

Publication No. 87

(2/1985)



GOVERNMENT OF KARNATAKA

REPORT ON THE EVALUATION  
OF  
INTEGRATED RURAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME



-5487  
307-72  
KAR-R

EVALUATION DIVISION  
Institutional Finance and Statistics Department  
Karnataka Government Secretariat  
Bangalore  
1985

Publication No.87  
(5/1985)

GOVERNMENT OF KARNATAKA

REPORT ON THE EVALUATION OF  
INTEGRATED RURAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME

NIEPA DC



D03103

EVALUATION DIVISION  
INSTITUTIONAL FINANCE & STATISTICS DEPARTMENT  
KARNATAKA GOVERNMENT SECRETARIAT  
BANGALORE

1 9 8 5

Sub. National Systems Unit,  
National Institute of Educational  
Planning and Administration  
17-B, SriAurobindo Marg, New Delhi-110016  
DOC. No. 3103  
Date 20-6-86

## F O R E W O R D

The Integrated Rural Development Programme is a major programme being implemented in the state for tackling rural poverty. It aims at improving family income of those residing in rural areas whose annual income is below Rs.3500/-. The present study is an attempt in evaluating the working of this programme in Karnataka. It covers the period 1980-84.

2. As the study reveals, the working of this all too important programme is good in some respects and not so good in other respects. The physical and financial targets over the period 1980-84 have been exceeded. The weak points relate to the qualitative aspects of its implementation. At present, planning and implementing the programme at the block level is not systematic. There is misutilisation and mismanagement of the programme to some extent. There are also instances of praiseworthy achievement.

3. At the state level, amounts released (Rs.4360 lakhs) accounted for only 92.3 per cent of budgetary allotments (Rs.4,725 lakhs) during the period 1980-84. However, expenditure (Rs.5,719 lakhs) was about 131.2 per cent. In some districts expenditure fell short of amounts released. Administrative expenses should not exceed 7.5 per cent of the total expenditure as per guidelines. But in many districts this figure was much higher; the highest being 21.9 per cent in Raichur district. The quantum of credit advanced by the commercial banks over the period 1980-84 was Rs.126.07 crores. Physical achievements (5.77 lakh beneficiaries) exceeded the target (4.20 lakhs) by 37.5 per cent over the period 1980-84. As per the guidelines, 30 per cent of the total beneficiaries must belong to SC/ST, but the achievement was only 24.3 per cent. It was lowest (6.1 per cent) in U.K. district and highest (39.0) per cent in Kolar district. As per the guidelines, assistance to beneficiaries under agricultural and allied

activities should not exceed 2/3rds. But, actually, 90 per cent of the beneficiaries were from this sector; beneficiaries under the animal husbandry sector (mainly supply of milch animals) alone constituted 68.5 per cent of the total beneficiaries, indicative of the disproportionate priority accorded in implementing this programme.

4. In the selected blocks, surveys for identifying the prospective beneficiaries were not properly carried out. In two of the four selected blocks, the percentage of SC/ST beneficiaries was lower than the prescribed minimum of 30.0 per cent.

5. Nearly 20 per cent of the beneficiaries, at the time of identification, had an annual family income exceeding Rs.3500/- who were thus ineligible for IRDP assistance. A majority of the beneficiaries had to visit the block office/banks 2 to 5 times for getting their loan applications sanctioned and subsidy released. The programme helped 20 per cent of the beneficiaries to cross the poverty line by 1983-84. The programme had a marginal impact in terms of employment generation; additional employment (mandays) generated during 1983-84 amounted to 7.6 per cent as compared to employment level in the initial year. 71.4 per cent of the beneficiaries had not repaid the loans.

6. A majority of the beneficiaries opted for milch animals, resulting in high demand and consequent scarcity of animals of good breed and yield. This inturn, had led to unduly high prices of animals, circulation of the same animals and other malpractices. Follow up work was very poor mainly because of inadequate staff at the block level. A complete recheck of assets by the implementing authorities in Dharwad district revealed misutilisation of assets varying from 7 per cent to 25 per cent. Co-ordination at the block level among the implementing agencies was not satisfactory. Credit camps in several cases were not conducted properly.

7. In a massive and complex programme like this, which involves a number of agencies, it may be difficult to eliminate deficiencies at the implementation stage altogether. In the short-run, perhaps a qualitative improvement in the implementation of the programme may be brought about through strengthening the staff at the periphery, reducing the physical target and conforming to priorities, particularly in respect of activities other than agriculture. In the long-run, to eliminate the inherent deficiencies, a policy modification may be worth considering; a modification in favour of methods for augmenting income of the target group through "Wage-Income" rather than "Asset-Derived-Income". Given the fact that Karnataka has one of the best administrative infrastructure for this programme, we can look for better results in the future if only correctives are applied to overcome the deficiencies.

8. The study was carried out under the guidance and supervision of Sri H.S. Nagaraj, Director of Evaluation. I am thankful to him and his colleagues for their hard work and co-operation in quickly finalising the report.

Bangalore  
September 5, 1985

D.M. NANJUNDAPPA  
Commissioner & Secretary to Government  
Planning and Institutional Finance &  
Statistics Departments.



## P R E F A C E

The Integrated Rural Development Programme is being implemented in Karnataka, as also in the country, since 1978-79. It is the most important, comprehensive programme aimed at alleviating poverty of rural masses. The programme covers the entire state. Huge investments are being made to stimulate economic activity in rural areas by subsidising asset formulation of the rural poor families whose annual income is below Rs.3500/-.

2. In view of its importance and role, the Government desired that an evaluation of the working of this programme be taken up. This study is the result of an evaluation of the programme by the Evaluation Division.
3. The study was initiated during the year 1983-84, the reference period being 1980-84. For purpose of detailed study, two districts, viz., Chikmagalur and Dharwad were selected. In each of these districts, two blocks and a few beneficiaries in each of these blocks were selected for detailed investigation at the grass-root level.
4. Co-operation extended by the officers of the Rural Development Department, particularly the Secretary to Government, Rural Development and Panchayat Raj Department, the Project Directors of DRDs of the districts concerned, the Block Development Officers, and Bank Managers is gratefully acknowledged.
5. I place on record my appreciation of the excellent work done ungrudgingly and enthusiastically by Sri V. Nagaraja Rao, Assistant Director. He was assisted by Sriyuths V. Shankara Reddy, and D.C. Viawanathaiiah, Senior Investigators. Secretarial assistance was provided by Smt. Jayalakshmi and Smt. A.P. Sunithramma, Stenographers I thank them also.



6. A critical review of the draft report by Dr. D.M. Nanjundappa, Commissioner and Secretary to Government, Planning and Institutional Finance and Statistics Departments, helped substantially to improve this report, which is acknowledged with gratitude.

Bangalore

Dated: 8.8.1985

H.S. NAGARAJ  
Director  
Evaluation Division  
Institutional Finance and  
Statistics Department

## C O N T E N T S

<u>Chapter Number</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Page Number</u>
I	Summary	1
II	Introduction	22
III	The Programme in Brief	27
IV	Review of the Implementation of the Programme in the State	32
V	Implementation of the Programme in Selected Blocks	46
VI	Beneficiary Survey	71
VII	Views of Implementing Officers and Bankers	92
VIII	Some discussions and conclusions	115
<u>APPENDIX</u>		
	A quick study of costs and benefits under Integrated Rural Development Programme in Kolar Block - (1983-85)	148



LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table No.</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Page</u>
4.1	Allocations and amounts released under IRDP - 1980-84	32
4.2	Expenditure incurred on the IRD Programme - 1980-84	34
4.3	Allotment and Expenditure under IRDP - 1980-84	35
4.4	Total investments under the IRD Programme - 1980-84	38
4.5	Coverage of SC/ST families under the IRD Programme - 1980-84	40
4.6	Sectorwise percentage of beneficiaries- 1980-84	42
4.7	Average investment per beneficiary - 1980-84	44
5.1	Distribution of families according to range of income - Gadag block	47
5.2	Subsidy and other expenditure under IRDP- Gadag block.	48
5.3	Families assisted under the IRD Programme - Gadag block	49
5.4	Expenditure per beneficiary - Gadag block	50
5.5	Occupational distribution of families identified - Kalghatagi block	51
5.6	Distribution of families according to annual income - Kalghatagi block	52
5.7	Expenditure under IRDP - Kalghatagi block	53
5.8	Families assisted under the programme - Kalghatagi block - 1981-84	55
5.9	Expenditure per beneficiary - Kalghatagi block	56

<u>Table No.</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Page</u>
5.10	Occupational distribution of families- Kadur block - 1980-84	58
5.11	Distribution of families according to annual income - Kadur block - 1980-84	58
5.12	Expenditure (subsidy+other items)under IRDP - Kadur block	59
5.13	Families assisted under the IRD Progr- amme - Kadur block - 1980-84	61
5.14	Expenditure per beneficiary - Kadur block - 1980-84	62
5.15	Occupational distribution of families- Sringeri block - 1982-84	63
5.16	Distribution of families according to annual income - Sringeri block - 1982-84	64
5.17	Expenditure under IRDP on providing subsidy - Sringeri block - 1982-84	64
5.18	Families assisted under the programme- Sringeri block - 1982-84	66
5.19	Expenditure per beneficiary on subsidy- Sringeri block - 1982-84	66
5.20	Financial and physical achievement (as per cent of target, blockwise)-1980-84	69
5.21	Percentage distribution of beneficia- ries by activity assisted by block - 1980-84	70
6.1	Size of the beneficiary families	72
6.2	Educational background of beneficiaries	73
6.3	Occupation of beneficiary households	73
6.4	Activity status of members of benefi- ciary families surveyed	74
6.5	Distribution of workers according to age	75
6.6	Percapita monthly income and annual in- come of beneficiary families at the time of identification	76

<u>Table No.</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Page</u>
6.7	Annual expenditure of beneficiary families (family of five persons - at the time of identification)	78
6.8	Monthly average family income of beneficiaries after receiving assistance	80
6.9	Average annual family income of beneficiaries before and after IRDP assistance (for a family of 5 persons)	81
6.10	Proportion of average annual family income generated from IRDP assets to total income (for a family of five persons)	82
6.11	Employment position-working members of beneficiary families before and after getting benefit under the programme	83
6.12	Beneficiary families crossing the poverty line - by the end of 1983-84	84
6.13	Distribution of non-beneficiary families (family of five) by income - 1980-81 and 1983-84	90
-----		
1	Annual allocation and amounts released	125
2	Expenditure incurred on the IRD Programme	126
3	Allotment and expenditure under the IRD Programme	127
4	IRDP - percentage of expenditure on Administration - 1982-83	129
5	Credit disbursed by financial institutions under the programme	130
6	Total investments under the IRD Programme	131
6A	Total investments under the IRD Programme - Average per block by district - 1980-84	133

<u>Table No.</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Page</u>
7	Physical targets and achievements under IRD Programme - 1980-84	135
7A	Physical targets and achievements (beneficiaries) average per block by districts- 1980-84	137
8	Coverage of SC/ST families under IRD Programme by district - 1980-84	138
8A	Families identified - total and SC/ST for selected districts to end of 1982-83	140
9	Percentage distribution of beneficiaries by major sectors	141
10	Per beneficiary investment under IRD Programme by districts - 1980-84	142
11	Operational details of IRDP-comparative picture (selected blocks and state)	144

\*\*\*\*\*

## CHAPTER - I

### Summary

- 1.1 The Integrated Rural Development Programme was designed to improve the economic and social life of the poorest of the poor living in rural areas; poor families with an annual income of less than Rs.3500 (for a family of five persons) were assisted for crossing the poverty line by making available to them economically viable assets through bank loans and subsidy. The programme came into operation in 1978-79 and was implemented through the District Rural Development Societies (Paras 2.1 to 2.3).
- 1.2 For identifying the families below the poverty line, a household survey was envisaged through which details relating to the size of the family, literacy, occupation, land holdings, assets, income and indebtedness, etc., had to be collected. This survey was confined to the families having an operational area of less than 5 acres and an income of less than Rs.3500 per annum (Para 3.11).
- 1.3 Under the programme, subsidies at the rate of 25 per cent and  $33\frac{1}{3}$  per cent to small farmers and marginal farmers respectively, are being provided. In the case of tribals, subsidy is of the order of 50 per cent. The maximum amount of subsidy per beneficiary is Rs.3000 for all beneficiaries except scheduled tribes for whom it is Rs.5000. However, for rural industries and artisans the maximum subsidy is only Rs.3000 for all beneficiaries (Para 3.10).
- 1.4 The expenditure on the programme is shared by both central and state governments equally. The financial outlay was Rs.5 lakhs per block during the first year of the sixth plan, Rs.6 lakhs during the second year and Rs.8 lakhs during the subsequent years (Para 3.9).



- 1.5 The physical target under the programme during the sixth plan was to provide assistance to 600 families per block every year (of which 30 per cent should belong to SCs/STs). Of these 400 families were expected to benefit through agriculture and related activities, 100 families through village and cottage industries and the remaining families in the service sector (Par 3.3).
- 1.6 For implementation of the programme, the DRDS do not have field staff of their own and have to depend on the staff of other development departments, block agencies and financial institutions (Para 3.6).
- 1.7 The evaluation of IRD Programme was taken up with the objectives of reviewing the performance of the programme, ascertaining the volume of investments, the scale and pattern of investments, coverage of SC/ST and the impact of the programme on beneficiaries and studying the various aspects of implementation of the programme (Para 2.5).
- 1.8 For the purpose of detailed study, two districts viz., Dharwad and Chikmagalur and four blocks viz., Gadag, Kalghatagi, Kadur and Sringeri were selected. 112 beneficiaries and 20 non-beneficiaries in 26 villages of these four blocks were selected for the impact study. The study covered the period from 1980-81 to 1983-84 (Paras 2.7 and 2.8).

Implementation of the Programme in the State:

- 1.9 Total amount released for the programme in the state during the period 1980-84 was Rs.4360 lakhs. The percentage of amount released to total allocations was 92.3 (Table-4.1).

- 1.10 Expenditure incurred on the programme in the state (which included expenditure on providing subsidy, administrative expenses, expenditure on providing infrastructural facilities, etc.) was Rs.5719 lakhs during 1980-84; accounting for 131.2 per cent of the releases during the period. During each of the four years, expenditure was considerably higher than the corresponding releases (Table-4.2 and Para 4.7).
- 1.11 Although the expenditure on the programme was higher than the amounts released at the state level, it was not so in the case of all districts (Para 4.8).
- 1.12 Financial target under the programme over 1980-84 was Rs.4725 lakhs as against which an expenditure of Rs.5719 lakhs was incurred. The target was thus exceeded by 21 per cent. The programme could be considered as successful in terms of financial achievements (i.e., expenditure) (Table 4.3 and Para 4.12).
- 1.13 With regard to the financial performance of the districts, Dakshina Kannada was far ahead of other districts, with 195 per cent performance while Raichur was at the bottom with 82 per cent (Para 4.13).
- 1.14 As per the guidelines issued by the Government of India, administrative expenses should not exceed 7.5 per cent of allocations. According to the information available for 1982-83, the proportion of administrative expenses in the districts varied from 5 per cent to 21.9 per cent. In seven out of 13 districts the ceiling had been exceeded (Para 4.14).
- 1.15 The total credit provided by the financial institutions during 1980-84 in the state amounted to Rs.126.07 crores. While expenditure on subsidy has shown an increase from year to year, the volume of credit disbursed had, strangely enough, declined in 1983-84 (Para-4.16).

