

REPORT OF
THE WORKING GROUP ON

BORDER AREA DEVELOPMENT
PROGRAMME

FOR
THE FORMULATION OF THE TENTH FIVE
YEAR PLAN



GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
PLANNING COMMISSION
November, 2001

CONTENTS

1.	Background	1
2.	Constitution of the Working Group	11
3.	Operation of BADP: State-wise implementation during the Ninth Plan	
	a. Arunachal Pradesh	11
	b. Assam	12
	c. Bihar	13
	d. Gujarat	14
	e. Himachal Pradesh	15
	f. Jammu & Kashmir	16
	g. Manipur	17
	h. Meghalaya	18
	i. Mizoram	19
	j. Nagaland	20
	k. Punjab	21
	l. Rajasthan	22
	m. Sikkim	23
	n. Tripura	24
	o. Uttar Pradesh	25
	p. Uttaranchal	26
	q. West Bengal	27
4.	Issues & Recommendations	28
5.	Evaluation of the Border Areas Development Programme	34
6.	Annexure I - List of Border Blocks	35
7.	Annexure II - BADP Guidelines	56
8.	Annexure III(a) - OM Constituting the Working Group	64
9.	Annexure III(b) – Members nominated to the Working Group	66
10.	Annexure III(c) – List of Participants in the Working Group Meetings	67
11.	Annexure IV – Executive Summary of Evaluation Report on Border Area Development Programme (Programme Evaluation Organisation)	73

REPORT OF THE WORKING GROUP ON BORDER AREA DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME FOR THE TENTH FIVE YEAR PLAN (2002-2007)

1. Background

The Border Area Development Programme(BADP) was started during the Seventh Plan with the twin objectives of balanced development of sensitive border areas in the Western Region through adequate provision of infrastructural facilities and promotion of a sense of security amongst the local population. The programme was revamped in the Eighth Plan (1993-94) and extended to States which have an international border with Bangladesh. The nature of the Programme was changed from a schematic programme with emphasis on education to a State level Programme with emphasis on balanced development of border areas. During the Ninth Plan, the programme has been further extended to States which border Myanmar, China, Bhutan and Nepal and currently covers seventeen border States which have international land borders.

Border Area Development Programme in the Seventh Plan:

The Border Area Development Programme was included as a new cent percent Centrally funded Special Area Development Programme in the Seventh Plan with a provision of Rs.200 crore. Originally, this Programme was to be implemented by the Ministry of Home Affairs. According to the guidelines formulated by the Committee of Secretaries, the emphasis under this programme was to be on the development of infrastructure in the border areas so as to facilitate the deployment of border security forces. Infrastructural development was to include development of power, roads along with other administrative support like rest houses etc., provision of drinking water facilities and development of health and educational facilities in those areas. Under this programme provision was also to be made for the distribution and installation of community T.V. sets so as to counteract the hostile propaganda from across the border and suitably enthuse the local population. This programme was to be supplemented by the State Governments with the programmes of normal development like IRDP, DDP etc. so as to improve the income earning capacity of the people living in the border areas.

An amount of Rs.40 crore was allocated for this programme for the year 1986-87. The programme was to be implemented in the States of Gujarat, Rajasthan and Punjab with distribution of outlay as follows :

(Rs. Crore)

1.	Gujarat	11.00
2.	Rajasthan	12.00
3.	Punjab	6.00
4.	Amount committed for purchase of pistols for security forces and the state police forces and an aircraft for BSF	10.12
5.	Amount approved for issue of identity cards for four tehsils of Rajasthan	00.39
6.	Amount placed at the disposal of the Planning Commission for Research and Evaluation studies	00.50

In November, 1986, it was decided to reorient this programme so as to concentrate only on education in the border areas. This was done from 1987-88 and the programme was to mainly address technical / school /vocational education in the border areas of Gujarat, Rajasthan, Punjab and Jammu & Kashmir.

The programme was implemented according to the following guidelines evolved by the Committee of Secretaries.

- i. Strengthening of school infrastructure in border areas through Operation Black Board;
- ii. Opening of new primary schools in habitations with a population of 200, and middle schools, provided they have a catchment of 2-3 primary schools;
- iii. Designing appropriate non-formal education programmes to meet the needs of working children and girls, who cannot attend school on whole-time basis;
- iv. Opportunities for continuing education for adults in the age group 15-35, particularly establishment of Jana Shikshan Nilayams to serve as community radio/TV Centres and windows for communication of development information.
- v. Schemes capable of contributing to the unity of the nation and national integration which nurture national awareness, pride in Indianness and national identity. These may include excursions to different parts of the country, organization of youth leadership camps etc.;
- vi. Implementation of the national curricular framework with greater vigour;
- vii. Organising programmes of distance education and providing for part-time educational opportunities in sparsely populated areas;
- viii. Vocational education and Technical Training through Community Polytechnics and ITIs (including establishment of new ITIs) as well as provision of opportunities for non-formal flexible and need based vocational programmes for youth who have completed primary education, school drop-outs and neo-literates;
- ix. Use of educational technology in the spread of useful information to improve quality of education, sharpen awareness of art and culture, inculcate abiding values-both in the formal and non-formal sectors.

- x. Organising programmes for orientation and training of teachers and establishment of District Institutes of Education and training in border districts on a priority basis;
- xi. Construction of hostels for border area students in colleges, teacher training institutions, polytechnics, ITIs, etc.
- xii. Any other scheme like organization of early childhood care and education centres, special education for the physically handicapped and special programmes for educationally backward sections could be formulated in view of the special needs of the area.

Further, in 1987-88, an amount of Rs.15 crore was allotted with the approval of the Prime Minister to the Ministry of Water Resources for the Indira Gandhi Nahar Project in Rajasthan. In addition, a study on the border areas of Punjab, Rajasthan, Jammu & Kashmir was entrusted to the Centre for Research in Rural and Industrial Development, Chandigarh. Allocation was also made to the Ministry of Home Affairs for a pilot project for Issue of Identity Cards to people living in the border areas.

Thus there were four schemes operating under the Border Area Development Programme, namely, Schemes under the Ministry of Education, Indira Gandhi Nahar Project under the Ministry of Water Resources, Pilot Project on Identity Cards of the Ministry of Home Affairs and Research Study in the border areas of Punjab, Rajasthan and J&K which was being implemented by Planning Commission. Although each Ministry implemented its own programme, overall coordination was under the Planning Commission.

Allocations for the programme from 1986-87 to 1991-92 are given in the Table below :

Border Area Development Programme - Actual Expenditure during the Seventh Plan
(Rs. crore)

Programme	1986-87	1987-88	1988-89	1989-90	1990-91	1991-92	1992-93
1 Deptt. of Education (Ministry of Human Resource Dev.)	0.00	25.00	45.50	50.00	49.50	55.00	31.00
2 Indira Gandhi Nahar Project (Ministry of Water Resources)	0.00	15.00	21.00	28.75	28.60	27.80	52.00
3 Photo Identity Card (Ministry of Home Affairs)	40.00*	1.10	0.00	0.17	1.91	0.88	2.00
4 Research Studies (Planning Commission)	0.04	0.11	0.12	0.08	0.02	0.11	0.00
Total	40.04	41.21	66.62	79.00	80.03	83.79	85.00

* Includes all the programmes of the Ministry of Home Affairs.

Border Area Development Programme in the Eighth Plan:

The question of continuing BADP in the Eighth Plan (1992-97) was discussed in an internal meeting of the Planning Commission held on 21.11.1991. It was agreed that BADP should be modified to cover only situations and problems caused by the existence of an international border in areas which are contiguous to such a border. BADP was revamped from 1993-94 and reoriented from a scheme-wise programme to a state level programme. The coverage was extended to the states bordering Bangladesh also. Hence, the programme covered J&K, Punjab, Rajasthan, Gujarat, West Bengal, Assam, Meghalaya, Mizoram and Tripura.

The main objective of the Programme was balanced development of remote, inaccessible areas situated near the border, ensuring effective administration in these areas, and involving people in strengthening their resilience.

The programme continued to be a 100% Centrally funded area programme. The outlay envisaged for the Eighth Plan was Rs. 640 crore (at 1990-91 prices).

The guidelines for the programme were issued which included the setting up of an Empowered Committee at the Central level which would decide on policy matters relating to the scope of the programme, prescription of geographical limits, etc. and Screening Committees at the State level chaired by the Chief Secretary of the State which would decide the schemes to be taken up under the programme.

It was further decided that among the schemes already in operation, the Indira Gandhi Nahar Project in Rajasthan and the scheme for Issue of Photo Identity Cards to inhabitants of the border areas of the concerned states would continue to be funded under the programme.

The state-wise allocations/releases under the programme during the Eighth Plan period are given in the table below :

BADP: Allocations / Releases during the Eighth Plan

(Rs. crore)

States	1993-94		1994-95		1995-96		1996-97	
	Allocation	Releases	Allocation	Releases	Allocation	Releases	Allocation	Releases
1. Assam	3.91	3.91	4.38	4.38	4.12	4.12	4.12	4.12
2. Gujarat	6.98	6.98	7.94	7.94	8.58	8.58	8.58	8.58
3. J & K	14.00	14.00	17.50	17.50	20.68	20.68	20.68	20.68
4. Meghalaya	3.89	3.89	4.23	4.23	3.95	3.95	3.95	3.95
5. Mizoram	2.84	2.84	3.25	3.25	2.73	2.73	2.73	2.73
6. Punjab	6.45	6.45	7.88	7.88	8.54	8.54	8.54	8.54
7. Rajasthan								
i} Through Formula	19.06	19.06	20.44	20.44	25.63	25.63	25.63	25.63
ii} IGNP	52.00	52.00	60.00	60.00	60.00	60.00	60.00	60.00
8. Tripura	8.04	8.04	9.81	9.81	10.96	10.96	10.96	10.96
9. West Bengal	21.83	21.83	24.57	24.57	30.81	30.81	30.81	30.81
Total	140.00 #	140.00	160.00	160.00	176.00	176.00	176.00	176.00

Note: # : Rs. 1.00 crore was released to Govt. of Bihar for issue of photo identity cards in three districts.

Border Area Development Programme in the Ninth Plan:

In the Ninth Plan period while the general thrust of the programme has been continued from the Eighth Plan, the programme has been extended to cover all the States which have international land borders: The programme was extended to the blocks bordering Myanmar in 1997-98, to blocks bordering China in 1998-99 and to those bordering Bhutan and Nepal in 1999-2000 (Latest Guidelines of the Programme are at Annexure-I).

Coverage:

The Programme covers seventeen States namely Arunachal Pradesh, Assam, Bihar, Gujarat, Himachal Pradesh, Jammu & Kashmir, Manipur, Meghalaya, Mizoram, Nagaland, Punjab, Rajasthan, Sikkim, Tripura, Uttar Pradesh, Uttaranchal and West Bengal.

Objectives:

The main objective of the Programme is to meet the special needs of the people living in remote, inaccessible areas situated near the international border.

Funding:

The Border Area Development Programme continues to be a 100% Centrally funded Area programme. Funds are provided to the States as Special Central Assistance for execution of approved schemes on a 100% grant basis and allocated on the basis of (i) length of international border, (ii) population of border blocks and (iii) area of border blocks. Each of these criteria is given equal weightage. The border block is the spatial unit for the programme and all schemes are to be implemented within the border blocks only (List of Border Blocks is at Annexure-II). However, as the programme was extended to the States bordering Myanmar, China, Bhutan and Nepal in the Ninth Plan only and the data for these variables was not available in the first two – three years of the plan, the allocations for the newly included States were made approximately on the basis of the length of international border for which information was available from the Ministry of Home Affairs. The current level of funding of the programme does not allow the use of the formula as some of the States would stand to lose their current level of SCA. Hence, for the Ninth Plan period, the system of allocation adopted for the newly included States has continued.

Eligible Schemes:

Schemes are to be designed to take care of the special problems faced by people living in the border areas. A long term Perspective Plan for each Border block is to be prepared by the State Governments keeping in view the objectives of overall balanced development of the region. The State Governments may undertake a study of remote villages in the border blocks in order to assess the needs of the people and the critical gaps in physical and

social infrastructure. Schemes are to be drawn up based on this assessment. Grassroot institutions such as PRIs/ District Councils / Traditional Councils should be involved in identification of the priority areas to the maximum extent possible. Since the people living in the border areas must have a direct say in the selection of the schemes, village level institutions such as Gram Sabhas are to be involved in the decision making process. Appropriate modalities may be worked out by the State Governments to ensure greater participation of the people of the border areas in the selection of schemes under the Programme. Schemes which address problems such as inadequacies relating to provision of essential needs, strengthening of the social infrastructure, filling up of critical gaps in the road network etc. may be taken up under the programme. Emphasis is to be laid on schemes for employment generation, production oriented activities and schemes which provide for critical inputs in the social sector.

Security related schemes can also be taken up. However, expenditure on such schemes should not exceed 7.5% of the total allocation in a particular year. Construction of housing for crucial functionaries such as teachers, doctors, nurses etc. may be taken up in border blocks under the programme along with construction of small culverts, bridges, bridle paths, feeder roads, etc. However, expenditure on schemes including provision of basic amenities such as supply of drinking water, approach roads, etc., for the border outposts, administrative buildings and road & bridge construction taken together should not be more than 60 per cent of the total allocation in any particular year. In addition, upto 15 per cent of the total allocation could be used for maintenance of the assets already created under the Programme. The State Governments are to ensure that no single sector gets a disproportionately large share of the total allocation.

The funds under BADP are to be used for schemes in the identified border blocks only. Funds under BADP are additive to normal Central Assistance and are allocated for meeting the special problems faced by the people of the border areas. Hence, these should not be used to replace normal State Plan flows.

Executing Agencies:

To provide flexibility, schemes under the Programme can be executed by any of the following agencies :

- i. State Government;
- ii. Central Government;
- iii. Central Para-Military Organisation located in the State; and
- iv. Voluntary Agencies.
- v. Panchayati Raj Institutions/District Councils/Traditional Councils.

While the voluntary organizations and agencies have to be selected with care, having regard to security of the sensitive areas, due emphasis should be given to effective involvement of local people / democratic institutions / Voluntary agencies in order to inspire mutual trust and confidence between the Government and the people.

Empowered Committee :

Policy matters relating to the scope of the Programme, prescription of geographical limits of areas in the States within which schemes will be taken, allocation of funds to the States and similar matters for proper execution of the programme will be laid down by an Empowered Committee in the Planning Commission. The composition of the Committee is as follows :

- | | | | |
|----|--------------------------------------|---|----------|
| 1. | Secretary, Planning Commission | - | Chairman |
| 2. | Secretary, Ministry of Home Affairs | - | Member |
| 3. | Secretary, Department of Expenditure | - | Member |
| 4. | Chief Secretaries of the BADP States | - | Members |

Adviser (Multi Level Planning) of the Planning Commission is the Secretary to the Committee and the Advisers (State Plans) are permanent invitees to the Committee.

Screening Committee:

Subject to such general or special directions as may be given by the Empowered Committee, individual schemes located in each State are approved by a Screening Committee chaired by the Chief Secretary of the State. The Screening Committee also includes a representative of the Ministry of Home Affairs, not below the rank of Joint Secretary to the Government of India, representative (s) at similar level of the major para-military organisation(s), SSB operating on the State border, State Planning Secretary, or Secretary, Home Department of the State (as Convenor) and the concerned State Plan Adviser / Adviser (MLP) of the Planning Commission. The State Chief Secretary may co-opt members on the Screening Committee depending on local requirements.

The Screening Committee has complete freedom to execute the schemes through any of the five agencies mentioned above. The Screening Committee is to meet at least once in a year, preferably in February – March to finalise the schemes for the following year.

