in Parliamentary Election	2004, Election Commission of India
% Share of Officials in service in IAS, IPS and Indian Forest Service	2006, DES, Andhra Pradesh
% Share of Enrolment in Medical and Engineering Colleges	2006, DES, Andhra Pradesh
% Share of Operational Land Holdings	2006, DES, Andhra Pradesh
% Females/Males with Bank Accounts in Scheduled Commercial Banks (with credit limit above Rs. 2 lakh)	2006, RBI

1) NA: Not Available

2) Estimated Earned Income Share per capita per annum calculated using WFPR, wage rate, NDDP and total population. This has been used in calculation of HDI, GDI and GEM; in case of HDI, GDI logarithmic value has been used while for GEM value as such has been used as in the UNDP methodology.

Statistical Tables for HDI and GDI for Mahabubnagar and Jodhpur

(1) A Long and Healthy Life: Infant Mortality Rate 2001

	Male	Female	Total
Mahabubnagar	62	54	58
Jodhpur	66	74	70

Source: Census of India, 2001

(2) Knowledge: Literacy Rate 2001

	Male	Female	Total
Mahabubnagar	56.63	31.98	44.41
Jodhpur	72.96	38.64	56.67

Source: For Mahabubnagar 7+ Literacy Rate for 2001 from Andhra Pradesh Human Development Report 2007 (AP HDR 2007) page 235 (Basic Source: Census, 2001)

For Jodhpur basic data sheet 0815 of Census, 2001

(3) A Decent Standard of Living

Work Force Participation Rate (WFPR) 2001

	Male	Female	Total
Mahabubnagar	56.3	47.2	51.9
Jodhpur	48.43	27.09	38.28

Source: For Mahabubnagar from AP HDR 2007 page 226 and 228

For Jodhpur http://statistics.rajasthan.gov.in/socio_economic.htm

Wage Rate

	Male	Female
Mahabubnagar 2004-05	52.8	35.4
Jodhpur 1999	42	35.83

Source: (i) For Mahabubnagar wage rate 2004-05 is for agricultural field labour from page 229 of Appendix III of AP HDR 2007

(ii) For Jodhpur calculated by averaging wage rates for ploughing for men and weeding for women during different months of the year, Agricultural Wages in India 1999, Central Ministry of Agriculture.

Net District Domestic Product (NDDP)

Mahabubnagar 2004-05 at 1999-00 prices	Rs. 13342.00 per person per annum
Jodhpur 2001 at current price	Rs. 16791.00 per person per annum

Source: (i) For Mahabubnagar per capita gross DDP from AP HDR 2007 for 2004-05 in 1999-00 prices page 225 of Appendix III

(ii) For Jodhpur from http://statistics.rajasthan.gov.in/socio_economic.htm

Population (thousands)

	Male	Female	Total
Mahabubnagar	1782	1732	3514
Jodhpur	1514	1373	2887

Source: Census of India, 2001

Estimated Earned Income per capita per annum (Rs)*

	Male	Female
Mahabubnagar	17014	9564
Jodhpur	22345	10665

*calculated value

Statistical Tables for GEM for Mahabubnagar

(1) Political Participation and Decision-making

Performance in Parliamentary Elections, 2004

	Contested		Elected	
	Male	Female	Male	Female
Mahabubnagar	4	1	1	0

Source: Statistical Report on General Elections 2004, Election Commission of India

Electors and Voters for Parliamentary Elections, 2004

	Contested		Voters	
	Male	Female	Male	Female
Mahabubnagar	672495	693427	434557	431686

Source: Statistical Report on General Elections 2004, Election Commission of India

Mahabubnagar Assembly Election, 2004

Mahabubnagar	Contested		Elected	
	Male	Female	Male	Female
Alampur	13	1	1	0
Amarchinta	5	1	0	1
Gadwal	7	1	0	1
Kodangal	1	1	1	0
Mahabubnagar	10	2	1	0
Makthal	4	0	1	0
Wanaparthy	4	1	1	0
Total	44	7	5	2

Source: Statistical Report on General Elections 2004, Election Commission of India

Percentage share of seats in Gram Panchayats and Zilla Parishads, 2006

	Gram Panchayats		Zilla Parishads	
	Male	Female	Male	Female
Mahabubnagar	67	33	64	36

Source: Directorate of Economics and Statistics, A.P. Government

Candidates in Electoral Process in National Parties in
Parliamentary Election, 2004

Mahabubnagar	Male	Female
Bharatiya Janta Party	0	0
Bahujan Samaj Party	1	0
Communist Party of India	0	0
Communist Party of India (M)	0	0
Indian National Congress	1	0
Nationalist Congress Party	0	0
Total	2	0

Source: Statistical Report on General Elections 2004, Election Commission of India

(2) Economic Participation and Decision-making

Percentage Share in All India Services, 2006

	Male	Female
Mahabubnagar	2	1

Source: Directorate of Economics and Statistics, A.P. Government

Percentage Graduating from Medical and Engineering Colleges, 2006

	Male	Female
Mahabubnagar	70.1	29.9

Source: Directorate of Economics and Statistics, A.P. Government

(3) Power over Economic Resources

Estimated Earned Income per capita per annum (Rs)*

	Male	Female
Mahabubnagar	17014	9564

*calculated value

Share in Number of Operational Land Holdings, 2006

	Male	Female
Mahabubnagar	639851	129226

Source: Directorate of Economics and Statistics, A.P. Government

Number who Availed of Credit from Scheduled Commercial Banks 2006

	Male	Female
Mahabubnagar	7168	1068

Source: RBI, BSR – 1A Surveys.



Indian Institute of Public Administration



Towards a new dawn

Ministry of Women and Child Development
Government of India



United Nations Development Programme