- 1.16 In the disbursement of credit, Dharwad district stood first with Rs.1341.89 lakhs, while Kodagu was at the bottom with only Rs.156.25 lakhs during the period 1980-84 (Para 4.17).
- 1.17 The total investments over the period 1980-84 was Rs.18,325.64 lakhs of which Rs.12,607.04 lakhs constituted credit and Rs.5718.60 lakhs were for subsidy and other expenses. The rate of subsidy and other expenses to credit provided would work out to 31: 69, instead of 28: 72 as prescribed (Para 4.19).
- 1.18 The investment per block during 1980-84, works out to Rs.104.70 lakhs, of which credit accounted for Rs.72.04 lakhs (Para 4.20).
- 1.19 The physical target for each block was to cover 600 families each year and the target for the state was 4,20,00,000 for the four year period (1980-84). As against this, the achievement during 1980-84 was 5,77,437 or 137.5 per cent of the target (Para 4.22).
- 1.20 Although the physical achievements are creditable, they are not brought about by corresponding increases in expenditure. This would lead to the conclusion that the quality of implementation could have suffered (Para 4.23).
- 1.21 It is seen that Gulbarga stood first with a physical achievement of 132.4 per cent of its target during the period 1980-84 (Para 4.26).
- 1.22 It was envisaged in the programme that atleast 30 per cent of the beneficiaries should belong to the scheduled castes and scheduled tribes. As against this, the percentage of their coverage was only 24.3 during 1980-84 (Para 4.28 and Table 4.5).

- 1.23 The coverage of SC/ST families ranged from a very low of 6.1 per cent in Uttara Kannada district to an impressive 39 per cent in Kolar district during 1980-84. Apart from Kolar, three other districts exceeded the target. To make up the short fall in coverage of SC/ST, serious efforts must be made in the remaining 15 districts (Para 4.30).
- 1.24 The percentage of SC/ST families identified are very low in the districts of Dharwad (12.6 per cent) and Mandya (13.7 per cent), which is not satisfactory (Para 4.33).
- 1.25 During 1980-84 animal husbandry sector accounted for 68.5 per cent of the beneficiaries. Over the years, this sector has been given increasing importance at the cost of other sectors (Para 4.35).
- 1.26 According to the guidelines, not more than two-thirds of the beneficiaries should be in agriculture and allied sector. But, 90 per cent of all beneficiaries and 85 per cent of SC/ST beneficiaries were provided assistance only under this sector. The high concentration of activities under animal husbandry sector has led to problems like inadequate/lack of availability of quality animals. As such, beneficiaries should be encouraged to take up activities in the ISB sector (Para 4.38).
- 1.27 The average investment per beneficiary during 1980-84 worked out to Rs.3174. Dakshina Kannada district topped the list with Rs.4250 per beneficiary while Shimoga district was at the bottom with Rs.2321 per beneficiary (Paras 4.40 and 4.41).

Implementation of the Programme in the Selected Blocks:

- 1.28 Among the selected blocks, the target number of families (27,686) was identified in Kadur block and the lowest number of families (4445) was identified in Sringeri block. 44.6 per cent of identified families belonged to SC/ST in Sringeri block and 22.05 in Kadur block (Para - 5.75).
- 1.29 Cultivators and labourers were the major occupational categories of identified families (Para 5.76).
- 1.30 A majority of the households in two blocks of Dharwad had an annual income of Rs.1000 or less at the time of identification. In the two blocks of Chikmagalur a majority of the households had an annual income ranging from Rs.1001 to Rs.2500 (Para 5.77).
- 1.31 A comparison of the average household income as per IRDP survey with the corresponding figures as per the field study by the Evaluation Division would indicate that family incomes are consistently under reported, in the IRDP surveys, in the two blocks of Dharwad district (Para 5.78).
- 1.32 In terms of physical achievements, the performance appears to be more than satisfactory in all the the blocks except Sringeri (Para 5.79).
- 1.33 The proportion of SC/ST families assisted was above the target in Kadur and Kalghatagi blocks. It was below target in Gadag (25.5 per cent) and Sringeri (only 11.5 per cent) blocks (Para 5.80).
- 1.34 Animal husbandry accounted for the largest single activity chosen by beneficiaries in all the selected blocks except Kadur where it was agriculture (Para 5.81).

- 1.35 Assistance per beneficiary was the highest in Kalghatagi block (Rs.3058) and the lowest in Gadag block (Rs.646) (Para 5.84)

Beneficiary Survey:

- 1.36 Among the beneficiary families selected for detailed study, the average family size was 6.2 (Para 6.5).
- 1.37 42.9 per cent of the selected beneficiaries were illiterate (Para 6.7).
- 1.38 The proportion of workers in the selected beneficiary families was 39.5 per cent. The number of workers per selected beneficiary family was 2.5 (Para 6.12).
- 1.39 A majority of workers among the selected beneficiary families were in the age group of 15-59 years, the average for the four selected blocks being 93.1 per cent (Para-6.14).
- 1.40 The average annual income of selected beneficiary families (per family of five persons) at the time of identification was Rs.3145 for all blocks. In Gadag block it was Rs.4080 which was higher than the ceiling fixed for assistance under the programme. As the income figures of the IRDP household survey are consistently lower it would appear that the survey had not been conducted properly (Table 6.6 and Para 6.17).
- 1.41 The average annual expenditure of selected beneficiary families on food and clothing was Rs.3004 at the time of identification. If other expenses are also considered, the total expenditure could be higher than the income ceiling (Para 6.19).
- 1.42 Of the beneficiaries selected for detailed study 46.4 per cent received assistance under animal husbandry sector, 20.5 per cent under agriculture sector, 30.4 per cent under ISB sector and 2.5 per cent for minor irrigation (Para 6.21).

- 1.43 The average cost of assets provided to selected beneficiaries was Rs.2920 per beneficiary. Under agriculture sector it was Rs.5631 per beneficiary. Whereas, under other sectors it was much less (Para 6.23).
- 1.44 The average annual income of beneficiary families which was Rs.3145 at the time of identification increased by only 1.7 per cent to Rs.3198 in 1982-83 (after receiving assistance). During 1983-84, the income rose to Rs.3991 an increase of 26.9 per cent (Para 6.28).
- 1.45 Among the selected blocks Kadur's performance was outstanding as the rate of growth in income was 59.5 per cent in 1982-83 and 80 per cent in 1983-84. In the case of Kalghatagi and Gadag blocks negative growth rates are noticed (Para 6.29).
- 1.46 The percentage contribution of IRDP assets towards total income of beneficiaries was 34.6 and 36.7 respectively during 1982-83 and 1983-84. Thus, a substantial portion of beneficiary families' income was generated through IRDP assets (Para 6.31).
- 1.47 The programme had helped the beneficiary families to raise their income fairly even though the income from other sources had declined marginally (Para 6.32).
- 1.48 The employment level of the working members of the beneficiary families had increased by 7.6 per cent in 1983-84 after receiving assistance under the programme. The highest increase was in Gadag block (18.9 per cent) (Para 6.34).
- 1.49 The low generation of additional employment may be attributable to the large number of milch animals provided which did not create much additional employment (Para 6.35).
- 1.50 Of the beneficiary families selected, for detailed study, 19.6 per cent had crossed the poverty line at the time of identification itself. This percentage had

gone up to 42.0 per cent by the end of 1983-84. Of the families which were below the poverty line at the time of availing IRDP assistance 27.7 per cent had crossed the poverty line over a period of 3 years; the corresponding percentage ranged from 47.9 (Kadur) to 8.7 (Kalghatagi) among the selected blocks (Paras 6.37 and 6.38).

- 1.51 Regarding delay in processing of applications, only 3.6 per cent of the selected beneficiaries felt that there were abnormal delays ranging from 2 to 4 months (Para 6.4).
- 1.52 A majority of the beneficiaries had to visit the Block Office and the Banks 2 to 5 times for getting sanction/benefit. The expenditure on such visits ranged from Rs.5 to Rs.100 per visit. The average expense per applicant was Rs.25/- per visit. The implementing authorities and bank officials should see that the beneficiary is not unnecessarily inconvenienced by quickly disposing off their applications (Para 6.43 and 6.44).
- 1.53 More than 50 per cent of the beneficiaries stated that the benefit provided helped them in realising additional income. However, most of the beneficiaries who were provided with sheep and goat units reported loss due to death of animals (Para 6.45).
- 1.54 13 of the selected beneficiaries stated that they were given cash for purchasing assets, which is surprising in view of the instructions to provide benefits only in kind (Para 6.46).
- 1.55 15 beneficiaries from ISB sector had to make their own arrangements for additional resources as the assistance provided was not adequate. In cases where the assistance sought is more than what is permissible, maximum assistance should be sanctioned if the requirement is genuine (Para 6.47).



- 1.56 A large number of beneficiaries were not aware of the procedures for repayment of loans, which could be one of the reasons for poor recoveries. It should be the responsibility of bank officials and implementing officers to inform the beneficiaries regarding repayment procedures. A small booklet of instructions on the subject would be useful (Para 6.48).
- 1.57 71.4 per cent of the beneficiaries had not repaid the loans promptly. The implementing officers should take an active role in collecting the dues as otherwise the future operations of the programme would be affected (Para 6.49).
- 1.58 Most of the beneficiaries were satisfied with available marketing outlets/facilities (Para 6.50).
- 1.59 There were a few cases where non-beneficiaries stated that although their applications were recommended, the bank officials did not sanction the loan. Because, they could not get a surety or they had provided surety to persons who had defaulted. In one village assistance was not recommended due to poor recovery in the village. The implementing officers should ensure that deserving persons are not denied benefits for the above mentioned reasons. The Bank Managers should also be clearly informed of this. The implementing officers should clearly explain to the concerned, the reasons for non-inclusion or delay in sanction, in such cases (Paras 6.54 to 6.56).

Views of Implementing Officers and Bankers:

- 1.60 The implementing officers felt that the data collected through the household survey was not satisfactory and a resurvey should be got done through gramasevaks after providing training. It was also felt by them that the income limit should be raised

to Rs.5000 from the present Rs.3500. However, there does not appear to be any reason for this as there is some amount of under-statement in incomes of the prospective beneficiaries and there<sup>is</sup> need to give priority to much poorer sections among those whose income is less than Rs.3500 (Paras 7.2 to 7.4).

- 1.61 The involvement of block staff in the proportion of annual plans appears to be minimal (Para 7.6).
- 1.62 While implementing the programme, it was not possible to follow the annual plans in toto. This was due to various reasons including non-involvement of banks in the preparation of annual plans. It would be advisable to involve the banks in the preparation of annual plans which will result in effective implementation of the programme (Para 7.7 and 7.42).
- 1.63 According to the guidelines, the family should be taken as the unit for deciding the benefit to be provided. However, this was not followed, due to non-cooperation from the banks as stated by the implementing officers. This problem needs to be resolved in the co-ordination committee meeting with the bankers at the DRDS level (Para 7.8).
- 1.64 The implementing officers felt that many of the bank managers were rule minded. They were reluctant to entertain IRDP loan applications during the period when crop loans were being advanced or at the time of annual accounts. This led to delays in sanction of loans (Para 7.9).
- 1.65 The banks had their own reasons for delays like dumping of large number of applications at a time (Para 7.10).

- 1.67 One bank manager however stated that under normal conditions about 5 applications could be processed per day. On this reckoning and as each branch may have about 160 applications per annum, a maximum of 4 months may be needed to process all applications. Considered in this context, the complaint that applications are being dumped in large numbers is not found to be tenable. Therefore, the District Co-ordination Committee must go into this question in detail (Para 7.45).
- 1.68 The rejection of applications by banks due to the applicants being defaulters to any of the banks or societies varied between 5 to 50 per cent. The block authorities should properly screen the applications and avoid forwarding such applications to the banks (Paras 7.13 and 7.47).
- 1.69 The implementing officers complained that the banks did not always agree with the choice of benefits. To overcome this problem, the choice of the benefit to be provided should be decided by the implementing authorities and the beneficiary in consultation with the bankers at the credit camps (Para 7.14, 7.47 and 7.48).
- 1.70 Another complaint was that the SC/ST beneficiaries were not sanctioned maximum amount of loan admissible for ISB activities. This matter should be taken up in the co-ordination committee meeting at the district level with the bankers (Para 7.15).
- 1.71 A majority of the beneficiaries opted for milch animals. This had led to a scarcity of animals of good breed and yield. Because of this scarcity, even local animals with low yields have been distributed. With such low yields, the economic condition of the beneficiaries will not improve. Also, the high demand for milch animals has caused high escalation in their prices. Hence, the beneficiaries should be encouraged to take up other economic activities. Wherever milch animals are provided they should be of good breed/yield (Paras 7.16 and 7.18).

- 1.72 If the animal husbandry programme is to be continued on the present scale, it is necessary to produce adequate number of heifers by starting new cattle breeding stations (Para 7.19).
- 1.73 According to NABARD norms, each beneficiary receiving milch animal should be provided with a second unit. But it appears that the banks are reluctant to sanction loan for the second animal unless the amount advanced to the first animal is repaid. This is unreasonable and should be taken up in the DRDS co-ordination committee (Paras 7.21 and 7.62).
- 1.74 The extent of misutilisation of assets in selected blocks varied from 7 per cent to 25 per cent. The block authorities should ensure that misutilisation is altogether eliminated (Paras 7.23 and 7.24).
- 1.75 Follow up of assets is being regularly done only by the banks. The implementing officers felt that the staff at the block level was not adequate for this purpose. As there is enormous workload due to implementation of IRDP, the staff at the block level will have to be strengthened. It was observed that in many blocks cluster supervisors had not been appointed due to vacancies or other reasons. They should be appointed immediately. Co-ordination with banks will improve effectiveness of follow-up (Paras 7.22, 7.25, 7.26 and 7.37).
- 1.76 The post of Animal Husbandry Extension Officer was found to be vacant in some of the blocks. As animal husbandry activities constitute the major component of the IRD Programme, these posts should be filled up immediately (Para 7.38).
- 1.77 It was pointed out that there was only one post of Assistant Statistical Officer in the DRDS which was

not adequate as there was heavy workload. Hence, creation of one post of Assistant Director of Statistics and two posts of Statistical Inspectors needs to be seriously considered (Para 7.40).

- 1.78 As the implementing officers felt that they did not have adequate powers to take action in cases of misuse of assets, adequate powers should be delegated/given to the block development officers. Provision will have to be made for summary recovery of loans and subsidy with penal interest (Paras 7.27, 7.55 and 7.56).
- 1.79 The recovery of loans, as estimated by the implementing officers, varied between 25 to 75 per cent. It is essential that the implementing officers should cooperate with the banks in improving recovery. The bank managers also felt that unless Government functionaries cooperated it was not possible to improve recovery. If necessary, recovery camps can be held and pressure brought on defaulters to repay the loans (Paras 7.28, 7.29 and 7.57 to 7.60).
- 1.80 The recovery of loans advanced for some activities was very poor. If this is due to uneconomical nature of assets, such assets should not be supplied in future (Para 7.30).
- 1.81 It was reported that several milk societies started under the programme were not functioning satisfactorily. It would be advisable to study in detail whether the infrastructure created was being properly made use of (Para 7.33).
- 1.82 It was pointed out by the implementing officers that many of the veterinary dispensaries were without surgeons and medicines. Such instances should be brought to the notice of the AH & VS Department. The AH and VS Department may avail IRDP assistance for creation of infrastructure (Para 7.34).