Release of funds, monitoring and review:

Before the commencement of a financial year Planning Commission informs the States of the funds available for the State during the next year under the Programme. A summary of the schemes proposed to be executed within the ceiling communicated, is sent to the Planning Commission for release of funds to the State. Funds are released in two instalments. The first release is normally made by the month of May – June after the receipt of the list of schemes, duly approved by the Screening Committee along with expenditure incurred till the last quarter of the previous year. The second release is made after October depending on physical and financial progress

but not later than February after adjusting unspent balance, if any of the previous year.

State Governments are required to have a separate budget head for the Programme.

Quarterly progress reports are to be submitted scheme wise giving actual physical and financial achievements and not in percentage terms. The quarterly progress reports are to be sent as soon as possible so as to enable Planning Commission to release Special Central Assistance.

Allocations / Releases:

The allocations / releases during the Ninth Plan period have been as follows:

BADP : Allocations / Releases during the Ninth Plan

(Rs. Crore)

States	1997-98		1998-99		1999-2000		2000-01		2001-02
	Allocation	Releases	Allocation	Releases	Allocation	Releases	Revised Allocation	Releases	Allocation
1. Assam	4.12	2.06	4.27	4.27	7.20	7.20	7.48	3.74	7.48
2. Gujarat	8.58	8.58	8.88	8.88	9.87	9.87	10.26	10.26	10.26
3. J & K	20.68	10.34	31.38	31.38	33.52	33.52	34.85	39.65	34.85
4. Meghalaya	3.95	3.95	4.11	4.11	4.52	4.52	4.70	4.70	4.70
5. Mizoram	6.73	6.73	6.82	6.82	8.00	8.00	8.32	12.32	8.32
6. Punjab	8.54	8.54	8.82	7.72	9.70	9.70	10.08	14.08	10.08
7. Rajasthan									
i) Formula	25.63	25.63	26.52	26.52	29.17	29.17	30.32	30.32	30.32
ii) IGNP	60.00	60.00	30.00	30.00	8.00	8.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
8. Tripura	10.96	10.96	11.34	11.34	12.47	12.47	12.96	12.96	12.96
9. West Bengal	30.81	15	31.86	29.38	38.05	38.05	39.56	37.99	39.56
10. Arunachal	4.00	4.00	11.00	11.00	13.00	13.00	13.51	6.75	13.51
11. Manipur	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.16	4.16	4.16
12. Nagaland	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.16	4.16	4.16
13. Himachal	0.00	0.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.16	8.16	4.16
14. Sikkim	0.00	0.00	4.00	4.00	5.50	5.50	5.72	4.63	5.72
15. Uttar Pradesh	0.00	0.00	4.00	4.00	12.00	12.00	8.32	8.32	8.32
16. Uttaranchal	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	4.16	4.16	4.16
17. Bihar	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	7.00	7.00	7.28	3.64	7.28
Total	196.00 *	163.79	195.00	191.52	210.00	210.00	210.00	210.00	210.00 **

Note:

* 1997-98 : Rs. 4 crore were left unallocated for Myanmar Border States.

** Actual = Rs. 240.00 crore.

2. Constitution of the Working Group for the Border Area Development Programme

In order to assess the operation of the programme in the Ninth Five Year Plan and to develop a framework for the programme in the Tenth Plan, it was decided to set up a Working Group for the Border Area Development Programme (O.M. Constituting the Working Group may kindly be seen at Annexure-III(a), List of Members at Annexure III(b) and List of participants in the meetings at Annexure III(c)). The Working Group also acknowledges the contribution and support received from Dr. Indu Patnaik, Deputy Adviser (MLP) and Shri B.B. Sharma, Research Officer (MLP) without whose assistance this report would not have been produced.

The terms of reference of the Working Group are as follows:

- (i) To review the impact of the BADP and bring out achievements and failures, if any, together with necessary remedial measures;
- (ii) To recommend policy framework for the development of areas under BADP during Tenth Five Year Plan, keeping in view the status of the development, needs and aspirations of the local people;
- (iii) To identify activities which fit into the specific needs of the areas under BADP;
- (iv) To suggest strategies and measures for long-term integrated development of the areas under the programme; and
- (v) To suggest administrative, operational and organizational measures both at the Centre and the State level for effective implementation and monitoring of the Programme.

3.Operation of BADP: State-wise Implementation during the Ninth Five Year Plan

ARUNACHAL PRADESH

The Border Area Development Programme (BADP) covers 20 blocks in 10 districts which border Myanmar, China & Bhutan. The total population of these blocks is 150179 as per 1981 Census while the total area is 18663 Sq. Kms. The length of the international border with Myanmar is 520 Kms, with China 1126 Kms and Bhutan 217 Kms.

The year-wise allocation and releases are as under :

Year	Allocation	Release
1997-98	4.00	4.00
1998-99	11.00	11.00
1999-2k	13.00	13.00
2000-01	13.51	6.75
2001-02	13.51	6.75

(Rs. Crore)

The State Government has undertaken schemes in the following sectors - Roads & Bridges, Community Halls and Community Centres, Health, Irrigation and Education (including hostels and school buildings).

Operational details

The State Government has an unspent balance of Rs. 6.89 crore as on 1.4.2001. The State Government has furnished the Quarterly Progress Reports upto 1999-2000. The Utilization Certificates have also been received from 1997-98 to 1999-2000. The second instalment for 2000-01 was not released to the State Government owing to the large unspent balance. The first instalment of Special Central Assistance (SCA) has been recommended for release to the State Government for 2001-02.

ASSAM

The Border Area Development Programme (BADP) covers 19 blocks in seven districts which border Bangladesh & Bhutan. The total population of these blocks is 2474912 as per 1981 Census while the total area is 5130.32 Sq. Kms. The State has an international border of 262 Kms with Bangladesh and 267 Kms with Bhutan.

The year-wise allocation and releases are as under :

Year	Allocation	Release
1993-94	3.91	3.91
1994-95	4.38	4.38
1995-96	4.12	4.12
1996-97	4.12	4.12
1997-98	4.12	2.06
1998-99	4.27	4.27
1999-2k	7.20	7.20
2000-01	7.48	3.74
2001-02	7.48	-

The State Government has undertaken schemes in the following sectors - Roads, School Buildings, Water Supply, Health and Community Centres.

Operational details

The progress of the schemes in the State are a cause for concern. The State Government was not released the second instalment of Rs. 3.74 crore for 2000-01 owing to the large unspent balance as on 30.6.2001. The State Government has an unspent balance of Rs. 12.18 crore. The State Government have furnished the Utilization Certificates (UC) upto 31st March, 2000. Quarterly Progress Reports have been received upto 30th June, 2001. The first instalment for the current year has not been released as the State Government has not yet convened the meeting of the Steering Committee to decide the schemes for the current year.

BIHAR

The Border Area Development Programme (BADP) covers 31 blocks in seven districts which border Nepal. The total population of these blocks is 3738325 as per 1981 Census while the total area is 18438.01 Sq. Kms. The length of the international border is 729 Kms.

The year-wise allocation and releases are as under :

Year	Allocation	Release
1993-94	1.00	1.00*
1999-2k	7.00	7.00
2000-01	7.28	3.64
2001-02	7.28	-

* Rs. 1.00 crore was released to the Govt. of Bihar for the scheme for issue of Photo Identity Cards in three districts.

The State Government is undertaking schemes in the following sectors - Roads, Rural Electrification, and Education.

Operational details

The State Government has an unspent balance of Rs. 5.05 crore as on 1.4.2001. No Utilization Certificate and Quarterly Progress Report has been received from the State Government since the inception of the Programme. Only Rs. 5.59 crore have been spent by the State Government for which scheme-wise details are not available.

GUJARAT

The Border Area Development Programme (BADP) covers 8 blocks in three districts which border Pakistan. The total population of these blocks is 1057328 as per 1981 Census while the total area is 18346 Sq. Kms. The length of the international border is 508 Kms.

The year-wise allocation and releases are as under :

Year	Allocation	(Rs. Crore)
		Release
1993-94	6.98	6.98
1994-95	7.94	7.94
1995-96	8.58	8.58
1996-97	8.58	8.58
1997-98	8.58	8.58
1998-99	8.88	8.88
1999-2k	9.87	9.87
2000-01	10.26	10.26
2001-02	10.26	-

The State Government has undertaken schemes in the following sectors - Energy, Road Development, Health, Water Supply, Irrigation and Security.

Operational details

The State Government has an unspent balance of Rs. 15.38 crore as on 30th September, 2001. Quarterly Progress Reports for the Quarter ending September, 2001 have been received. No Utilization Certificate (s) has been received since the inception of the programme. The first instalment for the current year has not been released to the State Government owing to the large unspent balance.

HIMACHAL PRADESH

The Border Area Development Programme (BADP) covers 3 blocks in two districts which border China. The total population of these blocks is 50978 as per 1981 Census while the total area is 12809 Sq. Kms. The length of the international border is 201 Kms.

The year-wise allocation and releases are as under :

(Rs. Crore)

Year	Allocation	Release
1998-99	4.00	4.00
1999-2k	4.00	4.00
2000-01	4.16	8.16*
2001-02	4.16	2.08

*Includes Additional Allocation of Rs. 4 crore as one-time Special Central Assistance

The State Government has undertaken schemes in the following sectors - Irrigation, Construction of Quarters for Police Department, Education, Roads & Bridges, Health, Power, Training to Youth in computer Education, Soil Conservation, Community Development and development of Leo village as model village.

Operational details

The State Government has an unspent balance of Rs. 5.15 crore as on 1.4.2001. The State Govt. has furnished the expenditure till March, 2001. Utilization Certificates have also been received upto 31st March, 2000. The release of the first instalment of Rs. 2.08 crore for 2001-02 has been recommended.

JAMMU & KASHMIR

The Border Area Development Programme (BADP) covers 44 blocks in nine districts which border Pakistan and China. This programme was extended to China Border in 1998-99.

The year-wise allocation and releases are as under :

Year	Allocation	Release
1993-94	14.00	14.00
1994-95	17.50	17.50
1995-96	20.68	20.68
1996-97	20.68	20.68
1997-98	20.68	10.34
1998-99	31.38	31.38
1999-2k	33.52	33.52
2000-01	34.85	39.65*
2001-02	34.85	17.43

*Includes Additional allocation of Rs. 4.80 crore as one-time Special Central Assistance.

The State Government has undertaken schemes in the following sectors - Education, Health, Construction (Community Centres, Link Roads and Bridges), Rural Sanitation, Power, Water Supply, Agriculture, Social Forestry, Food & Supplies, Irrigation & Flood Control, Animal / Sheep Husbandry, Horticulture, Information, Development of Public Parks and Industry (Development of Handlooms / Handicrafts). Major share of the SCA is being spent on construction of Roads & Bridges, Health and Education.

Operational details

The State Government has an unspent balance of Rs. 17.26 crore (Rs. 6.54 crore for Pakistan Border and Rs. 10.72 crore for China Border) as on 1.4.2001. Quarterly Progress Reports have been received upto September, 2001. Utilization Certificates have not been furnished by the State Government since the inception of the programme. The release of the first instalment of Rs. 17.43 crore for 2001-02 has been recommended.

MANIPUR

The Border Area Development Programme (BADP) covers 8 blocks in three districts which border Myanmar. The total population of these blocks is 147352 as per 1981 Census while the total area is 9570 Sq. Kms. The length of the international border is 398 Kms.

The year-wise allocation and releases are as under :

Year	Allocation	Release
1997-98	4.00	4.00
1998-99	4.00	4.00
1999-2k	4.00	4.00
2000-01	4.16	4.16
2001-02	4.16	2.08

The State Government has undertaken schemes in the following sectors
- Education, Agriculture, Health, Roads & Bridges, Construction (Yatri Niwas/ Auditorium, Parks, Marketing Sheds and Police Station Buildings), etc.

Operational details

The State Government has an unspent balance of Rs. 5.80 crore as on 1.4.2001. The State Government has submitted the Actual Expenditure from 1997-98 to 2000-2001 upto quarter ending December, 2000. For the last Quarter for these years the State Government has submitted only the Anticipated Expenditure. No Utilization Certificate(s) have been received except for the year 1999-2000. The release of the first instalment of Rs. 2.08 crore for 2001-02 has been recommended.

MEGHALAYA

The Border Area Development Programme (BADP) covers 16 blocks in five districts which border Bangladesh. The total population of these blocks is 300795 as per 1981 Census while the total area is 5136.04 Sq. Kms. The length of the international border is 443 Kms.

The year-wise allocation and releases are as under :

(Rs. Crore)

Year	Allocation	Release
1993-94	3.89	3.89
1994-95	4.23	4.23
1995-96	3.95	3.95
1996-97	3.95	3.95
1997-98	3.95	3.95
1998-99	4.11	4.11
1999-2k	4.52	4.52
2000-01	4.70	4.70
2001-02	4.70	2.35

The State Government has undertaken schemes in the following sectors - Construction (school buildings, community halls, foot bridges, foot path, market stalls, public toilets), Fisheries, Roads, Bee keeping, Bakery, Piggery, Drinking Water Supply, Agriculture, Sericulture, Health, Sports and Industry.

Operational details

The State Government has no unspent balance as on 30th September, 2001. Quarterly Progress Reports have been received till 2000-2001 upto quarter ending September, 2001. Utilisation Certificates have been received till 2000-01. The State Government has been released Rs. 2.35 crore as first instalment of SCA for 2001-2002.

MIZORAM

The Border Area Development Programme (BADP) covers 12 blocks in seven districts which border Myanmar. The total population of these blocks is 202831 as per 1981 Census while the total area is 11944.31 Sq. Kms. The length of the international border is 828 Kms.

The year-wise allocation and releases are as under :

(Rs. Crore)

Year	Allocation	Release
1993-94	2.84	2.84
1994-95	3.25	3.25
1995-96	2.73	2.73
1996-97	2.73	2.73
1997-98	6.73	6.73
1998-99	6.82	6.82
1999-2k	8.00	8.00
2000-01	8.32	12.32*
2001-02	8.32	8.32

*Includes Additional Allocation of Rs. 4.00 crore as one-time SCA

The State Government has undertaken schemes in the following sectors - Construction (Roads, Community Halls, & Play Grounds, School buildings and Hostels, Bus Stand, Circuit House, Orphanage and Library building), Water Supply, Medical and Public Health, Electrification and Education.

Operational details

As per the quarterly progress report received till September,2001, the State Government has no unspent balance. The State Government has yet to submit Utilization Certificates for 1997-98 and 1998-99. Planning Commission has recommended the release of both the instalments for the current year.

NAGALAND

The Border Area Development Programme (BADP) covers 7 blocks in three districts which border Myanmar. The total population of these blocks is 100773 as per 1981 Census while the total area is 1884.26 Sq. Kms. The length of the international border is 215 Kms.

The year-wise allocation and releases are as under :

(Rs. Crore)

Year	Allocation	Release
1997-98	4.00	4.00
1998-99	4.00	4.00
1999-2k	4.00	4.00
2000-01	4.16	4.16
2001-02	4.16	2.08

The State Government has undertaken schemes in the following sectors - Education, Health, Agriculture & Allied Sector and Social Sector.

Operational details

The State Government have furnished the Utilization Certificates upto 1999-2000. The State Government has an unutilized balance of Rs. 4.88 crore as on 1.4.2001. Detailed Quarterly Progress Report has been received from 1997-98 to 1999-2000.

PUNJAB

The Border Area Development Programme (BADP) covers 16 blocks in three districts which border Pakistan. The total population of these blocks is 1467400 as per 1981 Census while the total area is 6473.00 Sq. Kms. The length of the international border is 553 Kms.

The year-wise allocation and releases are as under :

(Rs. Crore)		
Year	Allocation	Release
1993-94	6.45	5.45
1994-95	7.88	7.88
1995-96	8.54	8.54
1996-97	8.54	8.54
1997-98	8.54	8.54
1998-99	8.82	7.72
1999-2k	9.70	9.70
2000-01	10.08	14.08*
2001-02	10.08	10.08

* Additional Allocation of Rs. 4 crore as one-time SCA.