- 1.83 The implementing officers at the block level complained about the non-cooperation from other departmental officers and also from banks. All problems of co-ordination should be periodically discussed at the co-ordination committee meetings to ensure full co-operation of all agencies and departments. Suitable measures will have to be taken to ensure proper co-ordination at the block level (Paras 7.35 and 7.36).
- 1.84 For monitoring the implementation of the programme and its impact, a 'vikas patrika' to be distributed to all the beneficiaries had been introduced. The patrika was yet to be provided to many of the beneficiaries. Even in cases where they had been distributed, all the details, particularly, those relating to income generation had not been entered. Suitable instructions must be issued to see that all the details in the patrika were provided regularly, so that a correct assessment of the number of persons crossing the poverty line could be made (Para 7.39).
- 1.85 A few bank officials felt that the number of villages/clusters allotted to them was too large. To obviate this, the allotment of villages/clusters should be done on the basis of equal workload for all banks (Para-7.43).
- 1.86 In one bank branch photographs of beneficiaries were collected for facilitating subsequent identification. As this appears to be a fool proof method of identification, the implementing authorities themselves may ensure affixing of the photograph before forwarding the applications; the cost being met by IRDP funds (Para - 7.50).

- 1.87 Some bank managers complained that beneficiaries were colluding with brokers in inflating the prices of animals. Involvement of brokers in purchasing animals should be discouraged (Para 7.51).
- 1.88 All the bank managers were unanimous in their opinion about the quality of animals supplied being not upto the mark and not yielding milk as per NABARD norms. Even sheep were also being supplied without regard to their breed/quality. In view of the opinion of the bankers, a decision has to be taken on continuing the programme of supplying milch animals in consultation with all DRDS, banks and the Department of AH & VS (Paras 7.52 to 7.54).
- 1.89 The banks officials felt that there was undue delay in issuing death certificates when an animal died which caused difficulties in claiming insurance. The Department of AH & VS should instruct its doctors to inspect the dead animal and issue the certificate immediately (Para 7.61).
- 1.90 Normally, the DRDS deposits advance subsidy with the banks which is adjusted while sanctioning loans. However, some bankers stated that as this procedure had been discontinued, they were sanctioning both subsidy and loan and were charging interest on subsidy portion till it is released to the banks. To avoid this unnecessary burden on the beneficiaries, the DRDS may continue to make advance deposits of subsidy (Para 7.63).
- 1.91 A visit to a few beneficiary households gave an impression that they belonged to lower middle income group. Hence, it is necessary to correctly assess the family income at the time of identification (Para 7.64).
- 1.92 In a credit camp visited, it was observed that the village accountant had prepared a list of prospective beneficiaries and the assets to be provided to them which

- was accepted by the implementing officers without scrutiny. The implementing officers should associate themselves in the above tasks without leaving everything to lower functionaries (Paras 7.65 and 7.66).
- 1.93 It was observed in the credit camp that the representative of the bank present was interested only in reducing the loan applied for in every case. The bank managers should not feel that their role is limited only to bargaining. They should see that the beneficiary gets the required amount so that he could be enabled to procure the right type and quality asset. (Paras 7.67 and 7.68).
- 1.94 The assets are required to be procured through the purchase committee at the block level. But in the credit camp it was observed that the beneficiaries had themselves brought the sellers and their animals which may lead to some clandestine arrangement between them. To avoid cheating and misuse of public funds the purchase committee alone should undertake the work of selection of animals (Paras 7.69 and 7.70).
- 1.95 In one of the villages visited, some of the beneficiaries felt that the Manager of a local branch was inflating prices of animals in collusion with a broker as the animals supplied yielded only about 2 litres of milk per day while their price was never below Rs.2000. To avoid such accusations, the supply of animals of poor quality should be stopped (Paras 7.71 and 7.72).
- 1.96 In some of the villages, it was observed that a few families had been provided with buffaloes against their desire to have sheep. As they had no source of fodder, they could not feed the animals and consequently they became a burden. To avoid recurrence of supply of unsuited assets it is suggested that the beneficiaries' resources and their ability to maintain the assets should be investigated before deciding upon the type of assets to be provided (Paras 7.73 and 7.74).



- 1.97 It was informed that in a few villages sheep and goats supplied died from diseases as they had been purchased from outside areas. To avoid such failures the purchase committee at the block level should carefully evaluate the adaptability of animals from outside to local conditions (Paras 7.75 and 7.76).

Discussions and Conclusions:

- 1.98 The instructions/guidelines issued by the Government of India in connection with the implementation of the programme over the years have been brought together in a single place and issued in July 1982. In many cases the original circulars and amendments appeared at different places in the volume which may not facilitate easy reference. In view of this, it is necessary that the volume is thoroughly revised to make it comprehensive and systematic (Paras 8.2 and 8.3).
- 1.99 Majority of the target group under the programme is labourers i.e., wage earners. But, most of the benefits extended to them under the programme involve some kind of managerial ability on their part, which is lacking. It is therefore, worth examining whether the income of the target group could be increased through "Wage Income" rather than "Asset Derived Income", provided for under the IRDP. This will reinforce the existing employment oriented and asset creating programme resulting in more useful assets (Para 8.5).
- 1.100 Most of the steps as per the guidelines for implementing the programme have not been either followed or not properly followed (Para 8.7).
- 1.101 According to the guidelines, a household survey for identifying prospective beneficiaries and infrastructure survey to identify the development potentiality of the block had to be conducted. While no infrastructure surveys have been carried out, the household

surveys were not conducted properly, as evidenced by the fact that several vital information related to identified population was not available. Therefore, household surveys should be conducted more systematically in future (Para 8.10).

- 1.102 No comprehensive and clearcut guidelines have been laid down for estimating annual family income of prospective beneficiaries. Therefore, there is need for proper guidelines in this regard (Paras 8.11 and 8.12).
- 1.103 At the planning stage a number of deficiencies have been observed.. Some of them are: (a) As per the guidelines a survey of existing infrastructure was to be conducted in each block. However, this was not done in any of the selected blocks. (b) Neither the block agency nor the banks were involved in the preparation of the block plans. Unless they are involved in the preparation of the plans the implementation of the programme would suffer. (c) IRDP assistance is planned and extended on individual basis rather than family basis, inspite of the guidelines that 'family economic plans' should be prepared for each beneficiary family (Para 7.31 and 8.15).
- 1.104 In deciding the assets to be provided, the difference between the actual income of the beneficiary family and the income ceiling does not appear to have been taken into account. The guidelines are also silent on this aspect. The guidelines have also not specified "the time frame" within which the beneficiary family is to be lifted above the poverty line (Para 8.15).
- 1.105 In the implementation of the programme, physical targets have been exceeded by a larger margin as compared to the performance on the expenditure side. This would indicate that more emphasis has been placed in achieving targets in terms of numbers even at the cost

of quality. Hence, it is necessary to ensure more uniform, even and quality performance (Para 8.17).

- 1.106 The guidelines laid down that about one third of the beneficiaries must be provided assistance for ISB activities. But the proportion of expenditure was only 11.6 per cent. Hence, appropriate corrective action for encouraging secondary and tertiary activities needs to be taken (Para 8.18).
- 1.107 The physical target for the block i.e., 600 families per annum does not take into account the size of the block in terms of population which does not appear to be rational. Therefore, there is need to revise the basis of targetting keeping in view the population of each block in the state (Para 8.22).
- 1.108 Monitoring and documentation, particularly, at the block and the district levels are not satisfactory. While it was difficult to get some basic information from the blocks, information supplied (for common years and areas) from different agencies would not agree. Unless systematic monitoring and documentation procedures are adopted and scrupulously followed, it would be difficult to ensure that the programme is running on right tracks. Urgent action is needed in this regard (Paras 8.26 and 8.27).
- 1.109 In terms of employment generation, the programme does not seem to have any significant impact (Paras 6.36 and 8.23).
- 1.110 The average annual income of an average family (of five persons) of beneficiaries is found to increase by 27 per cent over a period of 3 years as compared to their income at the time of identification. If increase in prices is taken into account, practically there will be no growth of income (Para 3.29).

- 1.111 It was observed that the income from activities other than those connected with IRDP assets declined to an extent of 10 per cent in 1983-84 compared with the income at the time of identification (Para 8.30).
- 1.112 Of the selected beneficiaries 27.7 per cent had crossed the poverty line; their income reckoned at current prices. If price increases are taken into account very few families will have crossed the poverty line (Para 8.31).
- 1.113 The programme does not seem to have made any impact by way of improving family incomes of the beneficiaries in real terms. Deficiencies in planning, organising and implementing the programme have contributed to this state of affairs. Changes as suggested in para 1.99 above may be necessary to improve the situation (Para 8.32).



## CHAPTER - II

### Introduction

- 2.1 The Community Development Programme which came into operation in 1952, was the first attempt for organised/systematic development of the rural economy. The "Rural Manpower Utilisation Projects", initiated in the early sixties and executed through the Community Development Organisation constituted the first programme for tackling rural poverty; with its emphasis on tackling poverty at the individual level; as compared to the area-approach adopted till then. In the late sixties/early seventies, the concept of growth-with-social justice came to be recognised as one of the basic tenets for improving the lot of the rural poor. With this, a number of new programmes/ideas were tried such as the DPAP, the SFDA, the MFAL, the CSRE, etc. Despite implementing these schemes, a majority of rural population continued to live in poverty. However, the objectives and goals as also the contents and modus-operandi of most of these programmes were similar. This similarity gave rise to the realisation that a common set of programmes with an integrated approach for tackling rural poverty at the individual level was essential. This led to the concept and formulation of the Integrated Rural Development Programme (IRDP). The IRDP was conceived as a strategy designed to improve the economic and social life of a specific group of people, i.e., the poorest of the poor living in the rural areas.
- 2.2 The programme aimed at identifying the poorest of the poor through surveys conducted for the purpose and providing assistance to them on priority basis through bank loans at concessional rate of interest and subsidy from government for taking up economic activity specially suited for each family. The activity to be selected for each family was to depend on the background of

the family, particularly, the type of skills they possessed, present occupation, availability of inputs locally, marketing facilities, etc. The ultimate objective was to ensure that each poor family below the poverty line (a family income of Rs.3500/- per annum for an average family of 5 members) was assisted in crossing the poverty line and becoming economically viable.

- 2.3 The programme came into operation in the country in 1978-79. It was implemented through the District Rural Development Societies (DRDS); autonomous bodies registered under the Registration of Societies Act. These DRDS have been specially constituted for implementing the IRDP. In Karnataka, the programme was put into operation in all the 175 blocks by October 1980; blocks which are coterminus with taluks.
- 2.4 As the IRDP was a major programme and was in operation for the past few years, the State Government felt that an evaluation of the programme be taken up to ascertain the gains so far made and to understand the problems in its implementation. Accordingly, an evaluation of this programme was taken up by the Evaluation Division.

Objectives of the Evaluation study:

- 2.5 The evaluation of IRDP was taken up with the following objectives, to:-
1. review the performance - financial and physical - of the programme as against targets set;
  2. ascertain the volume of investments by the financial institutions and the pattern of investment, under the programme;
  3. study the scale and pattern of investment per beneficiary, sectorwise;

4. study whether families belonging to SC/ST have received adequate attention under the programme;
5. study the impact of the programme on the income and employment levels of the beneficiaries; and
6. review the various aspects of implementation of the programme in relation to the guidelines issued; and in particular
  - (a) study the problems of co-ordination between the implementing authorities and
  - (b) study the problems/bottlenecks in the implementation of the programme and suggest solutions for the same.

Methodology of the Study:

2.6 The following methodology was adopted for the study:

- a) selection of preliminary data from the Rural Development and Panchayat Raj Department and from DRDS of all the districts, on financial and physical aspects of the programme,
- b) collection of detailed information on various aspects of the programme from (i) the selected districts and (ii) selected blocks in separate schedules,
- c) discussions on various aspects of the programme with the implementing officers and staff at all levels,
- d) selection of beneficiaries and collection of information from them on benefits accrued, changes in income and employment levels, problems faced by the beneficiaries, etc., on structured schedules/questionnaires through interviews and
- e) selection and study of non-beneficiaries for ascertaining reasons for their non-selection under the programme.



Coverage:

- 2.7 For the purpose of detailed study, two districts were selected, viz., Dharwad and Chiknagalur, based on the performance of the districts. Dharwad had shown a comparatively better performance and Chiknagalur poor. In each of these districts, two blocks were selected one from the malnad region and the other from the maidan region. Thus, Kalghatagi (malnad) and Gadag (maidan) blocks in Dharwad district and Sringeri (malnad) and Kadur (maidan) blocks in Chiknagalur district were selected. From each of these blocks, five villages were selected randomly and in each village five beneficiaries and one non-beneficiary were selected for canvassing the schedules. The number of beneficiaries selected under any activity was in proportion to the total number of beneficiaries under the activity. Although the number of villages, beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries to be covered were 20, 100 and 20 respectively, the actual number covered was slightly larger as it was found necessary to cover a few more beneficiaries under particular types of activities which would, on the basis of the criteria adopted for selection, go unrepresented. Also, in Sringeri block the number of villages selected had to be increased to 10 as, the villages being too small and houses scattered, typical of the malnad tract, the required number of beneficiaries were not available from five selected villages. The actual coverage, thus was 26 villages, 112 beneficiaries and 20 non-beneficiaries.

Period of Study/Survey:

- 2.3 The study covered the period from 1980-81 to 1983-84. The study was initiated in late 1982-83. Supply of preliminary information mentioned at (a) and (b) of para 2.6 was delayed by the authorities concerned.

As a result, the time-frame of the study which was to cover the period to end of 1982-83 was gradually extended to the end of 1983-84. It should be added that considerable difficulties were experienced in collecting the basic material which took nearly 18 months.

- 2.9 The discussions with implementing officers at various levels were held subsequently during September - October 1984. The beneficiary and non-beneficiary schedules were canvassed during November - December 1984.
- 2.10 It must also be mentioned that not only difficulties were experienced in getting the needed information (secondary data) at all levels (block, district and state levels), but, information made available from different sources on some items with the same coverage of space and time was different/conflicting. This called for considerable time and ingenuity for rectification/reconciliation of these deficiencies.



## CHAPTER - III

### The Programme in Brief

#### Genesis of the Programme:

- 3.1 The programme was first introduced in 1973-79 beginning with 2300 blocks in the country of which 2000 were already functioning under the ongoing programmes of SFDA, DPAP and CADA. With another 300 blocks added during 1979-80, its coverage was extended to 2600 blocks as on 31st March 1980. Besides the small and marginal farmers, the programme was specific in regard to agricultural workers and landless labourers. For the first time, rural artisans were also brought within its purview. The programme emphasised the family rather than individual approach in the identification of beneficiaries. Due to widespread rural poverty and unemployment, a major policy decision was taken in 1980-81 to extend the programme to all the 5011 blocks in the country with effect from the 2nd October, 1980. The specific area development programmes such as SFDA, IPAP etc., under operation in the selected areas, were merged with IRDP.