The State Government has undertaken schemes in the following sectors - Rural Water Supply, Health & Family Welfare, Technical Education & Industrial Training, Education, Home (Political), Rural Development, Dairy Development, Welfare, Sports & Youth Services.

Operational details

The State Government has no unspent balance pending with them as on 1.4.2001. Quarterly Progress Report has been received upto December, 2000 and one figure of expenditure (without Schemewise details) for 2000-2001 has been received. Utilization Certificates have been received from 1993-94 to 2000-2001 but these are not in proper shape and Utilization Certificates for first instalment of SCA released for 2001-02 has also been received.. The State Government has been requested in this regard. Planning Commission has recommended the release of both the instalments for the current year.

RAJASTHAN

The Border Area Development Programme (BADP) covers 13 blocks in four districts which border Pakistan. The total population of these blocks is 1983765 as per 1981 Census while the total area is 73958.81 Sq. Kms. The length of the international border is 1037 Kms.

The year-wise allocation and releases are as under :

(Rs. Crore)

Year	Allocation		Release	
	Through Formula	I.G.N.P.	Through Formula	I.G.N.P.
1993-94	19.06	52.00	19.06	52.00
1994-95	20.44	60.00	20.44	60.00
1995-96	25.63	60.00	25.63	60.00
1996-97	25.63	60.00	25.63	60.00
1997-98	25.63	60.00	25.63	60.00
1998-99	26.52	30.00	26.52	30.00
1999-2k	29.17	8.00	29.17	8.00
2000-01	30.32	-	30.32	-
2001-02	30.32	-	15.16	-

The State Government has undertaken schemes in the following sectors - Education, Health, Agriculture & Allied Sector, Infrastructure (Road & Bridges), Drinking Water Supply, Electrification, Security, Social Welfare, Medical & Health.

Operational details

The State Government has an unspent balance of Rs. 1.07 crore as on 30.9.2001. Quarterly Progress Reports have been received upto quarter ending September, 2001. The State Government has furnished the Utilization Certificate(s) upto 31st March, 2000. The State Government has been released Rs. 15.16 crore as first instalment of SCA for 2001-2002.

SIKKIM

The Border Area Development Programme (BADP) covers 17 blocks in three districts which border China, Bhutan and Nepal. The total population of these blocks is 14698 as per 1981 Census while the total area is 133.76 Sq. Kms. The length of the international border is 220 Kms. with China, 99 Kms. with Nepal and 32 Kms. with Bhutan.

The year-wise allocation and releases are as under :

Year	Allocation	Release
1998-99	4.00	4.00
1999-2k	5.50	5.50
2000-01	5.72	4.63
2001-02	5.72	2.86

The State Government has undertaken schemes in the following sectors - Forest, Power, Irrigation and Flood Control, Roads & Bridges, Health & Family Welfare, Cooperative, Food & Civil Supplies, Science & Technology, Animal Husbandry and Culture.

Operational details

The State Government has an unspent balance of Rs. 1.48 crore as on 1.4.2001. The State Government has furnished the Quarterly Progress Reports upto 2000-2001. No Utilization Certificates have been received since the inception of the programme. The State Government has been released Rs. 2.86 crore as first instalment of SCA for 2001-2002.

TRIPURA

The Border Area Development Programme (BADP) covers 38 blocks in four districts which border Bangladesh. The total population of these blocks is 2924504 as per 1981 Census while the total area is 10172.08 Sq. Kms. The length of the international border is 856 Kms.

The year-wise allocation and releases are as under :

(Rs. Crore)

Year	Allocation	Release
1993-94	8.04	8.04
1994-95	9.81	9.81
1995-96	10.96	10.96
1996-97	10.96	10.96
1997-98	10.96	10.96
1998-99	11.34	11.34
1999-2k	12.47	12.47
2000-01	12.96	12.96
2001-02	12.96	6.48

The State Government has undertaken schemes in the following sectors - Agriculture, Health, Roads, Minor irrigation, Fisheries, Education and Science & Technology.

Operational details

The State Government has not furnished Utilization Certificates since the inception of the programme. Quarterly Progress Reports upto March, 2001 have been received. There is no unspent balance pending with the State Government as on 1.4.2001. Rs. 6.48 crore has been released to the State Government as first instalment of SCA for the year 2001-2002.

UTTAR PRADESH

The Border Area Development Programme (BADP) covers 19 blocks in seven districts which border Nepal. The total population of these blocks is 2364696 as per 1981 Census while the total area is 171852.51 Sq. Kms. The length of the international border is 742.5 Kms.

The year-wise allocation and releases are as under :

Year	Allocation	Release
1998-99	4.00	4.00
1999-2k	12.00	12.00
2000-01	8.32	8.32
2001-02	8.32	4.16

The State Government has undertaken schemes in the following sectors - Medical & Public Health, Irrigation, Animal Husbandry, Forests, Solar Energy, Construction (Buildings and residential accommodation for panchayats), Rural Development, Roads & Bridges, Dairy Development, Soil Conservation and Education

Operational details

The State Government has no unspent balance as on 1.4.2001. The State Government has submitted Quarterly Progress Reports upto 30.9.2001. Utilization Certificates have been received from 1998-99 to 2000-01. The release of the first instalment of SCA of Rs. 4.16 crore for 2001-02 has been recommended.

UTTARANCHAL

The Border Area Development Programme (BADP) covers 9 blocks in five districts which border Nepal & China. The total population of these blocks is 427009 as per 1981 Census while the total area is 15142.92 Sq. Kms. The length of the international border is 80.5 Kms. with Nepal and 344 Kms. with China.

The year-wise allocation and releases are as under :

Year	Allocation	Release
2000-01	4.16	4.16
2001-02	4.16	-

The State Government has not furnished the list of schemes in spite of repeated requests.

Operational details

The State Government has an unspent balance of Rs. 4.16 crore as on 1.4.2001.

The State Government has not furnished the Quarterly Progress Report for 2000-2001. The State Government has not submitted the list of schemes which had been taken up for implementation in 2000-01. Utilization Certificates have also not been received so far. The State Government have not yet convened the State Level Screening Committee meeting for 2001-02.

WEST BENGAL

The Border Area Development Programme (BADP) covers 69 blocks in 9 districts which border Bangladesh, Bhutan and Nepal. The total population of these blocks is 10811838 as per 1981 Census while the total area is 17483.82 Sq. Kms. The length of the international border with Bangladesh is 2216.70 Kms, 183 Kms with Bhutan and 100 Kms with Nepal.

The year-wise allocation and releases are as under :

(Rs. Crore)

Year	Allocation	Release
1993-94	21.83	21.83
1994-95	24.57	24.57
1995-96	30.81	30.81
1996-97	30.81	30.81
1997-98	30.81	15.00
1998-99	31.86	29.38
1999-2k	38.05	38.05
2000-01	39.56	37.99
2001-02	39.56	19.78

The State Government has undertaken schemes in the following sectors - Roads & Bridges, Education, Water Supply, Construction (Police Station, Parks & Gardens, Community Halls, Public Toilets and Bus Stands), Electrification, Purchase of T.V. Sets, Flood Protection Work, Development of Play Grounds, Purchase of Computers and Medical & Public Health.

Operational details

The State Government has an unspent balance of Rs. 19.31 crore as on 30.9.2001. The State Government has submitted the Quarterly Progress Reports upto quarter ending September, 2001. The State has furnished Utilisation Certificates for Rs. 140.54 crore against the release of Rs. 190.45 crore made from 1993-94 to 1999-2000. The first instalment of Rs. 19.78 crore has been recommended for release to the State Government.

4. Issues and Recommendations

1. Continuation of the Programme with Special Central Assistance as an additive with funds earmarked for border blocks

All the State Governments which have sent their views support the continuation of the programme as a separate entity. Most of the States have reported that with the introduction of Border Area Development Programme, it had been possible for the State Governments to take up special schemes for the development of the remote and inaccessible border areas. In the absence of the Programme, the State Governments may not be in a position to take up such schemes from their own meager resources. The Government of West Bengal have informed that the programme provides scope to involve the people of the remote border areas to improve their economic status and helps to create the required infrastructure. Implementation of BADP also removes the feeling of alienation from the minds of the people living in remote border areas. The Government of Tripura is of the opinion that under the existing set-up effective monitoring is possible. The system also ensures judicious allocation of resources between schemes.

Hence, as per the views of the State Governments, the Border Area Development Programme should continue as a separate programme under the administrative control of Planning Commission .

2. Use of criteria for allocation of funds

The State Governments of Uttar Pradesh, Meghalaya, Rajasthan and Bihar support the existing criteria for allocation of funds. The Governments of Himachal Pradesh and Sikkim are of the opinion that accessibility should also be used as a criteria for allocation of funds. The State Governments of Punjab, Mizoram, Gujarat and Assam support the use of security sensitivity as a criterion for the allocation of funds under the Programme. The Government of Punjab is of the opinion that the number of skirmishes, cross border terrorism and smuggling, etc., in the border areas may be considered as a yardstick for security sensitivity and that the international borders may be divided into three categories : highly volatile, volatile and peaceful. Both the Governments of Punjab and Mizoram are of the opinion that the determination of the security sensitivity index may be left to the Ministry of Home Affairs. The use of security sensitivity index is however not supported by the State Governments of Meghalaya and Rajasthan. The Government of Assam is of the opinion that factors such as security sensitivity, remoteness, inaccessibility and cost of construction should be considered as criteria for distribution of Special Central Assistance. The use of cost of construction as a criteria is also supported by the Government of Sikkim. The Government of Assam has communicated that security sensitivity alone should not be the sole criterion for distribution of funds since the other factors are also equally important for making fair and reasonable allocations. The Government of Nagaland is of the opinion that along with security sensitivity , the following other criteria may also be included, namely, remoteness, terrain, basic development in areas such as education, road, water supply, health care etc. The Government of Tripura has suggested

that 50 per cent of the funds should be distributed on the basis of a composite index of security sensitivity and the balance 50 per cent based on the existing criteria. Government of Punjab has suggested that 20 per cent of the funds should be distributed on the basis of performance at the discretion of the Deputy Chairman, Planning Commission.

The use of security sensitivity index can be highly subjective. It may be appropriate to request the Home Ministry to work out an agreed index of security sensitivity in consultation with the State Governments and then assign an appropriate weight. Regarding accessibility/ cost of construction also it is difficult to draw up an objective data base.

Hence, it may be appropriate to continue with the existing criteria, till Ministry of Home Affairs is able to arrive at an agreed index of security sensitivity.

3. Involvement of PRIs/District Councils/ Traditional Councils

The Government of Assam have informed that as per the guidelines of Planning Commission issued in August, 2000, block level committees with members of public representatives / officials have already been constituted in the State to identify the schemes for implementation. The State Government has informed that the Block Level Committees will serve the purpose but PRIs may also be included in the process. The State Government of Himachal Pradesh have informed that the Project Advisory Committees have been constituted under the chairmanship of the local MLA for ITDP Kinnaur and Spiti. The other members include the Members of the Tribal Advisory Council, Chairman Zila Parishad, Vice Chairman Zila Parishad, Chairman Panchayat Samiti, Vice Chairman, Panchayat Samiti, two Pradhans of Gram Panchayats to be nominated by the Government etc., so that ITDP level Plan is formulated by involving the local public representatives, as such participation of PRIs is ensured in the formulation of the plan and in other developmental activities relating to local area.

The Government of Punjab have reported that Panchayati Raj Institutions are already being consulted while deciding the allocation of funds and there is no need for any other change.

The Government of Meghalaya have informed that there is a recognized Village Durbar in each village which is a strong traditional institution. Each village selects its own schemes as per its needs and priority. Implementation of the schemes is entrusted to the Village Committee formed by the Village Durbar and their work is satisfactory taking into the account the time factor, the quality of work and the amount spent. The State Government has therefore requested that the current system should therefore, be allowed to continue.

The Government of Mizoram has informed that though the involvement of the Village Councils / District Councils is not institutionalized in Mizoram, the Village Councils have always been consulted and the felt needs of the people have always been taken into account while preparing and finalizing the

proposals under BADP. This arrangement has been found adequate and it is felt that the involvement of PRIs / District Councils need not be institutionalized in the context of Mizoram and implementation of the programmes may be left the discretion of the State Government.

The Government of Gujarat have constituted a District Level Committee for BADP in which local MPs / MLAs and representatives of the people are members. The State Government has already decentralized the power of decision making and selection / implementation of schemes. However, the total and ultimate control should be with the Screening Committee for effective implementation of the programme.

The Government of Rajasthan have stated that the schemes / projects are finalized by the governing council of the DRDA, where Zila Pramukh is the chairman and all the MLAs / MPs / Pradhans of Panchayat Samitis etc. are members. Hence, the State has already institutionalized the involvement of PRIs and public representatives in the choice and implementation of schemes / projects. The State Government has suggested that necessary amendments may be made in the guidelines wherein the selection of schemes / projects is to be done by governing councils of DRDAs and finalized by the State Level Screening Committee.

The Government of Nagaland have informed that the local village institutions are already involved in drawing up and implementing the schemes under BADP. Hence institutionalizing their involvement is acceptable to the State Government.

The Government of Manipur have stated that there are no PRIs in the border areas and district councils are also at present superceded. However, the District Councils are likely to be operationalised in the near future with the holding of elections. Once they are functional, they can be actively associated in the choice and implementation of the schemes. For identification of schemes / works, a committee at the district level with DC, local MLAs / BDOs and local bodies may be constituted to prepare a perspective plan for each border district. This Committee may be actively involved both in the selection as well as monitoring of the schemes.

The Government of West Bengal have informed that schemes are selected on the basis of priority attached by the District Planning Committees and the availability of funds. All schemes except those of para-military and Central Organisations require prior clearance of the District Planning Committees of the respective districts. Thus involvement of the people's representatives in the selection of schemes is ensured.

The Government of Bihar have informed that the State Government is of the view that PRIs should be involved in the selection / implementation of schemes under BADP.

The Government of Sikkim and Tripura have stated that they favour local participation in the Programme.

Hence, most of the State Governments are already involving the local people in the selection and implementation of schemes. Considering the varying nature and effectiveness of local bodies, it may not be appropriate to lay down strict guidelines of institutionalizing the involvement of PRIs/ District Councils etc.

4. Sectoral ceilings on schemes

As per the guidelines for the programme, security related schemes are to be limited to 7.5% of the total annual allocation. Further, expenditure on provision of basic amenities such as supply of drinking water, approach roads, etc., for the border outposts; administrative buildings and road & bridge construction taken together should not be more than 60 per cent of the total allocation in any particular year. In addition, upto 15 per cent of the total allocation can be used for maintenance of the assets already created under the Programme.

The Government of Manipur has requested that the ceiling of 7.5% on security related schemes be relaxed so that police stations can be strengthened in the border towns/border areas with Myanmar which have base camps of insurgent groups.

The Government of Gujarat have suggested that the ceiling on the maintenance of assets may be raised to 25%.

The Government of Assam has suggested that sectoral ceilings may be made generally more flexible.

The State Governments of Rajasthan and Mizoram have requested that administrative cost should be allowed under the programme.

The allocation under BADP is relatively meagre and it may not be advisable to allow for administrative costs. The ceiling of 60% on administrative buildings and road and bridge construction has been primarily imposed to ensure that income generating activities and social sector infrastructure are not ignored. The ceiling of 7.5% on security related activities has been imposed as BADP is primarily a development programme.

5. Eligible Schemes

The guidelines for the programme give an illustrative list of schemes which can be taken up. This list is not complete nor does it purport to be all encompassing. The aim is to guide the states as to the type of schemes which can be taken up. Normally, Planning Commission has a very liberal approach as the felt needs of the people vary from area to area and generally it is only ensured that sectoral ceilings are adhered to. However, in a few cases such as land acquisition costs, repair / construction of private property, etc., the State Governments have been requested to change the schemes.

The Government of Rajasthan has suggested that the guidelines should only give a list of schemes which are not allowed. In this connection it is stated it would be very difficult to prepare such a list.

The Government of Bihar have requested that larger road schemes should be permitted. The Government of Bihar had submitted only one big scheme initially for a single road which was not agreed to. The main reason was that as per the guidelines no sector should get a disproportionately large share of funds as this would not meet the needs and aspirations of the local people.

6. Extension of coverage

Currently, the spatial unit for BADP is the block and all the blocks which have international borders are covered under the programme. It has been decided to limit the programme to border blocks rather than border districts as the funds would be spread too thinly to have any appreciable impact in the border areas. The State Governments of Gujarat and Rajasthan have requested that the entire border district be covered rather than just blocks on the international border.

The Government of Tripura is of the opinion that the entire State needs to be treated as a border State as all the four districts have international boundaries and almost all the towns including the State Capital are within 2-3 Kms from the international border.

The Government of Gujarat has also requested that the coastal border be included under the programme. This request had been made earlier also and was examined in detail. It was felt that as the funds available under the programme have not increased appreciably over the years and a large hike in the availability of funds is not envisaged in the Tenth Plan period, extension of the programme to sea borders would decrease the existing level of funding to States as there would be demands from other States/UTs particularly Maharashtra, Daman & Diu and Tamil Nadu for coverage also. In this case, the entire country except Madhya Pradesh, Jharkhand and Chhatisgarh would have to be brought within the purview of the programme.

In fact, the allocation of funds to the states bordering Myanmar, China, Nepal and Bhutan has been made roughly on the basis of length of international border alone and is still ad-hoc as even with the increase in the fund availability by Rs. 30.00 crore in the current year, it has not been possible to apply the extant formula. Application of the formula was tried for the current year but some of the States were getting a lower level of funding than they received in 2000-01. Hence, it was decided that the present system could continue until adequate hike was available in the allocation for the programme to allow the application of the formula.

7. Timely release of funds

The release of funds is a 2 to 3 step process by which first the funds are recommended for release by Planning Commission and are subsequently released by Ministry of Finance to the State Governments; the State Finance departments then release the funds to the nodal department / concerned implementing agencies.

Delay in the release of funds from the Centre to the State Governments is primarily owing to the delay in finalisation of schemes by the Screening Committees in most cases and secondly due to non-fulfillment of the guidelines such as submission of progress reports, utilisation certificates etc.

It has been seen that even after the funds are released to the State Governments, the implementing departments may get them only after a time lag of six months to a year or even more as they are used for ways and mean support by the State Governments. Hence the State Governments have been requested to let us know if the funds have been released to the implementing departments before releases are made.

The Border Areas Department of the Government of Meghalaya has reported that the State Government takes 5-6 months to release the funds. Hence, Special Central Assistance may be released to a specialized agency such as the District Rural Development Agency. The Government of Assam also supports the setting up of a separate agency.

As the institutional arrangements vary from State to State, it may not be appropriate for the Central Government to release the funds to a particular agency. As per practice, Planning Commission has been recommending the release only to the State Governments which is not only a time tested practice, but does not impinge on Centre – State relations.

8. Timing of release of funds

The State Government of Himachal Pradesh has suggested that the second instalment be released in the month of July of the respective year owing to the fact that most of the areas are snow bound for a large part of the year. The States which are snow bound could submit their progress reports earlier and on the basis of expenditure upto the quarter ending June, the second instalment could be released. The guidelines could be changed accordingly.

5. Evaluation of the Border Area Development Programme

The Border Area Development Programme was evaluated by the Programme Evaluation Organisation of Planning Commission during the period 1996-97. The study was carried out in six states namely, Assam, Gujarat, Punjab, Rajasthan, Tripura and West Bengal.

The executive summary of the report of the Programme Evaluation Organisation is at Annexure-IV. The main conclusion of the study is that to a large extent BADP has contributed towards creating an enabling environment for undertaking normal economic activities in border areas and expanding development opportunities for the local population. However, the degree of success varies between states and across sectors in a State.

					Annexure-1	
Border Area Development Programme - List of Border Blocks						
State	Block / Taluka	District	Population -1981	Area (Sq. Kms.)	Length of International border (Kms.)	
Arunachal Pradesh						
Myanmar border:						
	Namsang	Tirap	7371	1092		
	Pongchau-Wakka	Tirap	15473	618		
	Changland	Changland	10538	1554		
	Nampong-Manmao	Changland	9737	N.A.		
	Khagam	Changland	16579	499		
		TOTAL	59698	3763	520*	
China Border:						
	Hayuliang	Lohit	6797	N.A.		
	Hawai-Walong	Lohit	3716	N.A.		
	Anini-Etalín	Dibang Valley	4877	600		
	Hunli-Kronli	Dibang Valley	4222	300		
	Tuting	Upper Siang	3849	3681		
	Mechuka	West Siang	2644	2897		
	Nacho-Siyum	Upper Subansiri	7573	N.A.		
	Ruri-Damin	Lower Subansiri	4547	N.A.		
	Koloriang	Lower Subansiri	5419	N.A.		
	Dirang	West Kameng	12620	585		
	Nafra-Buragaon	West Kameng	3866	6167		
		TOTAL	60130	14230	1126*	
Bhutan border:						
	Kalaktang	West Kameng	8206	670		
	Tawang	Tawang	9111	N.A.		
	Lumle-Zemithang	Tawang	7082	N.A.		
	Mukto-Thingbu	Tawang	5952	N.A.		
		TOTAL	30351	670	217*	
		GRAND TOTAL	150179	18663	1863*	

State	Block / Taluka	District	Population -1981	Area (Sq. Kms.)	Length of International border (Kms.)
Assam	Agomoni	Dhubri	132061	256	
Bangladesh Border:	Gauripur	Dhubri	172329	345.6	
	Golokganj	Dhubri	109320	281.6	
	Mankachar	Dhubri	125896	186.88	
	North Karimganj	Karimganj	100086	147.1	
	Patherkandi	Karimganj	174629	678.6	
	Lowairopa				
	South Karimganj	Karimganj	196305	222.6	
	Badarpur	Karimganj	101382	136.4	
	Katigora	Cachar	193980	403.7	
		TOTAL	1305988	2658.48	262*
Bhutan Border:	Goverdhana	Barpeta	162207	301.73	
	Jalah	Barpeta	147808	318.3	
	Bhergaon	Darrang	95815	63	
	Udalguri	Darrang	217000	737.33	
	Tamulpur	Nalbari	111322	261.29	
	Nagrijiuli	Nalbari	80940	204.83	
	Baska	Nalbari	93723	264.18	
	Dhamdhama	Nalbari	73342	31.68	
	Borobazar	Bangaigaon	186767	289.5	
		TOTAL	1168924	2471.84	267*
		GRAND TOTAL	2474912	5130.32	529

State	Block / Taluka	District	Population	Area (Sq. Kms.)	Length of International border (Kms.)
			-1981		
BIHAR					
Nepal Border:					
	Bagaha	Betia	137227	575.34	
	Ramnagar	Betia	148242	321.55	
	Gonaha	Betia	123073	300.89	
	Nenatad	Betia	N.A.	N.A.	
	Sikta	Betia	110960	192.79	
		TOTAL	519502	1390.57	
	Raksol	Motiahari	96713	125.55	
	Aadhapur	Motiahari	114549	153.17	
	Ghauradanu	Motiahari	99224	134.9	
	Ghaurashahan	Motiahari	175895	207.47	
	Dhaka	Motiahari	160745	169.07	
		TOTAL	647126	790.16	
	Narpatganj	Araria	203249	3801.71	
	Farsisganj	Araria	226084	406.62	
	Kursakanta	Araria	87989	163.4	
	Sikti	Araria	92948	191.32	
		TOTAL	610270	4563.05	
	Nirmali	Supaul	55900	0.31	
	Basantpur	Supaul	114807	0.94	
		TOTAL	170707	1.25	

State	Block / Taluka	District	Population -1981	Area (Sq. Kms.)	Length of International border (Kms.)
BIHAR					
Nepal Border: (contd..)					
	Madhvapur	Madhubani	86063	108.35	
	Harlakhi	Madhubani	118251	147.92	
	Basopatti	Madhubani	108552	130.78	
	Roopnagar	Madhubani	106909	127.67	
	Ladania	Madhubani	104740	183.85	
	Shutauna	Madhubani	127906	215.21	
	Lokahi	Madhubani	125661	266.34	
		TOTAL	778082	1180.12	
	Bergania	Sitamadhi	81821	67.69	
	Sursandh	Sitamadhi	122574	358.45	
	Parihar	Sitamadhi	195200	212.3	
	Majorganj	Sitamadhi	79740	74.67	
	Sonversha	Sitamadhi	165000	454.37	
		TOTAL	644335	1167.48	
	Thakurganj	Kishanganj	170300	376.76	
	Dighalbank	Kishanganj	115059	254.7	
	Tighraghas	Kishanganj	82944	190.2	
		TOTAL	368303	821.66	
		GRAND TOTAL	3738325	18438.01	729*
Bangladesh Border:	West Phaileng	Mamit	21591	1016.17	
	West Bunghmun	Lunglei	15549	1302.26	
	Lungsen	Lunglei	26496	1071.29	
	Chawngte	Lawngtlai	24870	686.35	
		TOTAL	63636	3389.72	318*
		GRAND TOTAL	202831	11944.31	828

State	Block / Taluka	District	Population -1981	Area (Sq. Kms.)	Length of International border (Kms.)
Gujarat	Bhuj	Kutch	277215	4528.2	
Pakistan Border:	Lakhat	Kutch	36759	1945	
	Mandvi	Kutch	146034	1406.2	
	Abdasa	Kutch	86402	2398.2	
	Bhachau	Kutch	114759	1985.2	
	Rapar	Kutch	150517	3023.6	
	Vav	Banaskantha	159246	1711.8	
	Santalpur	Patan	86396	1347.8	
		TOTAL	1057328	18346	508*

State	Block / Taluka	District	Population -1981	Area (Sq. Kms.)	Length of International border (Kms.)
Himachal Pradesh					
China Border:					
	Pooh	Kinnaur	18432	3439	
	Kalpa	Kinnaur	22184	1779	
	Spiti	Lahaul & Spiti	10362	7591	
		TOTAL	50978	12809	201*

State	Block / Taluka	District	Population	Area (Sq. Kms.)	Length of International border (Kms.)
			-1981		
Manipur	Chakpi Karong	Chandel	15730	1513	
Myanmar border:	Tengnoupal	Chandel	25666	1113	
	Thanlon	Churchandpur	17939	1291	
	Singhat	Churchandpur	14936	1109	
	Chingai	Ukhrul	15377	N.A.	
	Kasom	Ukhrul	5964	1384	
	Kamjong	Ukhrul	9635	1404	
	Ukhrul Central	Ukhrul	42105	1756	
		TOTAL	147352	9570	398*

State	Block / Taluka	District	Population	Area (Sq. Kms.)	Length of International border (Kms.)
			-1981		
Meghalaya					
Bangladesh border:	Amlarem	Jaintia	23492		
	Khliehriat	Jaintia	39271		
	Saipung	Jaintia			
	Mawsynram	East Khasi	10917		
	Shella-Bholaganj	East Khasi	19829		
	Laitkroh	East Khasi			
	Mawkynrew	East Khasi			
	Pynursla	East Khasi	37086		
	Ranikor	West Khasi	31346		
	Mawkyrwat	West Khasi			
	Chokpot	South Garo	20739		
	Baghmara	South Garo	38453		
	Rongara	South Garo	12464		
	Zikzak	West Garo	38860		
	Betasing	West Garo			
	Dalu	West Garo	28338		
		TOTAL	300795	5136.04@	443 *

State	Block / Taluka	District	Population -1981	Area (Sq. Kms.)	Length of International border (Kms.)
Mizoram					
Myanmar Border:	Ngopa	Champhai	20956	1407.42	
	Khawzawl	Champhai	28320	1059.59	
	Khawbung	Champhai			
	E. Lungdar	Sechhip	28885	1858.54	
	Hnahthial	Lunglei	18615	958.39	
	Sangau	Chhimtuipui	8777	565.91	
	Tuipang	Chhimtuipui	15125	1399.9	
	Lawngtlai	Lawngtlai	18517	1304.84	
		TOTAL	139195	8554.59	510*
Bangladesh Border:					
	West Phaileng	Mamit	21591	1016.17	
	West Bunglei	Lunglei	15549	1302.26	
	Lungsen	Lunglei	26496	1071.29	
	Chawngte	Lawngtlai	24870	686.35	
		TOTAL	63636	3389.72	318*
		GRAND TOTAL	202831	11944.31	828

State	Block / Taluka	District	Population	Area (Sq. Kms.)	Length of International border (Kms.)
			-1981		
Nagaland					
Myanmar Border:	Noklak	Tuensang	21074	321.44	
	Thonokonyu	Tuensang	6647	282.24	
	Pungro	Tuensang	14730	501.76	
	Phomching	Mon	9776	83.61	
	Tobu	Mon	23527	136.33	
	Chen	Mon	11428	258.78	
	Meluri	Phek	13591	300.1	
		TOTAL	100773	1884.26	215*

State	Block / Taluka	District	Population -1981	Area (Sq. Kms.)	Length of International border (Kms.)
Punjab	Ajnala	Amritsar	136400	562.00	
Pakistan Border:	Chogawan	Amritsar	130100	521.00	
	Gandiwind	Amritsar	87300	338.00	
	Bhikhiwind	Amritsar	91400	320.00	
	Valtoha	Amritsar	76100	368.00	
	Kala Naur	Gurdaspur	63900	228.00	
	Dera Baba Nanak	Gurdaspur	83900	270.00	
	Nerot Jaimal Singh	Gurdaspur	59300	189.00	
	Barnial	Gurdaspur	11300	43.00	
	Dinanagar	Gurdaspur	96600	249.00	
	Gurdaspur	Gurdaspur	111200	271.00	
	Ferozepur	Ferozepur	126000	711.00	
	Guru Har Sarai	Ferozepur	93900	558.00	
	Jalalabad	Ferozepur	88700	491.00	
	Fazilka	Ferozepur	105300	659.00	
	Khuiian Sarver	Ferozepur	106000	695.00	
		TOTAL	1467400	6473.00	553*

State	Block / Taluka	District	Population -1981	Area (Sq. Kms.)	Length of International border (Kms.)
Rajasthan	Ganganagar	Sri Ganganagar	162395		
Pakistan Border:	Karanpur	Sri Ganganagar	92181		
	Padampur	Sri Ganganagar	105870		
	Raisinghnagar	Sri Ganganagar	128836		
	Anoog Garh	Sri Ganganagar	294097		
	Bikaner	Bikaner	247650		
	Kolayat	Bikaner	132657		
	Jaisalmer	Jaisalmer	80310		
	Sam	Jaisalmer	94930		
	Barmer	Barmer	171158		
	Sheo	Barmer	121551		
	Chohtan	Barmer	171105		
	Dhorimanna	Barmer	181025		
		TOTAL	1983765	73958.81 @	1037*

State	Block / Taluka	District	Population	Area (Sq. K	Length of International border (Kms.)
Sikkim					
China Border:	Dolepchen	East District	1500	5.99	
	Changeylakha	East District	328	1.95	
	Southregu	East District	419	7.5	
	Northregu	East District	710	15.13	
	Premlakha	East District	118	3.29	
	Subaneydra	East District	529	5.48	
	Sheganeybas	East District	237	5.31	
	Phademchen	East District	793	4.36	
	Gnathang	East District	2995	4.74	
		TOTAL	7629	53.75	220*
Nepal Border:					
	Manybong	West District	1571	7.01	
	Sopakha	West District	497	6.13	
	Karmatar	West District	447	4.47	
	Singramgpong	West District	168	3.97	
	Topung	West District	180	3.52	
		TOTAL	2863	25.1	99*
Bhutan Boredr:					
	Lachen	North District	919	N.A.	
	Lachung	North District	1508	28.14	
	Chungthang	North District	1779	26.77	
		GRAND TOTAL	14698	133.76	351*