#### Objectives:

- 3.2 The main objective of the IRDP is to raise the poorest families in the rural areas above the poverty line on a lasting basis by providing them with income generating assets and access to credit and other inputs. This is sought to be achieved through an operationally integrated strategy for enlarging the resource base and income earning capacity of vulnerable sections of the population on the one hand and increasing productivity and production in agriculture and other sectors, on the other. The thrust of the programme is on generating employment opportunities by giving them productive assets and resources. Since, bulk of the

rural poor are landless, a large part of the activities for their benefit has to be in agriculture and allied sectors. Suitable support to these families in terms of supply of rawmaterials, marketing facilities, training and upgradation of skills have been emphasised.

Target:

- 3.3 It was envisaged in the Sixth Plan to provide assistance under the IRDP to 3000 families on an average in each block. The target is to cover, on an average, 600 families (of which atleast 30 per cent should belong to scheduled castes and scheduled tribes) in each block every year. Of these, approximately 400 families are expected to benefit through agriculture and related activities, about 100 families through village and cottage industries and the remaining 100 families to be assisted in the service sector.

Block Plan:

- 3.4 It was laid down in the detailed operational guidelines issued by the Ministry of Rural Development (GOI), that a five year perspective plan for each block should be drawn up based on practical possibilities of development in primary, secondary and tertiary sectors. This plan should be based on an assessment of the developmental potential of the block and should aim at optimum utilisation of local resources of ground and surface water, dairy, animal husbandry, fisheries, village and cottage industries and other activities in the tertiary sectors. Based on this, a programme of assistance to the poorest of the rural families is required to be drawn up and implemented in a phased manner each year.
- 3.5 The district plan was to be prepared by aggregating the block plans so prepared.

Organisation:

- 3.6 The IRDP is being implemented through the DRDS at the district level. The DRDS, as already noted, is only a planning, coordinating and funding agency at the district level. For implementation of the programme, the DRDS do not have field staff of their own and have to depend on the staff of other developmental departments, block agencies and financial institutions.
- 3.7 The Project Directors of the DRDS are the Chief Executive Officers. They are responsible for the implementation of the programme in the district. The Project Directors work under the overall control and guidance of the Deputy Commissioners of the district, who are the Chairmen of the governing bodies of DRDS. The Project Directors are assisted by Assistant Project Officers and other supporting staff both technical and non-technical at the headquarters.
- 3.8 At the periphery, the Block Development Organisation is mainly responsible for planning and implementation of the IRDP, in cooperation with other development departments, namely; Agriculture, Animal Husbandry and Veterinary Services, Minor Irrigation, Industries, etc. The IRDP is being implemented by the Block Organisation without any additional staff.

Financial Inputs:

- 3.9 The expenditure on the programme is shared by both Central and State Governments equally. The financial outlay proposed for each IRDP block is Rs.5 lakhs during the first year of the plan, Rs.6 lakhs in the second year and Rs.8 lakhs each in the last three years. The gradual stepping up of the outlay is envisaged to take care of preliminary work such as preparation of block plan, identification of beneficiaries, gearing up of the organisational structure etc. The financial provision is mostly meant for subsidies, technical guidance, training, supply of inputs, marketing support, etc.

3.10 Under the programme, subsidies at the rate of 25 per cent and 33 1/3 per cent to small farmers and marginal farmers respectively are being provided. In the case of tribals, however, the subsidy is of the order of 50 per cent. However, the maximum amount of subsidy is fixed at Rs.3000 for small and marginal farmers, agricultural and non-agricultural labourers and scheduled castes and at Rs.5000 for scheduled tribes. As regards rural industries' and rural artisans' programme, a maximum subsidy of only Rs.3000 is fixed, irrespective of the community of the beneficiary.

Identification of Families below the Poverty Line:

3.11 Since about 3,000 families were to be covered in a block over a period of 5 years, it was thought advisable to phase the implementation of the programme year-wise in selected clusters of villages. The clusters were required to be formed in terms of a number of continuous villages or villages with functional linkages and availability of village functionaries, like, VWs, school teachers, etc. A household survey was envisaged covering all clusters for collecting details on the size of the family, social status, literacy, occupation, land holding, assets, income and indebtedness, etc. This survey was to be confined to the families (1) having an operational holding of less than 5 acres and (2) having their annual income less than Rs.3500; being the poverty line. The families below the poverty line were to be classified into various income ranges and the poorest among them were to be selected for providing the assistance under the programme. The final selection of the poorest families was required to be done in the meeting of the village assemblies (Gram-sabhas) attended by village panchayat members, to ensure fairness in the selection. The local MPs., MLAs., and MLCs., would also be invited to attend these meetings.

3.12 The appropriate economic activity for each identified poor family was to be determined in the gramasabha meetings. Following this, suitable bankable schemes were required to be drawn up by the Block authorities keeping in view the risk taking capacity of the identified household, its existing resource base and managerial ability. The investment plan for each identified family had to be sent to the designated bank for sanction of loans. It was also envisaged in the programme to take care of the entire chain of productive activity including marketing.

3.13 In sum, the operational strategy of the programme involved the following steps:

1. review of the on-going programmes,
2. preparing a resource inventor of the block,
3. conducting a baseline survey of households below the poverty line and determine the number of families below the poverty line and their annual income both from farm and non-farm sources.
4. selection of beneficiaries including scheduled castes and tribes, according to criteria prescribed (families with lowest income and SC/ST families were to be given priority),
5. assessment of the beneficiaries' choice/preference for asset/activity,
6. selection of projects keeping in view the local resources and choice of beneficiaries,
7. preparation of bankable projects familywise with reference to (5) and (6) above,
8. providing infrastructure immediately needed for programme implementation,
9. ensuring input supply, credit flow, extension and transfer of technology and marketing, and
10. ensuring proper implementation of familywise projects and its monitoring.





## CHAPTER - IV

### Review of the Implementation of the Programme in the State

- 4.1 A review of the implementation of the IRD Programme in the state is attempted in the following paragraphs. Although the programme was in operation in some of the blocks of the state since 1978-79, the review covers the period from 1980-81 to 1983-84 only, as all the blocks in the state were covered under the programme only during 1980-81.

#### Annual Financial Allocations and Amounts Released:

- 4.2 Statewise figures of annual allocations for the programme (both central and state shares) and the amounts released, during the period from 1980-81 to 1983-84, are presented in table-4.1 below.

Table-4.1: Allocations and Amounts released under IRDP 1980-84

(Rs. in lakhs)					
Item	1980-81	1981-82	1982-83	1983-84	1980-84
1	2	3	4	5	6
a) Allocations	875.00	1050.00	1400.00	1400.00	4725.00
b) Amounts Released	722.10	926.62	1317.10	1394.20	4360.02
c) Per cent (b) to (a)	82.5	88.3	94.1	99.6	92.3

- 4.3 The amount allocated during 1980-81 for the state was Rs.875 lakhs at the rate of Rs.5 lakhs per block. During 1981-82, the allocations rose to Rs.1050 lakhs as the assistance per block was enhanced to Rs.6 lakhs. During the subsequent years the allocation was Rs.1400 lakhs as the assistance per block was higher at Rs.8 lakhs per year.

- 4.4 As against the above allocations, the amount actually released was Rs.722.10 lakhs in 1980-81, Rs.926.62 lakhs in 1981-82, Rs.1317.10 lakhs in 1982-83 and Rs.1394.20 lakhs in 1983-84. The percentage of amount released to allocation was 82.5 in 1980-81, 38.3 in 1981-82, 94.1 in 1982-83 and 99.6 in 1983-84.
- 4.5 Districtwise information is presented in table-1 at the end of the report. As can be seen, Dharwad district got the highest allocation, as it had the largest number of blocks, i.e., seventeen. So far as districtwise releases are concerned the percentage of amounts released, varied from 24.4 in the case of Raichur to 223.4 in the case of Dakshina Kannada during 1980-81. During 1981-82, however, the inter district variations in the amounts released narrowed considerably and the lowest percentage was 75 (Bijapur, Gulbarga, Hassan, Raichur and Shimoga district) and the highest percentage was 103.2 (Mysore district). During 1982-83, except Raichur (56.3%) and Gulbarga (62.5%) districts the percentage of amounts, released varied between 87.5 and 100.0. Cent per cent amount was released in the case of 14 districts. During 1983-84 except Bellary (75%) and Kolar (75%), cent per cent amount was released for all the districts. For Gulbarga district, the amount released was 140.3 per cent of the allocation.
- 4.6 The expenditure incurred on the programme during the period under review, as compared to the releases made annually, in the state, is furnished in table-4.2 below. The expenditure incurred includes expenditure on providing subsidy to the beneficiaries (which is actually the major share), administrative expenses and expenditure on providing infrastructural facilities. However, breakup of expenditure according to these items was not available.

Table-4.2: Expenditure Incurred on the IRD Programme:  
1980-84

Item	(Rs. lakhs)				
	1980-81	1981-82	1982-83	1983-84	1980-84
a) Releases	722.10	926.62	1317.10	1394.20	4360.02
b) Expenditure	917.46	1144.20	1722.63	1934.31	5718.60
c) Percentage of (b) to (a)	127.1	123.5	130.8	138.7	131.2

- 4.7 During 1980-81, expenditure was Rs.917.46 lakhs as against Rs.722.10 lakhs released for the year. In 1981-82 it was Rs.1144.20 lakhs (amount released Rs.926.62 lakhs), in 1982-83 Rs.1722.63 lakhs (amount released Rs.1317.10 lakhs) and in 1983-84 Rs.1934.31 lakhs (amount released Rs.1394.20 lakhs). The percentage of expenditure to that released was 127.1 in 1980-81, 123.5 in 1981-82, 130.8 in 1982-83 and 138.7 in 1983-84. Thus, during all the four years, expenditure incurred was considerably higher than the amounts released. This was possible due to the availability of huge unspent balance carried over from the previous years.
- 4.8 Districtwise expenditure figures are presented in table-2. It is seen that although the expenditure incurred on the programme was consistently higher than the amounts released at the state level, it was not so in the case of all the districts as evident from table-2.
- 4.9 In 1980-81, it (expenditure as compared to amount released) varied from a mere 21.3 per cent in Kodagu district to 400 per cent in Tumkur district. In 1981-82, it ranged between 52.4 per cent (Bellary) to 265 per cent (Dakshina Kannada), in 1982-83, from 38.3 per cent (Mandya) to 240.1 per cent (Gulbarga); for 1983-84 the corresponding figures were 72 per cent (Chitradurga) and 175.2 per cent (Hassan).

- 4.10 However, a better indicator of financial performance would be provided by a comparison between the allotment (which also happens to be the target) and expenditure. The relevant figures for the state are shown in table-4.3 below.

Table-4.3: Allotment and Expenditure under IRDP (1980-84)

Item	(Rs. in lakhs)				
	1980-81	1981-82	1982-83	1983-84	1980-84
1	2	3	4	5	6
a) Allotment	875.00	1050.00	1400.00	1400.00	4725.00
b) Expenditure	917.46	1144.20	1722.63	1934.31	5718.60
c) Percentage(b) to (c)	104.9	109.0	123.1	138.2	121.0

- 4.11 It can be seen that financial performance in terms of expenditure, in the state during the period under review was quite satisfactory.
- 4.12 The percentage of expenditure to allotment has shown a consistently raising trend, it was 104.9 in 1980-81, 109.0 in 1981-82, 123.1 in 1982-83 and 138.2 in 1983-84; and over the period 1980-84, it was 121.0. Thus, the programme can be considered quite successful so far as the financial achievements are concerned.
- 4.13 Corresponding districtwise figures are presented in table-3. As can be noticed, some of the districts did not show the same trend over the period under review. There were wide variations in their performance during some of the years. In 1980-81, Mysore recorded an expenditure of 236 per cent over the amount allotted whereas it was only 20.6 per cent in Kodagu. In 1981-82, the percentage was 235.9 in Dakshina Kannada as compared to 30.4 per cent in Raichur. During 1982-83, Dakshina

Kannada again recorded the highest expenditure of 225.1 per cent as against 83.3 per cent in Mandya and in 1983-84 Gulbarga was in the forefront with 228 per cent expenditure and Chitradurga was at the bottom with 72 per cent. Overall, Dakshina Kannada was far ahead of the other districts with 195 per cent performance while Raichur was at the bottom with 82 per cent.

- 4.14 As per the guidelines issued by the Government of India, administrative expenses (mainly connected with DRDS staff) should not exceed 7.5 per cent of the IRD allocations. As per limited information (on administrative expenses), available for 1982-83, the proportion of administrative expenses to total IRD expenditure ranged from 5.0 per cent in Chitradurga district to 21.9 per cent in Raichur district; the state average (based on information for 13 districts) was 7.3 per cent (vide table-4). In seven, out of thirteen districts, the ceiling of 7.5 per cent had been exceeded. It is not clear how and why the ceiling has been exceeded in these districts.

Disbursement of Credit by Financial Institutions:

- 4.15 Financial institutions, viz., the commercial banks, regional rural banks and co-operative banks have a pivotal role in the implementation of the IRD Programme. While the central and state governments provide subsidy to the beneficiaries to take up gainful economic activity, their credit needs, which form a major share of the total investment, would have to be met by these financial institutions.
- 4.16 The volume of credit provided by these institutions in the state, during the period under review, varied between Rs.22.87 crores in 1980-81 and Rs.41.29 crores in 1982-83, which declined to Rs.38.52 crores in the year 1983-84. The total credit provided during the period 1980-84 amounted to Rs.126.07 crores. It would appear strange that while the expenditure on subsidy (table-4.4) has shown an increase from year to year, the volume of credit disbursed should decline, in 1983-84.

4.17 The volume of credit disbursed districtwise is shown in table-5. Dharwad district stood first with a total disbursement of Rs.1341.89 lakhs over the four year period. The performance of this district appears creditable, because of the reason that the district has the highest number of blocks for any district in the state i.e., seventeen. The credit disbursement among other districts varied from a mere 156.25 lakhs in Kodagu district (which has only 3 blocks) to Rs.906.99 lakhs in Bijapur district over the same period, 1980-84.

Total Investments:

- 4.18 The total investments under the programme consist of subsidy, administrative expenses and expenditure on providing infrastructural facilities (total expenditure from the Government side) and the amount of credit made available to the beneficiaries by the financial institutions. Table-4.4 shows the total investment made under the programme during the period 1980-84.
- 4.19 During 1980-81, the investment was of the order of Rs.3204.21 lakhs which rose to Rs.3483.57 lakhs in 1981-82, Rs.5851.17 lakhs in 1982-83 and to Rs.5786.69 lakhs in 1983-84. The total investments over the period 1980-84 was Rs.18,325.64 lakhs of which Rs.12,607.04 lakhs constituted credit and Rs.5718.60 lakhs were for subsidy and other expenses. The ratio of subsidy and other expenses to credit provided was 31:69, instead of 28:72 as prescribed (the proportion 28:72 is derived/worked out from guidelines; that 30 per cent of beneficiaries must be SC/ST - assuming that SC and ST beneficiaries are in the proportion of 4:1 and on this basis the weighted rate of subsidy for all classes of beneficiaries works out to 28 per cent). Districtwise details are shown in table-6. The quantum of investments among the districts varied from a mere Rs.255.81 lakhs in Kodagu to Rs.1910.71 lakhs in Dharwad, over the period 1980-84.