State	Block / Taluka	District	Population	Area (Sq. Kms.)	Length of International border (Kms.)
			-1981		
Tripura					
Bangladesh Border:					
	Khowai	West Tripura	60754	119.88	
	Mohanpur	West Tripura	200903	268.11	
	Padmabil	West Tripura	30376	134.89	
	Thulasikhar	West Tripura	43163	294.41	
	Kalyanpur	West Tripura	49868	137.94	
	Bishalgarh	West Tripura	177575	324.68	
	Melaghar	West Tripura	104471	220.11	
	Teliamura	West Tripura	84075	322.22	
	Jirania	West Tripura	138511	241.65	
	Mandai	West Tripura	62524	152.47	
	Hezamara	West Tripura	63215	147.03	
	Dukli	West Tripura	209342	135.03	
	Takarjala	West Tripura	62589	190.04	
	Kathalia	West Tripura	49584	147.71	
	Boxanagar	West Tripura	41759	110.54	
		TOTAL	1378709	2946.71	
	Kadamtala	North Tripura	108099	162.04	
	Panisagar	North Tripura	100323	237.88	
	Kumarghat	North Tripura	75228	242.42	
	Gouranagar	North Tripura	87531	239.12	
	Damcharra	North Tripura	18035	189.93	
	Dasda	North Tripura	68101	707.27	
	Pechaerthal	North Tripura	35007	150.8	
	Jampuihill	North Tripura	10542	169.34	
		TOTAL	502866	2098.8	

State	Block / Taluka	District	Population	Area (Sq. Kms.)	Length of International border (Kms.)
			-1981		
Tripura					
Bangladesh Border: (contd..)					
	Matabari	South Tripura	121179	325.05	
	Kakraban	South Tripura	69418	116.69	
	Killa	South Tripura	33852	179	
	Amarpur	South Tripura	91018	487.03	
	Karbook	South Tripura	33724	156.02	
	Rupaichari	South Tripura	39461	256.76	
	Satchand	South Tripura	74329	289.51	
	Bagafa	South Tripura	126714	511.98	
	Rajnagar	South Tripura	79571	320.18	
	Hrishyamukh	South Tripura	47339	166.29	
		TOTAL	716605	2808.51	
	Salema	Dhalai	123179	366.61	
	Ambassa	Dhalai	58379	548.05	
	Chawmanu	Dhalai	30012	562.46	
	Manu	Dhalai	70130	278.28	
	Dumburnagar	Dhalai	44624	562.66	
		TOTAL	326324	2318.06	
		GRAND TOTAL	2924504	10172.08	856*

State	Block / Taluka	District	Population	Area (Sq. Kms.)	Length of International border (Kms.)
			-1981		
Uttar Pradesh					
Nepal Border:					
	Haraia Satgarhwa	Balrampur	134524	609	
	Tulsipur	Balrampur	131314	449	
	Gaisdi	Balrampur	123883	519	
	Pachpedwa	Balrampur	110229	509	
		TOTAL	499950	2086	
	Paliya	Kheeri	98782	578.7	
	Nighasan	Kheeri	142423	801.5	
	Ramiabehad	Kheeri	122075	525.6	
		TOTAL	363280	1905.8	
	Mhipurva	Behraich	161103	82995.52	
	Nawabganj	Behraich	92428	82995.52	
		TOTAL	253531	165991.04	
	Badhni	Siddarthanagar	75163	215.1	
	Shoratgarh	Siddarthanagar	67502	148.1	
	Wordpur	Siddarthanagar	95044	227.4	
	Uskabazar	Siddarthanagar	128441	219.1	
		TOTAL	366150	809.7	

State	Block / Taluka	District	Population -1981	Area (Sq. Kms.)	Length of International border (Kms.)
Uttar Pradesh					
Nepal Border:					
(contd..)					
	Nichlaul	Maharajganj	134504	N.A.	
	Nautanva	Maharajganj	132861	N.A.	
		TOTAL	267365	N.A.	
	Puranpur	Pilibhit	219936	N.A.	
	Jamunuha	Shravasti	141796	362.41	
	Sirsiya	Shravasti	131512	435.5	
	Harihapurrani	Shravasti	121176	262.06	
		TOTAL	394484	1059.97	742.5*
		GRAND TOTAL	2364696	171852.51	742.5*

State	Block / Taluka	District	Population -1981	Area (Sq. Kms.)	Length of International border (Kms.)
Uttaranchal:					
Nepal Border:					
	Lohaghat	Champavat	30646	216	
	Champavat	Champavat	32854	469.5	
	Khatima	Udhamsinghnagar	134947	347	
		TOTAL	198447	1032.5	80.5
China Border:					
	Joshimath	Chamoli	29831	3635	
	Bhatbari	Uttarkashi	34619	4338.42	
	Munshyari	Pithoragarh	39371	2623	
	Munakot	Pithoragarh	41346	198	
	Kanalichina	Pithoragarh	42174	352	
	Dharchula	Pithoragarh	41221	2964	
		TOTAL	228562	14110.42	344*
		GRAND TOTAL	427009	15142.92	424.5

State	Block / Taluka	District	Population -1981	Area (Sq. Kms.)	Length of International border (Kms.)
					border (Kms.)
West Bengal	Kharibari-Pansidawa	Darjeeling	204057	478	
Bangladesh Border:	Rajganj	Jalpaiguri	314105	635	
	Jalpaiguri	Jalpaiguri	261379	497	
	Kumargram	Jalpaiguri	153891	504	
	Haldibari	Cooch Behar	77833	199	
	Mekhaliganj	Cooch Behar	111019	293	
	Mathabhanga-I	Cooch Behar	162527	325	
	Sitalkuchi	Cooch Behar	151933	261	
	Sitai	Cooch Behar	86199	158	
	Dinhata-I	Cooch Behar	239962	286	
	Dinhata-II	Cooch Behar	187612	257	
	Tufanganj-I	Cooch Behar	191455	325	
	Tufanganj-II	Cooch Behar	147389	259	
	Kaliaganj	Uttar Dinajpur	150118	312	
	Hemtabad	Uttar Dinajpur	95157	192	
	Raiganj	Uttar Dinajpur	277158	483	
	Karandighi	Uttar Dinajpur	230121	389	
	Goalpokhar-I	Uttar Dinajpur	194058	373	
	Islampur	Uttar Dinajpur	185086	345	
	Chopra	Uttar Dinajpur	165720	387	
	Goalpokhar-II	Uttar Dinajpur	114530	266	
	Tapan	Dakshin Dinajpur	186953	441	
	Balurghat	Dakshin Dinajpur	185204	372	
	Hilli	Dakshin Dinajpur	61806	88	
	Kumarganja	Dakshin Dinajpur	129676	287	
	Gangarampur	Dakshin Dinajpur	204518	328	

State	Block / Taluka	District	Population	Area (Sq. Kms.)	Length of International border (Kms.)
			-1981		
West Bengal					
Bangladesh Border: (contd...)					
	Kushmandi	Dakshin Dinajpur	144470	310	
	Kaliachak-III	Malda	214721	212	
	Kaliachak-I	Malda	195811	107	
	English Bazar	Malda	180434	206	
	Old Malda	Malda	132999	226	
	Habibpur	Malda	168397	397	
	Bamangola	Malda	107579	206	
	Jalangi	Murshidabad	173056	122	
	Raninagar-I	Murshidabad	126461	173	
	Raninagar-II	Murshidabad	132677	198	
	Bhagabangola-I	Murshidabad	131911	97	
	Bhagabangola-II	Murshidabad	110249	146	
	Lalgola	Murshidabad	206771	202	
	Raghunathganj-I	Murshidabad	118647	90	
	Raghunathganj-II	Murshidabad	124032	118	
	Suti-I	Murshidabad	111508	140	
	Suti-II	Murshidabad	157766	119	
	Samsherganj	Murshidabad	180319	105	
	Ranaghat-II	Nadia	282645	240	
	Hanskhali	Nadia	216292	246	
	Krishnaganj	Nadia	112872	59	
	Chapra	Nadia	229224	310	
	Tehatta-I	Nadia	186145	250	
	Karimpur-I	Nadia	163177	235	
	Karimpur-II	Nadia	143795	210	
	Hingalgaj	North 24 Pargana	142291	230	
	Sandeshkhali-I	North 24 Pargana	94176	181	

State	Block / Taluka	District	Population -1981	Area (Sq. Kms.)	Length of International border (Kms.)
West Bengal					
Bangladesh Border: (contd...)					
	Hasnabad	North 24 Pargana	151115	155	
	Basirath-I	North 24 Pargana	122156	112	
	Baduria	North 24 Pargana	211342	210	
	Swarupnagar	North 24 Pargana	200448	216	
	Gaighata	North 24 Pargana	257373	246	
	Bongaon	North 24 Pargana	294432	337	
	Bagdaha	North 24 Pargana	190757	233	
		TOTAL	10031623	14880	2216.70*
Bhutan Border:					
	Kumargram	Jalpaiguri	119657	504.63	
	Madarihat	Jalpaiguri	123386	190.48	
	Kalchini	Jalpaiguri	160615	417.83	
	Dhupguri	Jalpaiguri	145243	289.56	
	Gorubathan	Darjeeling	40178	445.00	
		TOTAL	589079	1847.5	183*
Nepal Border:					
	Mirik	Darjeeling	29420	47.45	
	Sukhiapokhri	Darjeeling	28895	388.57	
	Naxulbari	Darjeeling	81175	83.50	
	Khanbari	Darjeeling	51646	238.80	
		TOTAL	191136	756.32	100*
		GRAND TOTAL	10811838	17483.82	2499.7
* 'Figures taken from the Reply of Unstarred Lok Sabha Question No. 3536 answered on 30th July, 1992.					
@'Figures taken from the Minutes of the meeting of the Empowered Committee on Border Area Development Programme held on					

NOTE: In case of Jammu & Kashmir no figures are available pertaining to the prescribed criteria

Border Area Development Programme – Revised Guidelines:

I. Introduction:

Border Area Development Programme (BADP) was started during the Seventh Plan with the twin objectives of balanced development of sensitive border areas in the Western region through adequate provision of infrastructural facilities and promotion of a sense of security amongst the local population. The programme was revamped in the Eighth Plan (1993-94) and extended to States which have an international border with Bangladesh. The nature of the Programme was changed from a schematic programme with emphasis on education to a State level Programme with emphasis on balanced development of Border areas. During the Ninth Plan, the programme has been further extended to States which border Myanmar, China, Bhutan and Nepal and the Programme at present covers sixteen border States sharing international land border.

II. Coverage:

Border Area Development Programme covers Seventeen States namely Arunachal Pradesh, Assam, Bihar, Gujarat, Himachal Pradesh, Jammu & Kashmir, Manipur, Meghalaya, Mizoram, Nagaland, Punjab, Rajasthan, Sikkim, Tripura, Uttar Pradesh, Uttaranchal and West Bengal.

II. Objectives:

The main objective of the Programme will be to meet the special needs of the people living in remote, inaccessible areas situated near the border.

III. Funding:

The Border Area Development Programme will continue to be a 100% Centrally funded Area programme. Funds will be provided to the States as Special Central Assistance for execution of approved schemes on a 100% grant basis and allocated amongst the sixteen beneficiary States on the basis of (i) length of international border, (ii) population of border blocks and (iii) area of border blocks. Each of these criteria will be given equal weightage. The border block will be the spatial unit for the programme and all schemes would have to be implemented within the border blocks only.

IV. Eligible Schemes:

Schemes should be designed to take care of the special problems faced by people living in the border areas. A long term Perspective Plan for each Border block should be prepared by the State Government keeping in view the

objectives of overall balanced development of the region. The State Government may undertake a study of remote villages in the border blocks in order to assess the needs of the people and the critical gaps in physical and social infrastructure. Schemes should be drawn up based on this assessment. Grassroot institutions such as PRIs/ District Councils / Traditional Councils should be involved in identification of the priority areas to the maximum extent possible. Since the people living in the border areas must have a direct say in the selection of the schemes, village level institutions such as Gram Sabha should be involved in the decision making process. Appropriate modalities may be worked out by the State Government to ensure greater participation of the people of the border areas in the selection of schemes under the Programme. Schemes which address problems such as inadequacies relating to provision of essential needs, strengthening of the social infrastructure, filling up of critical gaps in the road network etc. may be taken up under the programme. Emphasis must be laid on schemes for employment generation, production oriented activities and schemes which provide for critical inputs in the social sector. (Illustrative list of schemes at Appendix-I).

Security related schemes can also be taken up. However, expenditure on such schemes should not exceed 7.5% of the total allocation in a particular year. Construction of housing for crucial functionaries such as teachers, doctors, nurses etc. may be taken up in border blocks under the programme along with construction of small culverts, bridges, bridle paths, feeder roads, etc. However, expenditure on schemes including provision of basic amenities such as supply of drinking water, approach roads, etc., for the border outposts, administrative buildings and road & bridge construction taken together should not be more than 60 per cent of the total allocation in any particular year. In addition, upto 15 per cent of the total allocation could be used for maintenance of the assets already created under the Programme. It may be ensured that no single sector gets a disproportionately large share of the total allocation.

The funds under BADP are to be used for schemes in the identified border blocks only. Funds under BADP are additive to normal Central Assistance and are allocated for meeting the special problems faced by the people of the border areas. Hence, these should not be used to replace normal State Plan flows.

V. Executing Agencies:

To provide flexibility, schemes under the Programme can be executed by any of the following agencies :

- (i) State Government;
- (ii) Central Government;
- (iii) Central Para-Military Organisation located in the State; and
- (iv) Voluntary Agencies .
- (v) Panchayati Raj Institutions/District Councils/Traditional Councils.

While the voluntary organizations and agencies have to be selected with care, having regard to security of the sensitive areas, due emphasis should be

given to effective involvement of local people / democratic institutions / Voluntary agencies in order to inspire mutual trust and confidence between the Government and the people.

VI. Empowered Committee :

Policy matters relating to the scope of the Programme, prescription of geographical limits of areas in the States within which schemes will be taken, allocation of funds to the States and similar matters for proper execution of the programme will be laid down by an Empowered Committee in the Planning Commission. The Committee will consist of the following :

- | | |
|---|------------|
| 1. Secretary, Planning Commission | - Chairman |
| 2. Secretary, Ministry of Home Affairs, Govt. of India | - Member |
| 3. Secretary, Department of Expenditure, Govt. of India | - Member |
| 4. Chief Secretaries of the BADP States | - Member |

Adviser (Multi Level Planning) of the Planning Commission will be Secretary to the Committee and the Advisers (State Plans) permanent invitees to the Committee.

VII. Screening Committee:

Subject to such general or special directions as may be given by the Empowered Committee, individual schemes located in each State will be approved by a Screening Committee chaired by the Chief Secretary of the State. The Screening Committee will also include a representative of the Ministry of Home Affairs, not below the rank of Joint Secretary to the Government of India, representative (s) at similar level of the major paramilitary organisation(s), SSB operating on the State border, State Planning Secretary, or Secretary, Home Department of the State (as Convenor) and the concerned State Plan Adviser / Adviser (MLP) of the Planning Commission. The State Chief Secretary may co-opt members on the Screening Committee depending on local requirements.

The Screening Committee will have complete freedom to execute the schemes through any of the five agencies mentioned in para VI above. The Screening Committee shall meet at least once in a year, preferably in February – March to finalise the schemes for the following year.

VIII. Release of funds, monitoring and review:

Before the commencement of a financial year Planning Commission will inform the States of the funds available for the State during the next year under the Programme. A summary of the schemes proposed to be executed within the ceiling communicated, will have to be sent to the Planning Commission for release of funds to the State. Funds will be released in two instalments. The first release will be made by the month of May – June after the receipt of the list of schemes, duly approved by the Screening Committee along with expenditure incurred till the last quarter of the previous year. The second

release will be made after October depending on physical and financial progress but not later than February after adjusting unspent balance, if any of the previous year.