Table-4.4: Total Investments under the IRD Programme  
1980-84

(Rs. in lakhs)					
Item	1980-81	1981-82	1982-83	1983-84	1980-84
1	2	3	4	5	6
<b>A. State</b>					
a) Total Expenditure	917.46	1144.20	1722.63	1934.31	5718.60
b) Credit disbursed	2286.75	2339.37	4123.54	3852.38	12607.04
c) Total(a+b)	3204.21	3483.57	5851.17	5786.69	18325.64
d) Percentage (b) to (c)	71.4	67.2	70.6	66.6	68.79
<b>B. Average per Block</b>					
a) Total Expenditure	5.24	6.54	9.84	11.05	32.68
b) Credit disbursed	13.07	13.37	23.59	22.01	72.04
c) Total(a+b)	18.31	19.91	33.43	33.06	104.72
d) Percentage of (b) to (c)	71.4	67.2	70.6	66.6	68.79

4.20 Information on total investments (expenditure including subsidy + credit) on per block basis by district during each of the years 1980-81 through 1983-84 is presented in table-6A. It is seen that the investments per block, in the state during the four year period 1980-84, works out to Rs.104.70 lakhs, of which credit accounts for Rs.72.04 lakhs. Over the districts, per block investment varied from Rs.74.65 lakhs (Chitradurga) to Rs.161.65 lakhs (Dakshina Kannada), the corresponding figures for credit disbursed being Rs.48.95 lakhs (Raichur) and Rs.109.01 lakhs (Dakshina Kannada).



- 4.21 Ten out of nineteen districts bettered the state average in terms of total investment per block.

Physical Targets and Achievements:

- 4.22 The physical target fixed for each block was to cover 600 families each year. At this rate, the target for the state works out to 1,05,000 per annum. As against this, the achievement was much higher in each of the years during 1980-84, except in 1981-82. The relative figures of achievement and per cent achievement of target shown in brackets are 1,08,893 (103.7) in 1980-81, 87,460 (83.3) in 1981-82, 1,78,356 (170.3) in 1982-83 and 2,02,228 (192.6) in 1983-84 or a total of 5,77,437 (137.5) over 1980-84.
- 4.23 It is no doubt creditable that the physical achievements far exceeded, as noted above, physical targets over the period 1980-84 (137.5 per cent), and particularly in the year 1983-84 (192.6 per cent). These achievements are not brought about by corresponding increased in expenditure relative to allotments. This would lead to the conclusion that the quality of implementation could have suffered on more than one count. The average quantum of assistance per beneficiary would have been reduced substantially, as compared to the prescribed scale.
- 4.24 Secondly, the rush of work and less than normal scale of assistance would lead to procurement and supply of improper, unsuitable and poor quality assets to the beneficiaries.
- 4.25 Thirdly, the increased number would mean dilution of attention to individual beneficiaries, poor followup etc., resulting in inefficient utilisation of assets provided under the programme; not to speak of outright misutilisation of assets. In effect, the real objective of the programme, viz., to lift the beneficiaries above the poverty line, would have been defeated in many a cases.

- 4.26 Districtwise details of achievements of physical targets during 1980-84 are given in table-7. It is seen that Gulbarga stood first with an impressive achievement of 182.4 per cent over the period 1980-84. All the other districts, except Chitradurga (86.3%) and Raichur (96.1%) had exceeded their targets.
- 4.27 Districtwise information on physical targets and achievements (i.e, number of beneficiaries), worked out on per block basis, during the years from 1980-81 to 1983-84 is presented in table No.7A . It is seen that, on an average, 3300 beneficiaries were covered per block over the four year period 1980-84 in the state. This works out to 137.5 per cent of the corresponding target. Percentage achievement of the target (per block) varied between 96.1 (Raichur) and 182.4 (Gulbarga). In ten out of the nineteen districts the achievement figures were better than the state average.

Coverage of SC/ST Families:

- 4.23 It was envisaged in the programme that atleast 30 per cent of the beneficiaries should belong to scheduled castes and scheduled tribes. The actual coverage of SC/ST families during the period 1980-84 in the state is indicated in table-4.5 below.

Table-4.5: Coverage of SC/ST Families under the IRD Programme 1980-84

Item	(in number)				
	1980-81	1981-82	1982-83	1983-84	1980-84
	1	2	3	4	5
a) Total families covered	1,08,393	87,460	1,73,356	2,02,228	5,77,437
b) Of which SC/ST Families	17,743	16,343	50,301	55,972	1,40,359
c) Percentage of (b) to (a)	16.3	13.7	23.1	27.7	24.3

- 4.29 During 1930-31, the number of SC/ST families covered was 17,743 which formed 16.3 per cent of the total beneficiaries, the corresponding figures for the other years are: 16,343 (13.7%) in 1931-32, 50,301 (23.1 per cent) in 1932-33 and 55,972 (27.7 per cent) in 1933-34. Thus, in none of the years under review, the target for coverage of SC/ST families was reached; though the coverage during 1932-33 and 1933-34 was much better as compared to the years 1930-31 and 1931-32.
- 4.30 Districtwise details of SC/ST families covered during each of the years are given in table-3. It is seen that the coverage of SC/ST families during 1930-34 ranged from the very low of 6.1 per cent (Uttara Kannada district) to an impressive 39 per cent (Kolar district). Apart from Kolar, only 3 other districts exceeded the target for coverage of SC/ST families. These were, Bangalore (33.1 per cent), Gulbarga (31.4 per cent) and Mysore (30.5 per cent). It is necessary to make up this shortfall. Hence, serious efforts must be made to improve the coverage of SC/ST families under the programme in the remaining 15 districts, and, particularly, in Uttara Kannada, Chikmagalur, Bidar, Hassan, Mandya, Kodagu and Shimoga districts where the coverage has been very poor.
- 4.31 It is to be added that according to the partial information available (vide table-3A). SCs. and STs. accounted for 25.91 per cent of the total identified (through IRDP household surveys) families till the end of 1932-33. The proportion of SC/ST beneficiaries to total beneficiaries, as already seen above, is 24.3 per cent. In other words, though the percentage of SC/ST beneficiary families falls short of the prescribed minimum of 30.0 per cent, it nearer to the percentage of SC/ST families identified (25.91 per cent).

4.32 A comparison of the figures in table-3 and table-3A would reveal that the proportion of the SC/ST families benefited (over the period 1930-34) were lower than the corresponding percentage of families identified in 9 out of 11 districts (for which information on the proportion of the SC/ST families identified is available - table-3A).

4.33 It is to be particularly noted that the percentage of SC/ST families identified are very low in the districts of Dharwad (12.6 per cent) and Mandya (13.76 per cent). The proportion of SC/ST population in the general population is about 13 per cent. Among the families eligible for IRDP, the proportion of SC/ST families must be much higher. Viewed in this context, identification of SC/ST families in Dharwad and Mandya districts does not seem to be satisfactory.

sectorwise Distribution of Beneficiaries:

4.34 Assistance would be provided to beneficiaries to take up economic activity under various sectors, like, agriculture, animal husbandry, minor irrigation, horticulture, sericulture, fisheries and small-industry, services and business. Sectorwise percentage of beneficiaries in the state during 1930-34 is indicated in table-4.6 below.

Table-4.6: Sectorwise Percentage of Beneficiaries (1930-34)

Item	Agri- cul- ture	Animal Hus- bandry	Minor Irri- gation	Horti- cult- ure	Seri- cul- ture	Fi- she- ries	Small In- dustry, Services & Business	All Sec- tors
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
a) All be- ne- fici- aries	17.4	63.5	2.5	0.2	0.5	1.0	9.9	100.0
b) SC/ST bene- fici- aries	20.4	53.1	3.4	0.9	0.9	1.3	14.5	100.0

- 4.35 During the period 1930-34, animal husbandry sector alone accounted for as high a percentage as 63.5 of the total beneficiaries. Over the years (table-9), the trend has been that the animal husbandry sector is given increasing importance, at the cost of the remaining sectors. The main activity under this sector was milch animal (cow and buffalo) rearing.
- 4.36 The percentages of beneficiaries in other sectors were: 17.4 in agriculture, 9.9 in small industry, services and business, 2.5 in minor irrigation, 1.0 in fisheries, 0.5 in sericulture and 0.2 in horticulture.
- 4.37 The pattern has been more or less the same in the case of SC/ST beneficiaries also. Animal husbandry sector accounted for 58.1 per cent of the SC/ST beneficiaries, followed by 20.4 per cent in agriculture, 14.5 per cent in small industry, service and business, 3.4 in minor irrigation, 1.3 per cent in fisheries and 0.9 per cent each in horticulture and sericulture sectors.
- 4.33 According to the guidelines issued for the implementation of the programme not more than two-thirds of the beneficiaries should be in agriculture and allied sectors and the rest must be under the small and cottage industries, services and business. However, as already seen (table-9) about 90 per cent of all beneficiaries and 35 per cent of SC/ST beneficiaries were provided assistance only under agriculture and allied activities including animal husbandry, minor irrigation, horticulture. The high concentration of activities under animal husbandry neglecting other activities has led to serious problems, namely, inadequate/lack of availability of quality assets, like, improved cows and buffaloes. This will also lead to under exploitation of other locally available natural resources and skills of the beneficiaries. As such, people should be encouraged to take up activities in the service, small industries and business sectors rather than in animal husbandry sector alone.

Investment per Beneficiary:

4.39 The average investment per beneficiary under the programme during each of the years, over the period 1930-34, is presented in table-4.7 below.

Table-4.7: Average Investment per Beneficiary, 1980-84

(Amounts in Rs.lakhs)

Item	1930-31	1931-32	1932-33	1933-34	1930-34
1	2	3	4	5	6
a) Subsidy/Government Expenditure	917.46	1144.20	1722.63	1934.31	5713.60
b) Total Investment*	3204.21	3483.57	5851.17	5786.69	18325.64
c) No. of Beneficiaries	1,08,893	87,460	1,73,356	2,02,223	5,77,437
d) <u>Per capita (Rs)</u>					
i) Subsidy/Govt. Expenditure	842.53	1308.83	963.14	956.50	990.34
ii) Total Investment	2942.53	3983.50	3271.44	2861.47	3173.62

Note: \*Subsidy/Government Expenditure + Credit from Financial Institutions.

4.40 The average investment per beneficiary in the state worked out to Rs.3,174 during the period 1980-84. It ranged from Rs.2861 (in 1983-84) and Rs.3984 (in 1981-82).

4.41 Districtwise information on per capita (per beneficiary) investment is presented in table-10. It is seen that, over the period 1980-84, Belgaum district topped the list with a per capita (per beneficiary) investment of Rs.4,250/-, followed by Dakshina Kannada (Rs.4026). Shimoga district was at the bottom with a per capita investment of Rs.2,321/-. In six, out of 19 districts, the per capita investment averaged less than Rs.300/- during the period 1980-84.

4.42 Over the years, the per beneficiary investment starting from Rs.2943 in 1980-81 rose to 3984 in the following year, therefore started declining to Rs.3271 in 1982-83 and to Rs.2861 in 1983-84, a level lower than that in 1980-81. This sort of variation is also noticeable under both the components viz., Government expenditure and credit from financial institutions.

## CHAPTER - V

### Implementation of the programme in Selected Blocks

5.1 For making a detailed assessment of the working of the programme, four blocks were selected in the state. These were Gadag and Kalghatagi in Dharwad district and Kadur and Sringeri in Chikmagalur district. A brief review of the working of the programme in these blocks is presented in the following paragraphs.

#### Gadag Block:

5.2 The programme was implemented in the block during 1980-81. The block had 61\* villages of which 50 had been covered under the programme till the end of 1983-84. There were 15 bank branches in the block through which loans were made available under the programme.

5.3 Household survey work was started in the block during 1981-82\*\*. The number of families identified under the survey was 1261 in 1981-82, 2782 in 1982-83 and 2939 in 1983-84; the total being 7032. The distribution of identified families according to annual income (range) is indicated in table-5.1.

5.4 It is seen that, according to the household survey, the annual family income of an overwhelming majority (about 75%) of the total identified families was as low as Rs.1000 or below.

---

\* as per 1981 census, the number of villages in Gadag Block/Taluk is.55.

\*\* Though the IRDP was implemented in Gadag w.e.f. 1980-81, the household survey, for identifying prospective beneficiaries, was conducted in the subsequent year 1981-82. It was learnt that IRDP assistance was extended during 1980-81 on the basis of beneficiaries identified for SFDA Programme.



Table-5.1: Distribution of Families according to range of Income - Gadag Block

Annual Income (Range in Rs.)	Percentage of Families
Upto Rs.500	30.9
Rs.501 and above upto Rs.1000	42.8
Rs.1001 " Rs.1500	11.9
Rs.1501 " Rs.2000	4.4
Rs.2001 " Rs.2500	3.8
Rs.2501 " Rs.3000	3.3
Rs.3001 " Rs.3500	2.9
All	100.0

Expenditure under the Programme:

- 5.5 The expenditure incurred on the programme in the block during the three years 1981-84 is furnished in table-5.2. Expenditure incurred during 1980-81 was not made available as the accounts had not been properly bifurcated between IRDP and SFDA programmes (SFDA programme was still under implementation during 1980-81). It is to be noted that the expenditure figures referred to here cover both (i) subsidy extended to the beneficiaries and (ii) expenditure incurred in administering the programme; break-up of which was not separately available.
- 5.6 As seen from the table, assistance was provided to take up activities only under agriculture, minor irrigation, animal husbandry and village industries. Expenditure during 1981-82 was Rs.5.2 lakhs, about 87.3 per cent of the target. During 1982-83, the performance was very poor, expenditure incurred being only Rs.1.92 lakhs (or 24.1%) against a target of Rs.8.0 lakhs. However, it improved considerably during 1983-84 when the expenditure incurred was as high as Rs.10.18 lakhs which was 127.3 per cent of the target. The total expenditure for the three years was Rs.17.34 lakhs or 78.8 per cent of the target.

Table-5.2: Subsidy and other Expenditure under IRDP-  
Gadag Block

(in Rupees)

Sl. No.	Sector	Subsidy & other expenditure during			Total (1981-84)	Percentage
		1981-82	1982-83	1983-84		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1.	Agriculture	45246	137278	165552	348076	20.1
2.	Minor Irrigation	168900	-	6166	<b>175066</b>	10.1
3.	Animal Husbandry	309462	52556	740544	1102562	63.5
4.	Village Industries (including services and business)	-	2566	106086	108652	6.3
	Total:	523608	192400	1018348	1734356	100.0
	Target:	600000	800000	800000	2200000	
	Percentage of expenditure	87.3	24.1	127.3	78.8	

5.7 Of the total expenditure of Rs.17.34 lakhs, animal husbandry programmes alone accounted for Rs.11.03 lakhs or 63.5 per cent (in conformity with the general trend in the state), 20.1 per cent was for agricultural programmes, 10.1 per cent for minor irrigation and only 6.3 per cent for village industries including services and business.

5.8 So far as disbursement of credit by financial institutions was concerned, data was not available in the block office. The block authorities expressed that it would be difficult for them to get information from the banks and also felt that banks were not co-operating with them.

Families Provided with Assistance:

5.9 Details of families provided with assistance under the programme are furnished in table-5.3.

Table-5.3: Families Assisted under the IRD Programme  
Gadag Block

Sl. No.	Sector	(Number of Beneficiaries)										
		1981-82		1982-83		1983-84		All Years		Per-centage of SC/ST beneficiaries	Sector-wise percentage	
		To-tal	SC/ST	To-tal	SC/ST	To-tal	SC/ST	To-tal (3+5+7)	SC/ST (4+6+8)		To-tal	SC/ST
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
1.	Agriculture	65	11	153	22	132	34	400	67	16.8	14.9	8.3
2.	Minor Irrigation	57	13	-	-	3	1	60	14	23.3	2.2	0.2
3.	Animal Husbandry	352	87	737	141	986	346	2075	574	27.7	77.3	84.2
4.	Village industries	-	-	4	-	146	30	150	30	20.0	5.6	7.3
Total		474	111	894	163	1317	411	2685	685	25.5	100.0	100.0

5.10 The total number of families provided with assistance was 474 in 1981-82 which rose to 894 in 1982-83 and further to 1317 in 1983-84. Only during 1981-82, the achievement was less than the annual target of 600 beneficiaries. The total number of families assisted during the period 1981-84 was 2685. The number of SC/ST beneficiaries also rose from 111 in 1981-82 to 163 in 1982-83 and to 411 in 1983-84, or a total of 685 over the period 1981-84. However, the percentage of SC/ST beneficiary families to total beneficiaries was only 25.5 which fell short of the target of 30 per cent.

5.11 Of the total beneficiaries during 1981-84, 77.3 per cent were provided assistance under animal husbandry sector, 14.9 per cent under agriculture, 5.6 under village industries and 2.2 under minor irrigation. In the case of SC/ST beneficiaries during the same period, 84.2 per cent were assisted under animal husbandry sector, 8.3 per cent under agriculture sector, 7.3 per cent under village industries and only 0.2 per cent under minor irrigation.

Expenditure per beneficiary:

5.12 Expenditure per beneficiary (including subsidy) in the block is furnished in table-5.4 below.

Table-5.4: Expenditure per Beneficiary - Gadag Block

Sl. No.	Sector	Expenditure per beneficiary during			(In Rs.)
					Average expenditure per beneficiary -
		1981-81	1982-83	1983-84	1981-84
1	2	3	4	5	6
1.	Agriculture	696	897	910	870
2.	Minor Irrigation	2963	-	2055	2918
3.	Animal Husbandry	380	71	751	531
4.	Village Industries (including services and business)	-	642	727	724
Total		1105	215	773	646

5.13 The expenditure per beneficiary (subsidy + others) was Rs.1105 during 1981-82 and Rs.773 during 1983-84. During 1982-83 it was only Rs.215 as the average expenditure per beneficiary under animal husbandry sector was only Rs.71 as per the figures furnished by the block authorities. It would appear that the data furnished by the block authorities pertaining to expenditure on animal husbandry sector or the number of beneficiaries under the sector or both are wrong. Due to this, the average expenditure per beneficiary under animal husbandry programme and the average expenditure for all the programmes during 1981-84 was low at Rs.531 and Rs.646 respectively. The average expenditure per beneficiary in other sectors during 1981-84 was Rs.870 under agriculture, Rs.2918 under minor irrigation and Rs.724 under village industries.

Kalghatagi Block:

5.14 In this block also, the programme was implemtned in 1980-81, Of the 88 villages in the block, 83 villa- ges had been covered under the programme till the end of 1983-84. There were 12 branches of 5 banks in the block.

5.15 Household survey work was taken up in the block during 1981-82 and by the end of 1983-84, 6,843 families had been identified. Percentage distribution of these families according to occupation is given in table-5.5.

Table-5.5: Occupational distribution of families identi-  
fied - Kalghatgi Block

Occupation	(Percentage)	
	Identified families	
	All	SC/ST
1	2	3
1. Small and Marginal cultivators	37.3	52.7
2. Dairying	6.5	10.6
3. Piggery, sheep and goat rearing	3.7	12.8
4. Labourers	45.2	21.8
5. Artisans	4.2	0.3
6. Traders and shop keepers	2.6	1.4
7. Other professions	0.5	0.4
Total	100.0	100.0

5.16 It is seen that a majority of the families identified constituted labourers (45.2 %) followed by cultivators (small and marginal farmers) 37.3 per cent., dairy 6.5 per cent, 4.2 per cent artisans, 3.7 per cent rearing pigs/goats/sheep, 2.6 per cent traders and 0.5 per cent other professions.

5.17 In the case of SC/ST families, however, the occupational pattern differed considerably; labourers accounting for only 21.8 per cent (as compared to 45.2% in the general population), 52.7 per cent cultivators and 23.4 per cent engaged in dairying or other animal husbandry activities.

5.18 The distribution of the families (identified over 1981-84) according to annual income is given in table-5.6 below.

Table-5.6: Distribution of Families according to annual income in Kalghatgi Block

Annual Income (Range in Rs.)	Percentage of Families
1. Upto 500	30.6
2. 501 - 1000	41.7
3. 1001 - 1500	13.5
4. 1501 - 2000	4.3
5. 2001 - 2500	3.8
6. 2501 - 3000	3.5
7. 3001 - 3500	2.6
All	100.0

5.19 This shows that even among those families in the block who were identified as below the poverty line, a majority, according to the household survey, was poorest, having an income of less than Rs.1000 per year. In fact, the percentage of such families was as high as 72.3.

Expenditure under the Programme:

5.20 The details of expenditure incurred under the programme during the years 1981-82 to 1983-84 are presented in table-5.7 (information on expenditure incurred during 1980-81 was not available).

Table-5.7: Expenditure under IRDP - Kalghatagi Block

Sl. No.	Sector	Expenditure during			(in Rs.)	
		1981-82	1982-83	1983-84	Total expenditure	Percentage to total
		3	4	5	6	7
1.	Agriculture	4,16,000	9,10,000	12,00,850	25,26,850	28.0
2.	Minor Irrigation	71,500	93,500	11,84,300	13,49,300	15.4
3.	Animal Husbandry	8,19,500	19,05,300	13,38,656	40,63,456	46.4
4.	Fisheries	-	1,350	3,909	5,259	0.1
5.	Horticulture	-	10,800	-	10,800	0.1
6.	Sericulture	5,000	20,400	11,400	36,800	0.4
7.	Village Industries	1,000	17,000	3,40,000	3,58,000	4.1
8.	Tertiary Sector	-	15,542	3,04,219	3,19,761	3.7
9.	Training Programme	-	40,000	36,000	76,000	0.9
	Total	13,13,000	30,14,692	44,19,334	87,47,026	100.0
	Target	6,00,000	8,00,000	8,00,000	22,00,000	
	Percentage of Expenditure	218.8	376.8	552.4	397.6	

5.21 Assistance was provided in the block for taking up activities under agriculture, minor irrigation, animal husbandry, fisheries, horticulture, sericulture, village industries, and tertiary sector activities. Expenditure was also incurred on training programmes.

5.22 Expenditure incurred on all the programmes was Rs.13.13 lakhs during 1981-82, Rs.30.15 lakhs in 1982-83 and Rs.44.19 lakhs during 1983-84. The total expenditure incurred during the three years was Rs.87.47 lakhs.

- 5.23 During each of the three years, expenditure was very much higher than the target; the percentage of expenditure being 218.8 in 1981-82, 376.8 in 1982-83 and 552.4 in 1983-84. The overall percentage for the three years was 397.6.
- 5.24 Of the total expenditure during the period 1981-84, an amount of Rs.40.63 lakhs (46.4 percent) was on animal husbandry programme, Rs.25.27 lakhs (28.9 per cent) on agriculture programme, Rs.13.49 lakhs (15.4 per cent) on minor irrigation works, Rs.3.59 lakhs (4.1 per cent) on village industries, Rs.3.20 lakhs (3.7 per cent) under tertiary sectors and the rest on fisheries, horticulture, sericulture and training programmes.

Credit from financial institutions:

- 5.25 According to the data furnished by the block authorities, the quantum of credit provided by financial institutions was more or less equal to the expenditure incurred on subsidy. The amount of credit disbursed was Rs.13.13 lakhs in 1981-82, Rs.30.22 lakhs in 1982-83 and Rs.44.14 lakhs in 1984-85.
- 5.26 Loan and subsidy in equal proportion, i.e., 50 per cent each, is permitted only in the case of scheduled tribe beneficiaries. In the context of figures indicated above, it would have to be concluded that all the beneficiaries in Kalghatgi block were STs. However, this is not reflected in the data furnished, as can be seen from table-5.8 to follow. Hence, the data is not reliable. It is surprising that such basic and essential data are not being maintained properly.

Families provided with assistance:

- 5.27 The number of families provided with assistance under the programme is furnished in table-5.8.
- 5.28 As per the information furnished by the block authorities, the number of families benefitted was 602 in 1981-82, 997 in 1982-83 and 1261 in 1983-84, or a total of 2860 over 1981-84.



Table-5.8: Families Assisted under the Programme -  
Kalghatgi Block - 1981-84

		(Number of Beneficiaries)									
Sl. No.	Sector	1981-82		1982-83		1983-84		All Years		Sector-wise percentages	
		Total	SC/ST	Total	SC/ST	Total	SC/ST	Total (3+5+7)	SC/ST (4+6+8)	Total	SC/ST
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1.	Agriculture	151	47	285	72	291	104	727	223	25.4	23.5
2.	Minor Irrigation	5	-	2	-	47	-	54	-	1.9	-
3.	Animal Husbandry	444	174	679	199	521	312	1644	685	57.5	72.1
4.	Fisheries	-	-	X	X	4	-	4	-	0.1	-
5.	Horticulture	-	-	X	X	-	-	-	-	-	-
6.	Sericulture	1	-	5	1	7	3	13	4	0.5	0.4
7.	Village Industries	1	-	10	-	120	5	131	5	4.6	0.5
8.	Tertiary Sector	-	-	3	-	239	27	242	27	8.4	2.9
9.	Training Programme	-	-	13	-	32	6	45	6	1.6	0.6
Total		602	221	997	272	1261	457	2860	950	100.0	100.0

X - Not furnished.

5.29 The number of SC/ST beneficiaries was 221 in 1981-82, 272 in 1982-83 and 457 in 1983-84, or a total of 950 over the period; the percentage of SC/ST beneficiaries being 33.2. In other words, the quota prescribed for SC/STs has been exceeded.

5.30 Of the total beneficiaries, (1981-84) 57.5 per cent were provided assistance in the animal husbandry sector, 25.4 per cent in agriculture sector, 8.4 per cent in tertiary sector, 4.6 per cent under village industries and the rest others viz., minor irrigation, fisheries, sericulture and training.

- 5.31 Of the total SC/ST beneficiaries (1981-84) as much as 72.1 per cent opted for animal husbandry programmes, while 23.5 per cent for agriculture and related activities, 2.9 per cent tertiary sector activities and the rest sericulture, village industries, etc.

Expenditure (including subsidy) per Beneficiary:

- 5.32 The expenditure incurred for providing subsidy per beneficiary is given in table-5.9.

Table-5.9: Expenditure per Beneficiary-Kalghatgi Block

Sl. No.	Sector	Expenditure per Beneficiary during			(in Rs.)
					Average expenditure per beneficiary
		1981-82	1982-83	1983-84	1981-84
1	2	3	4	5	6
1.	Agriculture	2,755	3,193	4,127	3,476
2.	Minor Irrigation	14,300	46,750	25,198	24,987
3.	Animal Husbandry	1,846	2,806	2,569	2,472
4.	Fisheries	-	-	977	977
5.	Sericulture	5,000	4,080	1,629	2,831
6.	Village Industries	1,000	1,780	2,833	2,739
7.	Tertiary Sector	-	5,181	1,273	1,321
8.	Training	-	3,077	1,125	1,689
Total		2,181	3,024	3,505	3,058

- 5.33 As can be seen from the table, expenditure per beneficiary for providing subsidy was Rs.14,300 in 1981-82, Rs.46,750 in 1982-83 and Rs.24,987 in 1983-84 under minor irrigation works; average for 1981-84 being Rs.24,987. Further, expenditure per beneficiary under the tertiary sector, during 1982-83 was Rs.5,181. These figures cannot obviously be correct as the maximum

subsidy allowed per beneficiary is only Rs.3000 (general) and Rs.5,000 for scheduled tribes. This would show that either the records regarding payment of subsidy or those pertaining to the beneficiaries or both have not been properly maintained.

- 5.34 Average expenditure per beneficiary was Rs.2,181 in 1981-82, Rs.3024 in 1982-83 and Rs.3,505 in 1983-84; with an overall average of Rs.3,058 for the period 1981-84 (Average per capita expenditure figures would be much lower if the inflated figures under minor irrigation are omitted).
- 5.35 Sectorwise, the average per capita expenditure during 1981-84 was Rs.3476 under agriculture, Rs.2472 under animal husbandry, Rs.977 under fisheries, Rs.2831 under sericulture, Rs.2739 under village industries, Rs.1321 under tertiary sector and Rs.1689 for training programmes.

Kadur Block:

- 5.36 The programme came to be implemented in the block during 1980-81 (as per DRDS authorities, however, the IRDP was implemented in this block w.e.f., 1978-79). There were 307 villages in the block, of which 261 had been covered under the programme upto 31.3.1984. There were 20 branches of 9 banks in the taluk through which loans under the programme were advanced to the beneficiaries.
- 5.37 The household survey work in the block was taken up in 1980-81 and by 1983-84, 27,686 families had been identified. Of the total families identified, 22.05 per cent were SCs/STs.

5.38 Occupational distribution of the identified families is shown in table-5.10 below.

Table-5.10: Occupational distribution of families, Kadur Block - 1980-84

Occupation	(Percentage)	
	Identified families	
	All	SC/ST
1	2	3
1. Small and Marginal cultivators	60.8	47.7
2. Labourers	24.0	52.3
3. Artisans	15.2	-
	100.0	100.0

5.39 Thus a majority (60.8%) of the families identified were cultivators and 24 per cent labourers. The corresponding figures for SC/ST are: 47.7 per cent and 52.3 per cent respectively.

5.40 The distribution of families (identified during 1980-84) according to their annual income is indicated in table-5.11 below.

Table-5.11: Distribution of Families according to Annual Income-Kadur Block - 1980-84

Annual Income (Range) (in Rs.)	Percentage of families
1. Upto 500	3.4
2. 501 to 1000	9.9
3. 1001 to 1500	20.7
4. 1501 to 2000	17.8
5. 2001 to 2500	25.0
6. 2501 to 3000	14.3
7. 3001 to 3500	8.9
All	100.0



5.41 Although the identified families were distributed over the entire income range of Rs.500 to Rs.3500, a majority of them, i.e., more than 60 per cent, were in the income range of Rs.1001 to Rs.2500. In contrast, it may be added here, the identified families in Gadag and Kalghatgi blocks were much poorer; 73.7 per cent (in Gadag) and 72.3 per cent (in Kalghatgi) of the total families were in the income range less than Rs.1001/-

Expenditure under the Programme:

5.42 Although the programme came to be implemented in the Block from 1978-79, details of expenditure on the programme (including subsidy) were available only from 1980-81. The same are presented in table-5.12 below.