State Governments are required to have a separate budget head for the Programme.

Periodical monitoring of schemes in the Planning Commission will be done by the concerned State Plan Adviser / Adviser (MLP). A review of the programme will be made at least once a year by the Empowered Committee.

Quarterly progress reports (proforma at Appendix-II) should be submitted scheme wise giving actual physical and financial achievements and not in percentage terms. The quarterly progress report should be sent as soon as possible so as to enable Planning Commission to release Special Central Assistance.

Border Area Development Programme :
Illustrative list of Schemes

- A. Education:
- a) Primary school buildings (additional rooms)
 - b) Middle school buildings (additional rooms)
 - c) Development of play fields
 - d) Construction of hostels / dormitories
 - e) Buying of school dresses / books
 - f) Adult education
 - g) Public libraries and reading rooms
 - h) Development of human resource through vocational and technical education
 - i) TV / dish antennas
 - j) Books / journals
- B. Health:
- a) Provision of medical equipments of basic / elementary type. X-Ray, ECG machines etc. can also be purchased.
 - b) Provision of equipment for Dental clinic
 - c) First-aid kit for midwives
 - d) Construction of public toilets & bathroom
 - e) Setting up of mobile dispensaries in rural areas by Govt./ Panchayati Raj Institutions
 - f) Health Awareness Programme
 - g) Eye camps
 - h) RCH programme
 - i) Blood Banks
 - j) Control of Malaria, Filariasis, Leprosy, AIDS etc.
- C. Agriculture and allied sectors:
1. Animal Husbandry
 2. Pisciculture
 3. Sericulture
 4. Farm forestry, horticulture, pastures, parks and gardens in government and community lands or other surrendered lands.
 5. Desilting of ponds in villages, towns and cities.
 6. Construction of public irrigation (minor work) and public drainage facilities.
 7. Construction of common gobar gas plants, non-conventional energy systems / devices for community use and related activities.
 8. Construction of irrigation embankments, or lift irrigation or water table recharging facilities.
 9. Minor irrigation works
 10. Anti-erosion works (only construction of small bunds etc.)

11. Water conservation programmes
12. Social Forestry, JFM
13. Use of improved seeds, fertilizers and improved technology
14. Veterinary aid Centres, artificial insemination Centres and breeding Centres.

D. Infrastructure:

1. Rural Sanitation
2. Solar Street Lights
3. Solar household lights
4. Electrification
5. Strengthening of existing roads (only links road)
6. Construction and strengthening of kutchra roads, part road, approach roads, link roads.
7. Drinking water facility – construction of tubewells, water tanks
8. Repair and maintenance of existing roads
9. Public Distribution System and its improvement (in terms of infrastructure)
10. Industries – Handloom, tiny units, handicraft, furniture making
11. Construction of culverts / bridges and roads
12. Drains & gutters
13. Footpaths, pathways and footbridges
14. Provisions of civic amenities like electricity, water, pathways, public toilets etc. in slum areas of cities, towns and villages and in SC/ST habitations.
15. Provision of common worksheds in slums and for artisans.
16. Bus sheds / stops for public transport passengers.
17. Repair and maintenance works of any type other than special repairs for restoration / upgradation of any asset.
18. Construction of buildings for local bodies for recognized Districts or State Sports Associations and for Cultural and Sport Activities or for hospitals (provision of multi-gym facilities in gymnastic centres, sports association, physical education training institutions, etc.)

E. Social Sector:

1. Construction of community centres
2. Rural Sanitation
3. Anganwadies, Creches
4. Cultural Centres / Community Halls
5. Construction of common shelters for the old or Handicapped.
6. Training for youth for self employment and skill upgradation.
7. Setting up of small industries using local inputs.

APPENDIX -II (Contd.)

Border Area Development Programme (BADP) – (Name of State) – Statement showing quarterly progress (Physical) for _____ (year) (for quarter ending _____).

(Rs. lakh)

Sector/Sub-Sector/Scheme	Approved Expenditure		Cumulative Expenditure upto the quarter	Remarks
	Outlay for (year)	during the quarter ending		
1.	2.	3.	4.	5.

M-13053/WG/SC/X Plan/2000-MLP
PLANNING COMMISSION
(MLP Division)

Yojana Bhavan, Sansad Marg,
New Delhi , Dated: 19.4.2001.

Subject: Constitution of Working Group for Border Area
Development Programme (BADP) for the Tenth Five Year Plan.

It has been decided to set up a Working group for Border Area
Development Programme (BADP) for the Tenth Five Year Plan. The
composition of the Working Group will be as follows:

- | | |
|--|------------------|
| 1. Secretary, Planning Commission | Chairperson |
| 2. Representative of M/O Home Affairs | Member |
| 3. Representative of M/O Finance | Member |
| 4. Representatives of BADP States | Members |
| 5. Pr. Advisers (SP) Advisers (SP) dealing with Members
BADP States | |
| 6. Adviser (MLP), Planning Commission | Member Secretary |

The following are the terms of reference of the Working Group:

- (i) To review the impact of the BADP and bring out achievements and failures, if any, together with necessary remedial measures;
- (ii) To recommend policy framework for the development of areas under BADP during Tenth Five Year Plan, keeping in view the status of the development, needs and aspirations of the local people;
- (iii) To identify activities which fit into the specific needs of the areas under BADP;
- (iv) To suggest strategies and measures for long-term integrated development of the areas under the programme; and
- (v) To suggest administrative, operational and organizational measures both at the Centre and the State level for effective implementation and monitoring of the Programme.

- Sd -
(T.R. Meena)
Deputy Secretary (Admn.)

To:

1. The Chairperson of the Committee.
2. All Members of the Committee.
3. All Divisions of Planning Commission.

Copy for information to:

1. PS to Deputy Chairman, Planning Commission
2. PPS to Secretary, Planning Commission.

Members nominated to the Working Group for Border Area Development Programme (BADP) for the Tenth Five Year Planning Commission

- | | | |
|-----|--|-------------|
| 1. | Dr. N.C. Saxena, Secretary, Planning Commission /
Shri Ajit Kumar, Secretary, Planning Commission - | Chairperson |
| 2. | Shri R.P. Sinha, Principal Adviser,
Planning Commission | - Member |
| 3. | Smt. Jyotsna Khanna, Principal Adviser,
Planning Commission | - Member |
| 4. | Shri P.K. Mohanty, Principal Adviser (PC),
Planning Commission | - Member |
| 5. | Shri L.M. Mehta, Adviser,
Planning Commission | - Member |
| 6. | Shri P.S.S. Thomas,
Planning Commission | - Member |
| 7. | Dr. Rajan Katoch, Adviser,
Planning Commission | - Member |
| 8. | Shri M.B. Kaushal, Special Secretary (ISP)
Ministry of Home Affairs | - Member |
| 9. | Smt. Shubha Kumar, Director (PF-I),
Deptt of Expenditure, Ministry of Finance | - Member |
| 10. | Secretary, Trade & Commerce
Govt. of Arunachal Pradesh | - Member |
| 11. | Commissioner & Secretary, Border Areas
Deptt., Govt. of Assam | - Member |
| 12. | Development Commissioner, Govt. of Bihar | - Member |
| 13. | Representative of Govt. of Gujarat | - Member |
| 14. | Dr. D.K. Sharma, Secretary, Deptt of Planning
Govt. of Himachal Pradesh | - Member |
| 15. | Shri K.B. Pillai, Principal Secretary,
Planning & Dev. Deptt, Govt. of J&K | - Member |
| 16. | Representative of Govt. of Manipur | - Member |
| 17. | Commissioner & Secretary, Border Area
Dev. Deptt, Govt. of Meghalaya | - Member |
| 18. | Shri Haukhum Hauzel, Commissioner,
Rural Development, Govt. of Mizoram | - Member |
| 19. | Development Commissioner, Planning &
Coord. Deptt, Govt. of Nagaland | - Member |
| 20. | Secretary, Deptt of Planning,
Govt. of Punjab | - Member |
| 21. | Secretary, Rural Development Deptt,
Govt. of Rajasthan | - Member |
| 22. | Representative of Govt. of Sikkim | - Member |
| 23. | Principal Secretary (Planning),
Govt. of Tripura | - Member |
| 24. | Principal Secretary, Deptt of Planning
Govt. of Uttar Pradesh | - Member |

- | | | | |
|-----|---|---|------------------|
| 25. | Principal Secretary & Commissioner,
Forest & Rural Dev. Deptt,
Govt. of Uttaranchal | - | Member |
| 26. | Special Secretary, Home Deptt,
Govt. of West Bengal | - | Member |
| 27. | Smt. Firoza Mehrotra, Adviser (MLP) | - | Member Secretary |

List of Participants in the Working Group Meetings

List of participants in the first meeting of the Working Group on Border Area Development Programme (BADP) held on 14.2.2001.

List of Participants

State Governments

Name	Designation
Shri G. Koyu	Secretary (T&C), Government of Arunachal Pradesh, Itanagar
Shri M.K. Barooah	Home Commissioner, Government of Assam, Assam Sachivalaya, Dispur, Guwahati – 781006
Shri A.B. Prasad	Resident Commissioner, Government of Bihar
Shri A.K. Pradhan	Addl. Chief Secretary(Planning), Block 7, New Sachivalaya, Gandhinagar, Gujarat- 382010
Dr. D.K. Sharma	Pr. Adviser-cum-Secretary(Planning), Room No. 501, Yojana Bhavan, Secretariat Complex, Government of Himachal Pradesh, Shimla – 171002.
Shri K.B. Pillai	Principal Secretary, Planning & Development Deptt, Government of J & K, Srinagar
Shri P.Kharkonoor	Secretary, Border Area Development Deptt, R.No. 414, Addl. Sectt. Building, Government of Meghalaya, Shillong
Shri B. Dhar	Director, Border Area Development Department, Horse Shoe Building, Government of Meghalaya, Shillong

Shri P. Sharat Chandra	Resident Commissioner, Government of Manipur
Shri Haukhum Hauzel	Commissioner & Secretary, Rural Development Deptt., Government of Mizoram, Aizawl.
Shri A. Jamir	Development Commissioner, Government of Nagaland, Kohima.
Shri M. Odyuo	Joint Development Commissioner, Government of Nagaland, Kohima.
Ms. Aolemla	Planning Officer, Government of Nagaland, Kohima.
Shri S. R. Ladhar	Special Secretary (Planning), 72, Sector 17, Government of Punjab, Chandigarh.
Shri Ram Lubhaya	Secretary (RD & Relief), Secretariat, SSO Building, Government of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
Shri Anil K. Ganeriwala	Additional Resident Commissioner, Government of Sikkim, Sikkim House, 12, Panchsheel Marg, Chanakyapuri, New Delhi.
Shri S.N. Shukla	Principal Secretary, Deptt of Planning, Government of Uttar Pradesh, Lucknow.
Ms. Jyoti Rao	Resident Commissioner, Government of Uttaranchal
Shri R. K. Varma	Addl. Secretary (RD), Government of Uttaranchal

Shri T.K. Burman
Special Secretary (Home),
Government of West Bengal,
Writers' Building,
Kolkata

Shri R.K. Vaish,
Principal Secretary (Planning),
Government of Tripura,
Agartala

Central Ministries

Name

Designation

Shri M.B. Kaushal
Special Secretary (ISP),
Ministry of Home Affairs,
North Block,
New Delhi

Shri A.K. Jain
Joint Secretary,
Ministry of Home Affairs,
North Block, New Delhi

Ms. Shubha Kumar
Director (PF-I),
Ministry of Finance,
North Block, New Delhi

Planning Commission

Name

Designation

Shri N.C. Saxena
Mrs. Firoza Mehrotra
Shri Vijay Kumar
Shri Raj Kumar
Dr. Indu Patnaik
Shri K.K. Lamba
Shri Madan Mohan
Shri B.B. Sharma
Secretary
Adviser (MLP)
Director (SP)
Dy. Adviser (SP)
Dy. Adviser (MLP)
Sr. Research Officer
Sr. Research Officer(MLP)
Research Officer (MLP)

List of participants in the second Meeting of the Working Group on Border Area Development Programme (BADP) held on 12.11.2001

List of Participants

State Governments

Name	Designation
Shri K.B. Pillai	Financial Commissioner, Planning & Development Deptt, Government of J & K, Srinagar
Shri A.K. Bhattacharjee	OSD, Government of Arunachal Pradesh, Arunachal Bhavan, Kautilya Marg, New Delhi.
Shri H.S. Das	Home & Border Commissioner, & Secretary, Government of Assam, Assam Sachivalaya, Dispur, Guwahati – 781006
Shri A.B. Prasad	Resident Commissioner, Government of Bihar
Shri M.B. Grasia	Deputy Secretary(Planning), Block 7, New Sachivalaya, Gandhinagar, Gujarat- 382010
Dr. D.K. Sharma	Pr. Adviser-cum-Secretary(Planning), Room No. 501, Yojana Bhavan, Secretariat Complex, Government of Himachal Pradesh, Shimla – 171002.
Shri P. Sharat Chandra	Resident Commissioner, Government of Manipur, New Delhi.
Shri H.K. Mazhari	Commissioner & Secretary, Border Area Development Deptt, R.No. 230, Reliang Building, Government of Meghalaya, Shillong- 793001

Shri B. Dhar	Director, Border Area Development Department, Horse Shoe Building, Government of Meghalaya, Shillong
Shri Ziley Singh	Adviser Planning & Finance Deptt., Government of Mizoram, Aizawl.
Shri V.N. Gaur	Resident Commissioner, 29, Aurangzeb Road, Government of Nagaland, New Delhi.
Shri H.I.S. Grewal	Special Secretary (Planning), 72, Sector 17, Government of Punjab, Chandigarh.
Shri Ram Lubhaya	Secretary (RD & Relief), Secretariat, SSO Building, Government of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
Shri Anil K. Ganeriwala	Additional Resident Commissioner, Government of Sikkim, Sikkim House, 12, Panchsheel Marg, Chanakyapuri, New Delhi.
Shri R.K. Mathur	Resident Commissioner, Government of Tripura, New Delhi.
Shri V.P. Agrawal	Joint Director, State Planning Commission, Government of Uttar Pradesh, Lucknow.
Shri A.M. Bali	Consultant, Planning Department, Government of Uttar Pradesh, Lucknow.

Shri Amarandra Sinha

Secretary,
Deptt of Planning,
Government of Uttaranchal
Dehra Dun

Shri T.K. Burman

Special Secretary (Home),
Government of West Bengal,
Writers' Building,
Kolkata

Central Ministries

Name

Designation

Ms. Shubha Kumar

Director (PF-I),
Ministry of Finance,
North Block, New Delhi

Planning Commission

Name

Designation

Shri Ajit Kumar

Secretary

Shri Vijay Kumar

Director (SP)

Shri Harish Chandra

Director (SP-UP, Uttaranchal)

Shri T.P. Biswas

Director (SP-J&K/Punjab)

Shri J.K. Chahal

Director (SP-NE)

Shri H.C. Bharti

Consultant (SP-Bihar)

Dr. Indu Patnaik

Dy. Adviser (MLP)

Shri B.B. Sharma

Research Officer (MLP)

Shri R.Nihal Pedric

Research Officer (WGS)

Evaluation Report on BADP (Programme Evaluation Organisation)

Executive Summary

Absence of war and civil dissensions is a precondition for the success of any development initiative. For the greater part of the last fifty years, the 15,200 sq.km. of land frontier of India cannot be said to have had the peace and security that is essential for socio-economic development. No wonder, therefore, the normal plan schemes were less effective in transforming the economies of the border areas. It is also obvious that private initiative for development is unlikely to come through in areas where people do not enjoy a sense of security. The planners realised that normal plan programmes alone are inadequate to set the development process in motion and that creation of a congenial environment to impart a sense of security among the local people should constitute an integral part of any development strategy for border areas.