Table-5.12: Expenditure (subsidy + other items) under IRDP - Kadur Block

Sl. No.	Sector	Expenditure during				(in Rs.)	
		1980-81	1981-82	1982-83	1983-84	Total expenditure	Percentage to total
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1.	Agriculture	325650	192436	1083721	1056429	2658236	37.1
2.	Animal Husbandry	156769	175649	742456	692356	1767230	24.7
3.	ISB	522421	134219	997632	1081963	2736235	38.2
	Total	1004840	502304	2823809	2830748	7161701	100.0
	Target	500000	600000	800000	800000	2700000	
	Percentage of expenditure	201.0	83.7	353.0	353.8	265.2	

5.43 Expenditure during 1980-81 was Rs.10.05 lakhs which fell sharply to Rs.5.02 lakhs during 1981-82. However, there was a big spurt in the expenditure during the subsequent two years; Rs.28.24 lakhs during 1982-83 and Rs.28.31 lakhs during 1983-84. The total expenditure during 1980-84 was Rs.71.62 lakhs. Compared to the annual targets, the achievement was 201.0 per cent during 1980-81,

83.7 per cent in 1981-82, 353.0 per cent in 1982-83 and 353.8 per cent in 1983-84; the overall percentage for the period 1980-84 was 265.2 which can be said to be highly creditable.

- 5.44 Of the total expenditure (during 1980-84), 37.1 per cent was for providing subsidy under agriculture sector, 24.7 per cent under animal husbandry sector and 38.2 per cent for other programmes which include small industries, services and business.
- 5.45 One noteworthy feature in this block was, the expenditure for providing subsidy to animal husbandry activities was appreciably low at 24.7 per cent when compared to other selected blocks as well as in the state. Also, the highest percentage of subsidy provided, i.e., 38.2 was for activities like village industries, services, and business which is worth emulating by other blocks.
- 5.46 So far as disbursement of credit by financial institutions is concerned, the figures furnished by the Block Authorities do not appear to be correct. As in the case of Kalghatgi block, here too the amount disbursed by the financial institutions tallied exactly with the amount spent on subsidy. As already stated, this is possible only when all the beneficiaries belong to the scheduled tribes. But, according to the data furnished by the block authorities, there were no ST beneficiaries at all.

Families provided Assistance:

- 5.47 The number of families provided with assistance during the period 1980-84 is shown in table-5.13.

Table-5.13: Families Assisted under the IRD Programme - Kadur Block  
1980-84

		(Number of Beneficiaries)											
Sl. No.	Sector	1980-81		1981-82		1982-83		1983-84		All Years		Sector-wise percentages	
		To-tal	SC/ST	To-tal	SC/ST	To-tal	SC/ST	To-tal	SC/ST	Tot-al (3+5+7+9)	SC/ST (4+6+8+10)	To-tal	SC/ST
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
1.	Agriculture	165	65	81	32	817	245	565	255	1328	567	54.8	55.2
2.	Animal Husbandry	62	22	57	35	197	75	446	201	762	333	31.4	32.4
3.	ISB	46	20	77	27	93	42	119	38	335	127	13.8	12.4
Total		273	107	215	94	807	332	1130	494	2425	1027	100.0	100.0

5.48 The number of families provided assistance was 273 in 1980-81, 215 in 1981-82, 807 in 1982-83 and 1,130 in 1983-84; the total during 1980-84 being 2425. The number of SC/ST beneficiaries was 107 in 1980-81, 94 in 1981-82, 332 in 1982-83 and 494 in 1983-84 or a total of 1,027 during 1980-84. The percentage of SC/ST beneficiaries was 42.4 of the total beneficiaries which is quite commendable.

5.49 Of the total beneficiaries, 54.8 per cent received benefits under agriculture sector, 31.4 per cent in the animal husbandry sector and only 13.8 per cent under 'ISB' programmes. This is quite <sup>in</sup> contrast to the pattern of expenditure on subsidy (table-5.12) which showed the highest expenditure being incurred on 'ISB'. This would mean that per capita assistance under 'ISB' was much higher as compared to other sectors.

5.50 A similar pattern was observed in the case of SC/ST beneficiaries. 55.2 per cent of them received assistance for agriculture activities, 32.4 per cent for animal husbandry activities and 12.4 per cent for ISB.



Expenditure per Beneficiary:

5.51 Based on the data pertaining to expenditure and the number of beneficiaries, the expenditure per beneficiary has been worked out and presented in Table-5.14 below.

Table-5.14: Expenditure per Beneficiary - Kadur Block  
1980-84

Sl. No.	Sector	Expenditure per Beneficiary during				(in Rs.)
		1980-81	1981-82	1982-83	1983-84	Average expenditure per beneficiary 1980-84
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1.	Agriculture	1974	2376	2096	1870	2002
2.	Animal Husbandry	2529	3082	3769	1552	2319
3.	ISB	11357	1743	10727	9092	8168
		3681	2336	3499	2505	2953

5.52 The table brings forth again vividly the deficiencies in the maintenance of data at the block level which has been discussed already. Expenditure per beneficiary under ISB was Rs.11,357 during 1980-81, Rs.10,727 during 1982-83 and Rs.9092 during 1983-84, which are quite high; exceeding the norms of Rs.3000/- per beneficiary (Rs.5000 in the case of SC/ST beneficiary, but no ST families identified in this block).

5.53 So far as the other two sectors are concerned, the average expenditure per beneficiary during 1980-84 was Rs.2002 for agriculture and Rs.2319 for animal husbandry.

Sringeri Block:

5.54 The programme was introduced in the block as late as in 1982-83. Unlike the other selected blocks, this is a typical malnad area with its own peculiarities. Most of the block consists of forests and the population is thin and scattered. Cultivation is done only in valleys. The main crops are paddy, arecanut and plantation crops.

- 5.55 The block has 10 village panchayats consisting of 49 villages of which two are uninhabited. Unlike the maidan area, the villages consist of scattered dwellings/houses.
- 5.56 There were 6 banks in the block with 10 branches.
- 5.57 The household survey work was taken up in the block during 1982-83 and by 1983-84, 4445 families had been identified as being below poverty line.
- 5.58 Of the total families identified, 44.6 per cent belonged to SC/ST, a majority of the latter being STs. The occupational pattern of identified families is given in the table-5.15 below.

Table-5.15: Occupational Distribution of Families, Sringeri Block - 1982-84

Occupation	(Percentage)	
	Identified Families	
	All	SC/ST
1. Small and Marginal cultivators	54.0	17.2
2. Labourers	40.4	82.8
3. Artisans	5.6	-
All	100.0	100.0

- 5.59 A majority of the identified families (54%) were cultivators and another 40.4 per cent were agricultural labourers. The corresponding figures for SC/ST are 17.2 per cent and 82.8 per cent respectively. The entire SC/ST (rather ST) families are practically agricultural labourers.

5.60 The distribution of families (identified during 1982-84) according to their annual income is shown in table-5.16 below.

Table-5.16: Distribution of Families according to Annual Income, Sringeri Block 1982-84

Annual Income (Range) (Rs.)	(Percentage)
	Percentage
1. Upto 500	-
2. 501 to 1000	13.6
3. 1001 to 1500	17.9
4. 1501 to 2000	30.0
5. 2001 to 2500	22.0
6. 2501 to 3000	16.5
7. 3001 to 3500	-
All	100.0

5.61 None of the identified families had an income of less than Rs.500 or more than Rs.3000. Even those families which had an income of less than Rs.1000 per annum were comparatively less.

Expenditure under the Programme:

5.62 Details of expenditure (on providing subsidy etc.) in the block are furnished in table-5.17.

Table-5.17: Expenditure under IRDP on providing subsidy- Sringeri Block (1982-84)

Sl. No.	Sector	Expenditure during		Total Expenditure 1982-84	Percentage to total
		1982-83	1983-84		
1	2	3	4	5	6
1.	Agriculture	1,07,677	1,77,148	2,81,825	42.3
2.	Animal Husbandry	1,38,918	59,437	1,98,355	29.8
3.	ISB	1,05,226	80,493	1,85,719	27.9
	Total	3,51,821	3,14,078	6,65,899	
	Target	8,00,000	8,00,000	16,00,000	
	Percentage of expenditure	44.0	39.3	41.6	100.0

- 5.63 The expenditure on subsidy was Rs.3.52 lakhs during 1982-83 and Rs.3.14 lakhs in 1983-84. The total expenditure during the two years was Rs.6.66 lakhs. When compared to the annual outlay target of Rs.8 lakhs the percentage of expenditure was only 44.0 in 1982-83 and 39.3 in 1983-84; or 41.6 over the period 1982-84. The low percentage of achievement was attributed by the block authorities to the difficult terrain, inaccessibility, scattered dwellings, etc. Also, high wage rates ruling in the plantations were cited as another major reason though it was, as pointed out to them, clear that such high wage earners should not and would not get included in the identified group.
- 5.64 As can be seen from table-5.17, of the total beneficiaries (1982-84), 42.3 per cent availed benefits under the agriculture sector, 29.8 per cent under the animal husbandry sector and 27.9 per cent under ISB. It is noteworthy that expenditure on animal husbandry activities has not dominated the programme in this block too, as in Kadur.
- 5.65 Of credit distributed by financial institutions, an amount of Rs.8.78 lakhs was distributed during 1982-83 and Rs.9.14 lakhs during 1983-84.
- 5.66 The major contributors to the programme were commercial banks who distributed loans amounting to Rs.4.52 lakhs in 1982-83 and Rs.8.75 lakhs in 1983-84. Co-operative Banks contributed Rs.4.26 lakhs in 1982-83 and Rs.0.39 lakhs in 1983-84.

Families Provided Assistance:

- 5.67 The number of families provided with assistance under the programme is given in table-5.18.

Table-5.18: Families assisted under the Programme - Sringeri Block (1982-84)

		(Number of Beneficiaries)							
Sl. No.	Sector	1982-83		1983-84		Both years		Sectorwise percentages	
		To- tal	SC/ ST	To- tal	SC/ ST	Total (3+5)	SC/ST (4+6)	Total	SC/ST
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1.	Agriculture	100	14	152	11	261	25	32.2	26.9
2.	Animal Hus- bandry	185	30	94	12	279	42	34.4	45.2
3.	ISB	145	1	126	25	271	26	33.4	27.9
	Total	439	45	372	48	811	93	100.0	100.0

5.68 The number of beneficiaries was 439 in 1982-83 and 372 in 1983-84, the total being 811 in the two year period. The number of SC/ST beneficiaries was 45 in 1982-83 and 48 in 1983-84, the total being 93. The percentage of SC/ST beneficiaries was only 11.5, which is not at all satisfactory compared to the target of 30 per cent.

5.69 Of the total beneficiaries, 32.2 per cent received benefit under agriculture sector, 34.4 per cent under animal husbandry sector and 33.4 per cent under ISB. The corresponding figures for SC/ST are, 26.9 per cent, 45.2 per cent and 27.9 per cent respectively.

Expenditure per Beneficiary:

5.70 Expenditure (on subsidy etc.) per beneficiary sector-wise is presented in table-5.19.

Table-5.19: Expenditure per Beneficiary on Subsidy- Sringeri Block, 1982-84

		(in Rs.)		
Sl. No.	Sector	Expenditure per Beneficiary during		Average expenditure per beneficiary 1982-84
		1982-83	1983-84	
1	2	3	4	4
1.	Agriculture	988	1146	1080
2.	Animal Hus- bandry	751	632	716
3.	ISB	726	639	686
	Total	801	844	821

- 5.71 The average expenditure per beneficiary was Rs.801 in 1982-83 and Rs.844 in 1983-84; average for the two year period being Rs.821. The highest per capita expenditure was Rs.1080 for activities under agriculture sector, followed by Rs.711 under animal husbandry sector and Rs.686 under ISB.

The Selected Blocks - A comparative Picture

- 5.72 Table-11 at the end of the report brings together the data in respect of essential operational aspects of the IRDP of the four blocks studied in the foregoing pages. Corresponding information for the state, to the extent available, is also incorporated.
- 5.73 The study period covers 4 years, 1980-84, in respect of Kadur (and state), 3 years, 1981-84 in the case of Gadag and Kalghatagi blocks and two year period, 1982-84, in the case of Sringeri.
- 5.74 The percentage of villages covered by the IRDP ranges from 32.0 (Gadag) and 95.5 (Kalghatgi); information on the number of villages covered was not available for Sringeri.
- 5.75 The largest number of families (27686) was identified in Kadur block, followed by Gadag (7032), Kalghatgi (6843) and Sringeri (4445). 44.6 per cent of the identified families belonged to SC/ST in Sringeri and 22.0 per cent in Kadur block; information was not available for the remaining two blocks.
- 5.76 Cultivators (small and marginal farmers) and labourers were the major occupational categories of identified families; the combined percentage to total identified families being 94.4 in Sringeri, 84.8 in Kadur and 82.2 in Kalghatgi (information was not available for Gadag).
- 5.77 Distribution of identified families according to annual income in the blocks of Northern Karnataka (Dharwad) and Southern Karnataka (Chikmagalur) provides a contrasting picture. A majority of the households (over 70

per cent) in the two blocks of Dharwad had an annual income of Rs.1000 or less at the time of household survey by IRDP agencies. On the other hand, in the two blocks of Chikmagalur, a majority of the households (70 per cent) had an annual income ranging from Rs.1001 to Rs.2500; and most of them in the income range Rs.1501 to Rs.2500.

- 5.78 Annual average household income, as per IRDP surveys, blockwise, are Gadag - Rs.925, Kalghatgi - Rs.930, Sringeri - Rs.1800 and Kadur - Rs.1901. However, corresponding figures as per the field study\* of the selected beneficiaries by the Evaluation Division are, Kadur - Rs.2257, Sringeri - Rs.2882, Kalghatgi - Rs.3360 and Gadag - Rs.4080; the latter set of figures refer to the year of identification. While both the sets of average family income are based on oral enquiries, the magnitude of the difference between the two sets would indicate that family incomes are consistently underreported, in the IRDP surveys, in the two blocks of Dharwad.
- 5.79 In terms of achievement of physical targets (number of families assisted), the IRDP performance appears to be more than satisfactory in practically all the blocks (except Sringeri) and in the state as well. The two blocks of Dharwad, however, have shown very good performance - 158.0 per cent of the target over the period concerned in Kalghatgi and 149.2 per cent in Gadag; Kadur with 101.0 per cent and Sringeri with 67.7 per cent in Chikmagalur trailed behind the former. State as a whole, the performance is quite satisfactory in as much as 137.5 per cent of the targetted families were assisted under the IRDP over the period 1980-84.
- 5.80 The proportion of scheduled caste families assisted to the total beneficiaries were as follows - Kadur 42.2 per cent, Kalghatgi - 33.2 per cent, Gadag - 25.5 per cent and Sringeri - 11.5 per cent as against 24.3 per cent in the state. Considered against the minimum percentage prescribed for assisting SC/ST families, viz.,

---

\*Vide Chapter-VI

30.0 per cent, the performance in only Kadur and Kalghatgi blocks is satisfactory.

- 5.81 A majority (over 80 per cent) of the beneficiaries chose either animal husbandry or agriculture activities in the state and the blocks, except Sringeri where it was about two-thirds. However, animal husbandry accounted for the largest single activity chosen by beneficiaries in all the blocks as also in the state except Kadur, where agriculture accounted for the largest population.
- 5.82 The pattern of activities assisted was also similar in the case of SC/ST beneficiaries both in the state and the selected blocks; animal husbandry sector accounting for the largest proportion except Kadur block, where it was agriculture.
- 5.83 In terms of financial performance (percentage of expenditure to allotment), the picture is altogether different in comparison to physical performance as between Gadag and Sringeri blocks on the one hand and Kalghatgi and Kadur blocks on the other as revealed by the following figure ..