The Scheme

The Border Area Development Programme (BADP) was introduced in the Seventh Plan as a Centrally Sponsored Scheme (CSS) with the objective of infusing a sense of security among the people and building the much-needed social and physical infrastructure to propel normal development activities. BADP is to be seen, as a Central Government intervention strategy to bring about a balanced development of border areas, which encounter area-specific problems, like inaccessibility, remoteness, sense of insecurity arising out of threat perception from external aggression, cross-border terrorism and unlawful activities.

Originally, the programme was to be implemented in western Border States under the administrative control of the Ministry of Home Affairs with an emphasis on development of infrastructure to facilitate deployment of Border Security Force. Subsequently, the scope of the programme was broadened to include within its purview, first the school and technical education of the Ministry of Human Resource Development (HRD) in November, 1986 and then the Indira Gandhi Nahar Pariyojana (IGNP) of the Rajasthan Government from 1987-88. In addition to these, issuing photo identity cards in the four western Border States and conducting research on socio-economic aspects of border areas were also brought under its purview.

Subsequently, during the Eighth Five Year Plan, the area coverage was further extended to include the eastern states bordering Bangladesh. Since

1993-94, its scope, too, was extended to include many other schemes that are relevant for ensuring effective administration and balanced development of border areas. **The revamped BADP is being implemented by the concerned State Governments under the overall administrative control of Planning Commission.**

As per guidelines, the concerned state governments are required to conduct 'need assessment' surveys of border areas to identify and formulate specific schemes in the broad areas of concern of BADP. The programme lays emphasis on **development of social and economic infrastructure, law and order, promotion of people's participation in development, elimination of the sense of alienation and insecurity from the minds of people so as to create conditions conducive to social and economic progress.**

The annual allocation under BADP is not very high (less than Rs. 100 crore in 1996-97) and should be considered as an additionality to normal state plan funds. The scheme is designed to be implemented in the identified border blocks (units of planning) through the State Governments. The funds available under the programme can be used only in identified blocks for creation of durable assets. The guidelines provide for use of 7.5 per cent of available funds on security related schemes, and that the total expenditure on administrative buildings, road construction and security should not exceed 40 per cent of the annual allocation.

Evaluation Study

The BADP has been in operation in the Western Sector since the Seventh Plan and in Eastern Sector bordering Bangladesh since 1993-94. However, there has not been any systematic evaluation of the scheme to assess its impact on the well-being of the people and the effectiveness of the implementation methods adopted by the implementing agencies. Nor do the monitoring mechanisms adopted by the implementing agencies and the Planning Commission throw up information that could provide even a rough assessment of the performance of the scheme. Also occasional media reports on illegal activities like smuggling, unaccounted trade, terrorist activities, etc., seem to indicate that BADP has not made the intended impact. Thus, the need for an evaluation study was felt in the Planning Commission.

At the instance of Planning Commission, the Programme Evaluation Organisation (PEO) took up the evaluation study of BADP to assess / examine:

- if the utilization of funds is in accordance with the guidelines;
- the physical and financial performance of the programme;

- the relationship between the implementation mechanisms adopted by different state governments and the performance of the scheme;
- the impact of the programme on the well-being of people living in border areas;

- if the scheme has generated a sense of security among the people for them to undertake normal economic activities; and
- the extent of people's participation in the implementation of the scheme.

Based on the findings of the study, if necessary, PEO may make suggestions for modifications in design and implementation that could bring about improvement in the performance of the scheme.

Methodology

To meet the aforesaid objectives of the study, information on a large number of parameters relating to design, implementation and impact was required to be collected. PEO collected the necessary information on design and implementation from the MLP division of Planning Commission and from the state, district and block level authorities of the implementing agencies. The background materials relating to design and broad guidelines for implementation were obtained from the MLP Division of Planning Commission, while the detailed **information relating to flow of funds, and their utilisation, formulation of specific schemes, the role of various departments of states, etc. was collected by the PEO field teams through structured questionnaires canvassed at different nodes of the implementing agencies of the States.**

Structured questionnaires were also designed to elicit the required village and household level information. Through the village schedule, information on the physical, social, economic and demographic characteristics of the village, and on the role of the Panchayat and people in the implementation of the programme was sought. The household schedule was designed to elicit information on the **socio-economic and demographic profile of the households and on the benefits being received by them under various schemes of BADP.** In addition to these structured questionnaires, **PEO field teams were required to write notes on their field visits** in a way that would enable the project director to **supplement the quantitative database for meaningful interpretation/explanation for the results of the tests of various hypotheses of the study.**

A large part of the database of the study was generated through a sample survey. A multi-stage stratified sample design was adopted. The first stage sample units were six states, viz. Assam, Gujarat, Punjab, Rajasthan, Tripura and West Bengal. The second stage units are eight districts chosen from the selected states on the basis of the area coverage under BADP. The third and fourth stage sample units are the blocks and villages. One block from each district on the basis of the size of the population (maximum) was selected. For villages – one from among the villages close to the border and three among those villages where the BADP schemes are fully operational (as per records) were randomly chosen from each selected block.

The households constitute the fifth stage sample units. Since most of the BADP schemes relate to creation and / or strengthening of infrastructure, the benefits of BADP is assumed to accrue to each household. Ten households from a (selected) village were selected giving weightage to the occupational pattern in the

village. Altogether 165 agriculturists, 88 landless labourers and 67 belonging to other occupations were selected for the survey.

Thus, 320 households spread over 32 villages in eight border blocks (districts) of six Border States were selected for the evaluation study. In addition, discussions with knowledgeable persons (sarpanch, teacher, gram sevak, doctor, etc.) and on the spot observation of PEO field officers were used to prepare state level qualitative notes to supplement the database generated through structured questionnaires.

The field survey for the study was conducted during April to August 1997. The PEO field teams encountered a number of difficulties in eliciting the required information from the implementing agencies, as data were not available readily and in an organized manner. In most of the cases, there was no coordinating agency at the district level. **The existence of multiple implementing agencies without a coordinating agency resulted in lack of monitoring of utilization of BADP funds. No data on flow of funds and their utilization could be obtained even at the State level for the period 1985-92.** The non-existence of a separate monitoring arrangement for utilization of BADP funds made the task of examining the flow of funds and their utilization pattern really difficult.

Planning, Administration and Monitoring

At the national level, the Empowered Committee in Planning Commission administers the programme. The Secretary, Planning Commission is the Chairman and the Secretary, Ministry of Home Affairs, Secretary, Department of Expenditure, Ministry of Finance, Chief Secretaries of the states covered under the programme are its members. The Joint Secretary (State Plans) is the Secretary of this Committee whereas the Advisors (State Plans) are the permanent invitees to this Committee. **The Committee meets once in a year and decides on various policy matters relating to the execution of the programme.** The Empowered Committee conducts annual review, whereas periodical **monitoring is done on the basis of quarterly progress reports by the MLP division and State Plan Advisers.** As per guidelines, execution of schemes under the programme can be assigned to implementing agencies of the state governments/ central government, para military organizations located in the state and also to non-government organizations.

In the State, the **Screening Committee** is chaired by the Chief Secretary and other members include the Secretary, Planning Department, Secretary, Home Department, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Home Affairs, State Plan Advisors in the Planning Commission and a representative of the major paramilitary organization operating on the state border. **The Screening Committee is required to meet at least twice a year and it identifies and approves area specific schemes for the state. It reviews the physical targets and achievements of the schemes being implemented** in the state under BADP and submits a list of schemes approved along with the expenditure incurred till the last quarter of the previous year by 1st May, every year.

Though, the Screening Committee is chaired by the Chief Secretaries, the nodal **department is not the same in all the states**. In Punjab and Tripura, the **Planning Department** was coordinating the programme whereas in West Bengal, it was **Home Department**, in Rajasthan it was **Department of Special Schemes and Integrated Rural Development** and in Assam, the **Directorate of Border Areas**. It was only in Gujarat and West Bengal that the Screening Committee was holding meetings twice a year. In other states, it was only once a year. **Except in Assam and Tripura, they were also reported to be monitoring the Schemes. The function of coordination and issuing of guidelines for implementation was not performed by any of the Committees.** There was no proper programme planning. Due to lack of area specific planned projects, there was adhocism resulting in exclusion of need-based projects. **Need assessment surveys were not conducted in a scientific manner. Manpower for administering and implementing programme is not specified.**

Two systems of coordination were prevailing among the States. **In Assam and Rajasthan, all the funds were placed under the district authorities** to be released in instalments, whereas in **Gujarat, Punjab, Tripura and West Bengal**, funds for the **schemes approved by the Screening Committee were released to the line departments / agencies at the state level, which** got the schemes executed through their field offices in the districts and blocks. The latter was found to be **quite effective in a small state, like Tripura but not in Gujarat, Punjab and West Bengal.** There was no coordination at the block level, which was the unit of planning and implementation of the programme. Even at the district level, coordination was not effective. There was no coordination even among the implementing agencies. The District Planning Office was not sufficiently equipped and empowered to ensure coordination.

The programme was being monitored from the point of view of physical and financial achievement vis-à-vis targets at the level of Empowered Committee, Screening Committee and at District and Block level. The methods of monitoring were personal visits, periodical reports and review meetings. Where all the methods were being used, monitoring was very effective. However, personal visits appeared to be the dominant mode of monitoring. In a small state like Tripura monitoring was found to be quite effective with review committee meeting. **Monitoring schedule was not notified anywhere. Grassroot level organizations, block level Panchayat Samiti, BSF, etc. were not involved in monitoring.** The monitoring authorities in the states did not identify the main indicators of monitoring that have a bearing on the objectives of BADP.

Financial Allocation and Their Utilisation

The BADP is a 100 per cent centrally funded special area programme and its financial allocation is decided at the level of Deputy Chairman, Planning Commission. After the funds for Indira Gandhi Nahar Project (IGNP) of Rajasthan Government and Photo Identity Cards schemes of the Ministry of Home Affairs are pre-empted from the allocation of BADP funds, the balance is distributed amongst the beneficiary states on the basis of (i) length of international border (ii) population of border blocks and (iii) area of border blocks (sq.kms.), giving equal weightage to each of these criteria. Since the enabling legislation is still pending in the

Parliament, the amount meant for Photo Identity Cards scheme has been reallocated amongst the states towards the end of each year.

The funds under BADP fall under non-lapsable category. The releases are made by the Department of Expenditure, Ministry of Finance, on the basis of recommendations of Planning Commission in two instalments. Before the commencement of the financial year, the states are informed about the amount of funds to be made available to each state during the next year under BADP. A summary of schemes proposed to be executed within the ceiling communicated will have to be sent to the Planning Commission for release of funds to the state. The first instalment is released in the month of June and the second in February after reviewing the progress upto 31st December and adjusting unspent balance, if any .

The State Governments did not provide information on allocation and expenditure for the period 1985 to 1992. From the information provided on allocation for the year 1993 to 1997, it was found that the allocation principles, as mentioned in the guidelines, were not meticulously followed. Further, allocations do not take into account factors like topography, threat perceptions of people living in border areas and infrastructural deprivation. The limits prescribed for allocation and expenditure during a year on security, administrative buildings and roads were crossed by all the states, except Punjab. **The Empowered Committee must, therefore, review the past performance and evolve new criteria (Planning Commission).**

There was delay in the release of funds from Centre to the States. In case of Assam, a maximum delay of 12 months was reported for the second instalment during 1995-96, while the first instalment was delayed for 8-9 months in the year 1993-94 to 1994-95. The first instalment has been delayed for 8-9 months in almost all the states. The reasons for these delays were poor feedback from states, wrong coverage of schemes and untimely submission of the list of approved schemes. From the states, the funds were allocated to districts on the basis of the same criteria of population, the area of border blocks and the length of border in the district. Project based approach was not being followed. In Assam and Rajasthan, allocation of funds from states to districts was being made directly, whereas in Gujarat, Punjab, Tripura and West Bengal, the funds from coordinating departments were going **to the heads of the line departments at the state level, who were further allocating them to the district level implementing authorities under their administrative control.** There was no set pattern of releases of funds from state to districts. However, **the flow of funds was quite regular in the states of Punjab and Rajasthan. The State Governments were also delaying the release of funds to district authorities of line departments at the district level.** The reasons cited for such delays were: delayed receipt of funds from the Centre, not enough proposals coming from line departments and late submission fo completion certificate from implementing agencies.

The average utilization rate of BADP funds in the six states was found to be 77 per cent during the Eighth Plan and it varied between a maximum of 95 per cent in Punjab and a minimum of 69 per cent in Rajasthan. It has been observed that per capita and per sq.km expenditures under BADP are quite insignificant compared to those under normal State Plan. During the Eighth Plan the per capita and per

sq.km. expenditures under the State Plan in 94-5 were respectively fifteen and thirty seven times of those of BADP. **Thus, BADP funds should be used only as an additionality to State Plan Funds.** It is, however, difficult to ascertain from the available information whether this principle is being strictly followed by all the Border States.

To ensure sectoral balance in allocation and expenditure, the guidelines imposed limits on the use of BADP funds for some sectors. However, none of the six sample States has observed these limits. It was noted that a majority of BADP funds were being used for building roads and bridges, followed by security, irrigation etc. as is indicated in the table below. Almost in all the sample states, **the observed allocation pattern is neither in keeping with the guidelines, nor in accordance with the felt needs of border areas. The Empowered Committee must examine the relevant issues and devise a set of criteria for use of BADP funds that are acceptable to the States and in keeping with the objectives of BADP.**

Sector-wise Expenditure during Eighth Plan

Sector	Transport	Security	Irrigation	Education	Pub.Health	Others	Total
	(Roads/ Bridges)						
%	42.9	14.8	10.9	10.6	10.4	10.4	100.00

Another interesting aspect of the use of BADP funds by the States is that the utilisation rates vary greatly across sectors. While it is reasonably good for administration, health and education infrastructure, irrigation, roads and bridges and security, it is very low for sectors, like agriculture and allied, rural development, energy and other services. Different reasons have been given by the states for under-utilization of BADP funds. Insufficiency of funds and delayed release of funds have been mentioned by the majority of the Border States. Insufficiency of funds is, however, not tenable, as BADP funds are to be used as an additionality. The delay in receipt of funds was because of poor feedback from States, inappropriate schemes and late submission of the list of approved schemes.

Design, Implementation & Performance

For the realization of the objectives of a development programme, the quality of design and implementation is as important as allocation of funds. The Ninth Plan document (Vol. I) has noted that many development projects and programmes, having laudable objectives have failed to deliver results because of inadequacies in the implementation and delivery systems. An attempt is made in the study to examine if the necessary steps for making the implementation of BADP effective were taken by the implementing agencies.

For effective implementation, the states were required to conduct 'need assessment' surveys of the border areas, so that suitable schemes in accordance with local needs could be identified and formulated, realistic targeting and phasing is done and the schemes be implemented with the co-operation of the locals. It was noted in the PEO survey that the need assessment surveys were not conducted in a

scientific manner. In a majority of the cases, the schemes were identified in consultation with the local MLAs/MPs while in some others; no attempt was made to assess people's needs. Only in the case of Gauripur block (Assam), the PRIs were involved in such surveys.

The implementation methods adopted by the States did not seem to have given due importance to the felt needs of the people. Wide deviations between the schemes under implementation and the felt needs of the locals were noticed in the case of most of the States. For example, in Assam, where the PRIs were taken into confidence in need assessment, priority was not accorded to schemes, which the locals needed the most.

The inadequacies in design and implementation have affected physical performance of the scheme. During the Eighth Plan, sectoral targets were not achieved in a number of cases. In the transport sector, which got a large share in the BADP funds, only about 60 per cent of the physical targets (roads and bridges) could be met during the Eighth Plan. Across the states, the variation in the gap between target and achievement ranges from 76 per cent in Tripura to 11 per cent in West Bengal. In the education sector, the overall gap is about 10 per cent, but it is 32 per cent in Rajasthan and 25 per cent in Assam. In the public health, the average gap was 12 per cent. But, it was 100 per cent in Tripura, 33 per cent in Gujarat and 29 per cent in Rajasthan. An attempt was made to assess if the assets created under BADP were of good quality and being maintained. About 40 per cent of the 52 assets created so far were stated to be of 'average' to 'bad' quality and poor maintenance was also reported by a section of knowledgeable persons.

The acid test of the effectiveness of the implementation and delivery systems is the 'satisfaction of the people'. This is more so for BADP, as it aims at removing the sense of insecurity among the people living in border areas and inducing people to undertake normal economic activities in border areas. It is noted in PEO survey that except in a few cases, the people in general are not satisfied with the implementation and delivery systems of the scheme. The reasons for dissatisfaction are the oft-cited ones, viz; the inefficiency in public delivery systems and the mismatch between the schemes being implemented and the felt-needs of the locals.

Impact

It is difficult to isolate the impact of BADP on the development of border areas and on the well being of people, as BADP funds were used to supplement normal state plan funds. However, in the PEO study, an attempt has been made to establish an association between the development efforts under BADP and their results. The methods employed for this purpose relate to "before-and-after" or "with-and-without" results. Along with PEO's survey data, information from several published sources have been used for this purpose. At times, the opinion of knowledgeable people and observations of PEO field teams have been used to establish such correlations. Though such correlations are indicative of associations between inputs and results, these should be interpreted with the necessary caution and care.

Between 1991 and 1997, a change in the occupational pattern has been observed in border areas. Except for Punjab, the proportion of principal earners in agriculture shows a decline, while that in non-agriculture has risen. Most of the earners have shifted to petty trade and household industries. **Abnormally low work participation rate (23 per cent to 25 per cent) was observed in Assam and Tripura**, resulting in a very high dependency ratio. In these two states (border areas) both male and female work participation rates are much lower compared to the border areas of West Bengal and the Western border states. The work participation rate in the border areas of Assam and Tripura is also lower than their respective state averages (1991 Census).

However, some explanations for low work participation rate in Assam and Tripura could be found in the unremunerative agriculture and lack of diversification in rural economic activities in their border areas. The average size of land holding and the proportion of holding under irrigation are the lowest among the border areas of all border states. Perhaps, because of sluggish agriculture and low purchasing power of people, non-agricultural activities have not developed. This is supported by the fact that a very low proportion of earners in these border areas are engaged in non-agricultural activities. **While low participation in the border areas of Assam and Tripura can be explained partly by the sluggish economic activities in these areas, it is necessary to examine if factors like the relatively unrestricted cross border movement and unaccounted trade have any impact on the work participation rates of the local population.**

It is interesting to note that except in Gujarat, **agricultural productivity in border areas is comparable with the state average yields of crops grown in these areas.** It has been observed that wherever irrigation facilities are available, the agricultural productivity in border areas is reasonably good. Thus, increased availability of irrigation, complementary inputs and other facilities could make agriculture in these areas remunerative.

An attempt was made in the PEO survey to arrive at an estimate of per capita income of people living in border areas. The per capita income of the sample households in border areas for the year 1997-98 was found to be 67 per cent of the per capita State Domestic Product (for 1994-95) in the case of Assam, 36.5 per cent in Gujarat, 59 per cent in Punjab, 51 per cent in Rajasthan, 65 per cent in Tripura and 52 per cent in West Bengal. Except in Punjab (20 per cent) and West Bengal (35 per cent) the poverty ratio in border areas was found to be very high. It was about 57 per cent in Assam, 47 per cent in Gujarat, 56 per cent in Rajasthan and 80 per cent in Tripura.

It is interesting to note that the **two northeastern Border States have done much better in the area of education than the western Border States.** The literate population among the sample households was found to be 79 per cent in Assam, 36 per cent in Gujarat, 57.3 per cent in Punjab, 33.6 per cent in Rajasthan, 69.4 per cent in Tripura and 67.7 per cent in West Bengal. A comparison of these estimates with district level Census statistics indicates that there has been significant improvement in the education participation rate in the eastern/north-east border areas, while no marked improvement is noticed in the case of western border areas.

The state governments were permitted to use BADP funds for improving the access to safe drinking water in border areas. A “before-and-after” comparison reveals that even **though safe drinking water facilities were created in 19 per cent of the villages under BADP, the access is still very poor. Only 38 per cent of the border villages were found to have adequate access, while in the remaining villages people were dissatisfied because of irregular supply of electricity and water, unsatisfactory quality of water and defunct/non-operational sources.**

As per available information, **a large proportion of border villages have benefited from the creation of physical, social and security related infrastructure under BADP.** In Assam, 75 per cent of the border villages benefited from road construction and 25 per cent from school projects. In Gujarat, 50 per cent of the border villages were covered under road construction, 38 per cent under security related infrastructure and 63 per cent under water supply schemes. Fifty per cent of Punjab (border) villages were covered under health infrastructure scheme (PHC, CHC etc.) and 75 per cent in security infrastructure schemes. In Rajasthan, Tripura and West Bengal, too, a large proportion of border villages benefited from the creation of physical, social and security related infrastructure.

In the opinion of knowledgeable people, construction of roads and bridges in Assam, Gujarat, Rajasthan, Tripura and West Bengal has increased mobility, provided easy access to other villages, markets, hospitals and reduced hardships of people. However, there are several inadequacies, like lack of maintenance, low-lying roads and delay in making roads operational due to lack of funds. The drinking water supply and irrigation projects implemented in Gujarat, Punjab and Rajasthan have increased supply of drinking water, reduced incidence of diseases and drudgery of women. However, the facilities created lack maintenance, resulting in erratic supply. In the case of schools and health centres, the complementary facilities are lacking, making these ineffective.

BADP funds have been used for construction of additional rooms in primary schools, Bal Utsav Kendras, play grounds and teachers’ residential quarters. Funds were also used for augmentation of health services in Gujarat, Punjab and Rajasthan. However, shortage of staff in schools and lack of doctors, medicine and equipments were experienced in some cases. BADP funds were used for flood control measures in Assam, Gujarat, Tripura and West Bengal. These have been used primarily for small projects, like works for prevention of erosion of riverbank and soil, and for shelter for the flood affected people.

Sense of Security & BADP

One major objective of BADP is to create an enabling environment and impart a sense of security among the people, so that normal economic activities and human development goals could be pursued. It is for this reason that 7.5 per cent of BADP funds was earmarked for security related schemes. This is over and above other schemes (like roads and buildings), which could be related to security measures.

PEO's field survey was designed to assess if the implementation of BADP has imparted a sense of security among the people living in border areas. For this purpose information relating to threat perception, steps taken under BADP, the economic behaviour of people as revealed by the production, investment and asset formation, their education and health seeking behaviour etc. were collected. In addition, views of knowledgeable people, block development authorities, village level authorities and households were sought about the threat perception in border areas and the impact of measures taken under BADP.

Threat perception in border areas varied across states. **In Assam and Punjab, neither the people nor the authorities perceived any major security threat from the border.** In Assam, floods and occasional cattle lifting were viewed as the main threats to the livelihood of people. In Punjab, too, floods had led to loss of human lives, cattle heads, damage to crops and houses. Some farmers, who have lands across the barbed fencing, expressed that there were restrictions on their movement and the type of crops they could grow. As a result, their economic interests are affected. Also, electricity supply in border areas being erratic, people prefer to stay indoors after sun set, particularly in West Bengal.

Under BADP, some measures were taken to improve the security in border areas. **In Gujarat and West Bengal, border out posts and observation posts equipped with drinking water facilities, night vision equipments etc. were constructed. With these, BSF patrolling and raids were intensified. A large majority of the households in Gujarat, Rajasthan, Tripura and West Bengal expressed satisfaction with the measures taken and felt that the security environment in the border areas has improved.** However, in the other states, measures taken so far were inadequate and haphazard and more needs to be done.

The security environment influences the migration behaviour of people, among other things. **It was reported that during the past five years, only two persons from 40 households in Punjab and 5 persons from 80 households in Rajasthan out migrated for search of employment. On the other hand, 54 members of 80 households in Gujarat returned to their native places. This is an indication of improvement in security environment in the border areas.**

The security environment influences the household investment behaviour. An analysis of the survey information reveals that about 41 per cent of the households made investment during the last five years in items like purchase of agricultural land, tube well, pump sets, tractors, land development, building/extension of houses, business and livestock. This proportion varies across states, with Punjab leading the table with (72.5 per cent), followed by West Bengal (70 per cent), Gujarat (42.5 per cent), Assam and Rajasthan (25 per cent each) and Tripura (22.5 per cent). **A large proportion of this investment is in agriculture and related activities.** The relatively low investment in Assam, Rajasthan and Tripura could partly be due to widespread poverty on the one hand and factors like floods and inhospitable terrain on the other.

Credit markets do not operate in an environment of uncertainty and insecurity. In the PEO study, information on loans taken by households, their purpose and sources were sought to assess if the activities were normal. It was noted that the proportion of households taking loans was very small. Only in West Bengal (37.5 per cent), Tripura (25 per cent), Gujarat (20 per cent) and Punjab (20 per cent) some households took loans, primarily from Cooperative or Regional Rural Banks. The private credit market does not seem to have developed in the area. **All this tends to suggest that whatever improvement in the security environment has taken place is not adequate to motivate people to undertake non-agricultural activities on a wider scale. Perhaps, it would take place in the long run, if the present peace and security situation is sustained.**

Conclusions and Suggestions

The evaluation study has covered various aspects of the planning, implementation and impact of BADP in the border states of Assam, Gujarat, Punjab, Rajasthan, Tripura and West Bengal. The findings of the study tend to suggest that, **to a large extent, BADP has contributed towards creating an enabling environment for undertaking normal economic activities in border areas an expanding development opportunities for the local population. However, the degree of success varies between states and across sectors in a state.**

Some areas where BADP has made notable contribution are: (i) construction of building for police stations, check posts and residential quarters for security personnel, night vision equipments and tube wells at BOPs and OPs has improved the security environment in Punjab, Rajasthan and West Bengal; (ii) construction of community centres in Rajasthan has been received well by the people of border areas of Rajasthan; (iii) the piggeries project has improved the economic conditions of some people in Tripura; (iv) construction of roads in Tripura has improved connectivity to other villages and market, with positive impact on the well being of people; and (v) establishment of polytechnic, college and residential quarters for teachers, particularly in Punjab had a favourable impact.

At the other end, the BADP has not made any notable contribution in some priority areas. BADP has failed to attack the major problems of recurrent floods, water logging, salinity and soil erosion in Assam and Punjab. It has not contributed towards streamlining the PDS in Assam where exclusion of the Jhumias, the majority of whom belonged to the BPL category, was noticed. In Assam, the scheme has not been able to motivate the local people to participate in the development process. The scheme has not helped in the development of a reliable transportation system to enable the people to have access to facilities created in the nearby towns/cities. Non-availability of safe drinking water in border areas continues to remain a major problem. In the northeast Border States, a large majority of the households live in abject poverty for lack of employment and alternative avenues of earning. In the Western Border States, there has not been any improvement in access to education and health facilities. No efforts were made to ensure participation of the people in the programme in any state.

The above inadequacies notwithstanding, **the BADP holds the potential for bringing about an improvement in the quality of life of people living in border**

areas. For realization of this potential, some suggestions are made, based primarily on the diagnostic analysis of the information generated through the PEO study.

1. The development of border areas warrants a different intervention strategy because of the additional problems arising out of their topography and the threat perception from external aggression, cross-border terrorism and unlawful activities. **The BADP was originally designed with the limited objective of addressing some security related issues. However, in its present form and content, the security and socio-economic development issues have got intertwined.** Perhaps, the two sets of development issues are inseparable. This peculiarity has made the task of planning and implementation of BADP more challenging than normal plan schemes.

The findings of the evaluation study indicate that **socio-economic development of border areas is possible only when a sense of security prevails. This clearly brings into focus a few additional dimensions that need to be given due weightage in deciding on the development strategy for border areas.** First, the nature of threat perception obviously varies across the Border States. **The relative roles of the peacekeeping agencies and normal development administration in planning and execution of development schemes would, therefore, be different in different states.** Secondly, **the financial allocation criteria for BADP funds across the Border States should consider the nature of threat and topography of border areas, in addition to population – cum- area criteria.**

It appears that these aspects are at present not receiving the importance they deserve. **The Empowered Committee may like to deliberate on these issues on the basis of the inputs from the Ministry of Home Affairs and Ministry of Defence, and examine specifically if the implementation methods for BADP need to be made state specific.**

2. An area of concern that needs to be addressed is the 'adhocism' in the formulation and implementation of schemes under BADP. **It would be appropriate to have a long term perspective for each border block, assuming that BADP funds would continue to be available on a long term basis.** Such a perspective plan would obviously need, among other things, an assessment of the security environment for each border area. The BADP can be made an integral part of these perspective plans by suitably identifying the areas of intervention for each state. The Empowered Committee may like to examine the proposal.

3. Though the need assessment surveys (as required) are reported to have been conducted in all the states, **some priority areas of concern, such as shortage of drinking water supply, recurrent floods in some border areas and low education participation have not been given due importance in planning and execution of schemes.** This is happening, perhaps because direct contact with the local people and organizations was not established while conducting the need assessment surveys. **The District Planning Committees must ensure that the local level institutions (PRIs, NGOs) are involved in identifying the priority areas while preparing schemes/ proposals.**

4. The Screening Committee in most of the states does not meet regularly. Both planning and monitoring of BADP should be within the domain of this Committee. **The frequency of meeting must increase to at least two, if not more. The programme for any fiscal year should be finalized by the Committee before April** so as ensure timely availability of funds. This is necessary because of the short duration of the working season in some border states.

5. Co-ordination between the implementing agencies of sectoral schemes is a weak area. The practice of releasing funds to the line departments at the state level needs to be changed. **It is advisable to place the BADP funds with the district authorities to ensure co-ordination in planning and implementation.** It may, however, be noted that though such a system is in vogue in Assam and Rajasthan, the result is not satisfactory, as the District Planning Offices are neither equipped nor empowered to ensure the required co-ordination. **Capacity building of the District Planning Offices and delegation of authority to plan and implement BADP are the areas that need the attention of the Screening and Empowered Committees.**

6. A proper mechanism for monitoring expenditure and performance of schemes under BADP is not in place in most of the states. As a result, the information for evaluation of performance of BADP is not available with the Empowered Committee and Screening Committee for decision-making. **The District Planning Committee should be equipped for generation and transmission of data on BADP to these (decision making) Committees.**

7. The BADP guidelines stipulate that the expenses on security related schemes (7.5%) and administration buildings and roads should not exceed 40 per cent. **It was noted that none of the six states was observing this limit on expenses. The Empowered Committee must examine the relevant issues and adopt a more flexible approach in this regard. The Committee may also deliberate on the issue of using BADP funds strictly as an 'additionality' to normal plan funds for border blocks. At present, there is no mechanism that ensures this.**

8. In general, the antipoverty programmes like IRDP, JRY, EAS, PDS, IAY, TRYSEM, DWACRA etc. are not working effectively in border areas. **Wherever feasible BADP funds may be used to supplement those available under these schemes to build productive assets and create employment opportunities to raise the income level of the people.** For example, funds from IRDP, EAS, JRY and BADP could be used to provide minor irrigation facilities in Assam, Gujarat, Rajasthan and Tripura.

9. The artisans and petty traders of border areas expressed the need for credit and marketing facilities. It has been noted in the PEO survey that the capital market in border areas is weak and institutional credit is not available as per requirement. **The NABARD authorities may be involved (in the District Planning Committee) to identify areas that can be provided credit facilities.**