Table-5.20: Financial and Physical Achievement (percent of target, blockwise) 1980-84

Item	(Percentage)				
	Gadag	Kalghatgi	Kadur	Sringeri	State
1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Percent of financial achievement	78.8	397.6	265.2	41.6	121.0
2. Percent achievement of physical target over the period	149.2	158.2	101.0	67.7	137.5



5.84 Assistance per beneficiary was the lowest at Rs.646 in Gadag block, for others the figures are, Sringeri - Rs.821, Kadur - Rs.2953 and Kalghatgi - Rs.3058 (State Rs.992).

5.85 In keeping with the largest proportion of beneficiaries found in agriculture and animal husbandry sector, in terms of financial assistance extended also, these two activities accounted for the largest proportion; as per figures mentioned below.

Table-5.21: Percentage distribution of beneficiaries by activity assisted by Block, 1980-84

Item	Gadag	Kalghatgi	Kadur	Sringeri	State
1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Percentage of beneficiaries in -					
a) Agriculture	14.9	25.4	54.8	32.2	17.4
b) Animal Husbandry	77.3	57.5	31.4	34.4	68.5
Both	92.2	82.9	86.2	66.6	85.9
2. Percentage of financial assistance in the sector of					
a) Agriculture	20.1	28.9	37.1	42.3	NA
b) Animal Husbandry	63.5	46.4	24.7	29.8	NA
Both	83.6	75.3	61.8	72.1	NA

5.86 Figures relating to credit extended by financial institutions were either not available or were not complete for most of the blocks.

\*\*\*\*\*

## CHAPTER - VI

### Beneficiary Survey

- 6.1 A beneficiary survey was conducted in the four selected blocks to study the economic conditions of the beneficiaries and the impact of the programme on their income and employment.
- 6.2 The total number of beneficiaries selected was 112, of whom 28 were from Gadag, 29 from Kalghatagi, 28 from Kadur and 27 from Sringeri blocks. The number of villages covered was 26, of which 5 were from Gadag, 6 from Kalghatagi, 5 from Kadur and 10 from Sringeri. Of the selected beneficiaries, 25 belonged to scheduled castes and tribes.
- 6.3 The names of the villages selected are:

Kalghatagi block: (1) Devikoppa, (2) Junjun Bayalu, (3) Hirehonnali, (4) B. Shiggathi, (5) Tabakada Honnali and (6) Tumrikoppa.

Gadag block: (1) Hombala, (2) Neralagi, (3) Balaganur, (4) Kalasapura and (5) Sortur.

Sringeri block: (1) Begar, (2) Markal, (3) Kochavalli, (4) Holekoppa, (5) Addagadde, (6) Vidyaranyapura, (7) Nelluru, (8) Mudbha, (9) Gandhagatti and (10) Ginigini.

Kadur block: (1) Chikkangala, (2) Haruvanahalli, (3) Bisalahalli, (4) Hirenallur and (5) Hochihalli.

#### Size of beneficiary families:

- 6.4 Distribution of the beneficiary families according to family size is shown in table-6.1.

Table-6.1: Size of beneficiary families

Block	Less than 5 members	5 to 9 members	Above 9 members
1	2	3	4
Kalghatagi	6	20	3
Gadag	6	17	5
Sringeri	6	19	2
Kadur	6	21	1
Total:	24	77	11
Percentage	21.4	68.8	9.8

6.5 The number of beneficiary families having less than 5 members was 24 or 21.4 per cent of the total selected families. In 77 families, the number of members ranged between 5 to 9 accounting for about 68.8 per cent. Only 11 families or 9.8 per cent had more than 9 members. Thus, a majority of beneficiary families had their family size between 5 and 9 members. The average family size works out to 6.2.

Educational status of beneficiaries:

- 6.6 The educational background of the beneficiaries is furnished in table-6.2.
- 6.7 Of the total beneficiaries, as many as 48 (42.9 per cent) were illiterates and 39 (34.8 per cent) had studied upto IV standard only. Only 15 (13.4 per cent) had studied upto VII standard and 10 persons (8.9 per cent) had studied beyond VII standard.

Table-6.2: Educational background of beneficiaries

Block	(Number)					Total
	Illiterates	Upto IV standard	Upto VII standard	Above VII standard		
1	2	3	4	5	6	
Kalghatagi	17	8	3	1		29
Gadag	11	11	3	3		28
Sringeri	6	11	6	4		27
Kadur	14	9	3	2		28
Total:	48	39	15	10		112
Percentage	42.9	34.8	13.4	8.9		100.0

Occupation of the beneficiary households:

6.8 Distribution of beneficiaries according to their primary and secondary occupation is presented in table-6.3.

Table-6.3: Occupation of beneficiary households

Block	Primary occupation			Secondary occupation		
	Agri-culture	Agricultural labour	Others	Agri-culture	Agricultural labour	Others
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Kalghatagi	15	8	6	14	7	8
Gadag	8	12	8	7	10	11
Sringeri	14	1	12	5	7	15
Kadur	8	16	4	3	8	17
Total:	45	37	30	29	32	51
Percentage	40.2	33.0	26.8	25.9	28.6	45.5

6.9 Of the selected beneficiary households, the primary occupation of 45 (40.2 per cent) was agriculture, 37 households (33.0 per cent) were depending for their livelihood on agricultural labour and 30 (26.8 per cent) had other occupations.

6.10 The secondary occupation of 29 households (25.9 per cent) was agriculture, of 32 households (28.6 per cent) it was agricultural labour and that of 51 households (45.5 per cent) it was other activities.

Workers and non-workers in the beneficiary families:

6.11 The number of workers and non-workers in the beneficiary families is shown in table-6.4.

Table-6.4: Activity status of members of beneficiary families surveyed.

Item	(Number)				
	Gadag	Kalghatagi	Kadur	Sringeri	All blocks
1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Non-workers	94	132	98	98	422
2. Workers	86	58	64	68	276
3. Total population	180	190	162	166	698
4. Percentage of 2 to 3	47.8	30.5	39.5	41.0	39.5
5. Average family size	6.4	6.6	5.8	6.1	6.2
6. Average No. of workers per family	3.1	2.0	2.3	2.6	2.5

6.12 It is seen that the population of workers (to total population) ranged between 30.5 per cent (in Kalghatagi block) to 47.8 per cent (in Gadag block); with an over-all average of 39.5 per cent for all selected blocks. It is also seen that the average family size (for the four blocks) works out to 6.2 and the corresponding figure for workers is 2.5.

Workers according to age:

6.13 The distribution of workers according to age is shown in table-6.5 below:

Table-6.5: Distribution of workers according to age

Age group (in years)	(Number)				
	Gadag	Kalghatagi	Kadur	Sringeri	All blocks
1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Less than 15	6	3	1	3	13
2. Percentage	7.0	5.2	1.6	4.4	4.7
3. 15-59	80	53	63	61	257
4. Percentage	93.0	91.8	98.4	89.7	93.1
5. 60 years & above	-	2	-	4	6
6. Percentage	-	3.4	-	5.9	2.2
7. All age groups	86	58	64	68	276
8. Percentage	(100.0)	(100.0)	(100.0)	(100.0)	(100.0)

6.14 A majority (nearly 90 per cent) of workers are in the working-force age-group of 15-59, the percentage ranging from 89.7 (in Sringeri) to 98.4 (Kadur), the average for the four selected blocks being 93.1 per cent. It is also seen that 4.7 per cent (average for the four blocks) of workers were children below 15 years of age.

Family income of beneficiaries at the time of identification:

6.15 To ascertain whether identification of persons has been properly done or not, data was collected from the beneficiaries themselves regarding their monthly family income with reference to the period (year) of the household survey conducted by the IRDP authorities. For the purpose, information on the average monthly income of each earning member of the beneficiary was collected. The per capita monthly income and average annual family income figures have been worked out (the latter for a family of five persons). The relevant information is presented in table-6.6 below:

Table-6.6: Per capita monthly income and annual income of beneficiary families at the time of identification

(in Rs.)		
Block	Per capita monthly income of beneficiary families	Average annual income for a family of five persons
1	2	3
Kalghatagi	56	3,360
Gadag	58	4,080
Sringeri	48	2,882
Kadur	38	2,257
Average for all blocks	52	3,145

6.16 The average per capita monthly income of all beneficiary families at the time of identification was Rs 52. The annual income per family of five persons works out to Rs 3,145 for all the blocks. This is nearer to the income ceiling of Rs 3,500 fixed for identifi-

cation. As a matter of fact, the income could be even higher than this as respondents had a tendency to under-state their incomes with the hope that such an underestimate might help them in getting benefits. As the income figure shown here differ considerably from the income figures of the household survey by IRDP authorities, and as the latter are consistently lower than the former (which are themselves under estimates) it would appear that the IRDP survey has not been conducted properly.

- 6.17 As seen from table-6.6, the annual average family income of the beneficiaries was Rs. 4,080 in Gadag block which means that a substantial number of beneficiaries had a family income much higher than the ceiling fixed. Such families would not have been eligible for assistance under the IRD programme.

Consumption expenditure of beneficiary families at the time of identification:

- 6.18 Data was also collected from the beneficiaries on the pattern of expenditure on food, clothing etc. There was a noticeable tendency on the part of the respondents to inflate expenditure. As such, data pertaining to expenditure on food and clothing only is presented in table-6.7.
- 6.19 The average expenditure of beneficiary families on food was Rs. 2,743 per annum and on clothing Rs. 261; total expenditure being Rs. 3,004. If the expenditure on purchase of household articles, entertainment, smoking, liquor, social<sup>and</sup>/religious functions etc., is also taken into consideration, the total expenditure per annum of the beneficiary household could be higher than the income ceiling. While the income



Table-6.7: Annual expenditure of Beneficiary Families (Family of five persons - at the time of identification)

(in Rs.)			
Block	Expenditure on food	Expenditure on clothing	Total expenditure
1	2	3	4
Kalghatagi	2,820	235	3055 (3360)
Gadag	2,160	295	2455 (4080)
Sringeri	2,618	404	3022 (2882)
Kadur	3,374	108	3482 (2257)
Average for all blocks	2,743	261	3,004 (3145)

Note: Figures in brackets indicate average annual family income (from table 6.6)

and expenditure figures in respect of Kalghatagi and Gadag blocks (Table-6.7) appear reasonable, the same can not be said in respect of the remaining two blocks.

6.20 It was observed during field investigation that a considerable number of beneficiary families had assets, like, radio, watch, furniture, cycle, steel utensils, agricultural implements etc. It would not have been possible to purchase all these assets with their stated income. Hence, it can be concluded that the income of the beneficiary households at the time of identification was much higher than what was stated.

Sectorwise - families assisted:

6.21 52 of the beneficiaries selected received assistance under the animal husbandry sector, 23 received assistance under the agriculture sector, 34 under the ISB (Industries service and Business) sector and 3 for minor irrigation; the corresponding percentages being

46.4, 20.5, 30.4 and 2.7.

6.22 Activities for which assistance was provided under different sectors were as follows:

1. Animal Husbandry - She-buffaloes, cows, sheep and goats.
2. Agriculture - Bullocks and bullock carts.
3. Minor Irrigation - Irrigation wells and Pumpsets.
4. ISB - Restaurant, tea-stall, barber shop, black-smithy, copper smithy, goldsmithy, carpentry, basket weaving, cycle shop, cloth shop, petty shop, kirana shop, bangle shop, tailoring and band sets.

Cost of Assets provided to Beneficiaries:

6.23 Information on value of assets obtained under IRDP was also collected from beneficiaries. The average cost of assets provided to selected beneficiaries including loan and subsidy was Rs.2240 per unit under animal husbandry sector, Rs.5631 under agriculture sector (including minor irrigation - wells and pumpsets etc.) and Rs.2164 under ISB (industries, service and business) sector or an overall average of Rs.2920 per beneficiary.

Annual average family income after IRDP Assistance:

6.24 To ascertain changes in the income of beneficiary families, after receiving assistance, data was collected on the income earned by the beneficiary families out of assets provided under the programme and also from other sources. Data was collected for two years, 1982-83 and 1983-84. Table 6-8 embodies these details.

Table-6.8: Monthly average family income of Beneficiaries after Receiving Assistance.

Block	1982-83			1983-84		
	Average monthly income from			Average monthly income from		
	IRDP assets	Other sources	Total	IRDP assets	Other sources	Total
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Kalghatagi	65.86	191.55	257.41	89.14	194.48	283.62
Gadag	94.82	156.79	251.61	269.14	402.86	672.00
Sringeri	95.83	256.03	351.86	98.73	266.17	364.90
Kadur	169.46	177.62	347.08	199.64	192.02	391.66
Average for all blocks	106.49	195.50	301.99	164.16	263.88	428.04

6.25 The average monthly income of the beneficiary families works out Rs.301.99 in 1982-83 and Rs.428.04 in 1983-84. The average monthly family income derived from the assets provided under the programme works out to Rs.106.49 in 1982-83 and Rs.164.16 in 1983-84. The income figures for 1983-84 both from IRDP assets and other sources are higher than in 1982-83. This was more so in Gadag block where the beneficiaries' income rose from Rs.251.61 in 1982-83 to Rs.672.00.

6.26 However, one disturbing feature noticed is that the income from "other sources" in 1982-83 was lower than the income earned by the beneficiaries at the time of identification i.e., Rs.262.10 (Table-6.6) and almost the same in 1983-84. The main reason for this may be under-reporting of income, as already noted, by beneficiaries. Another reason possibly is diversion

of a part of their labour (or working time) from earlier occupations to working IRD assets.

- 6.27 To have an idea of changes in income before and after IRDP assistance, information on the annual income of the beneficiary families (worked out for a family of five persons) at the time of identification and after assistance, is presented in table-6.9.

Table-6.9: Average annual family income of Beneficiaries before and after IRDP assistance (for a family of 5 persons)

Block	Annual Income		Percentage change in column (3) over column(2)	Percentage change in column (5) over column(2)	
	At the time of identification	In 1982-83		Annual income in 1983-84	Percentage change in column (5) over column(2)
1	2	3	4	5	6
Kalghatagi	3360	2880	-14.3	3060	- 8.9
Gadag	4080	2880	-29.4	5280	+29.4
Sringeri	2882	3434	+19.2	3561	+23.6
Kadur	2257	3599	+59.5	4062	+80.0
Average for all blocks	3145	3198	+ 1.7	3991	+26.9

Note: Figures in Cols. 3 and 5 - derived from Table-6.8.

\* : At current prices, between 1979-80 and 1983-84, the all India whole sale price index (on average basis) has increased by 45.0 per cent and the all India consumer price index has leapt by 52.0 per cent over the same period; a rise of more than 12 per cent per annum.

- 6.28 The average annual income of beneficiary families, which was Rs.3145 (average of 4 blocks) at the time of identification increased by only 1.7 per cent to

Rs.3198 in 1982-83. One of the reasons for this could be that some of the beneficiaries had received the benefit only during that year and did not get much income out of it. During 1983-84 the income rose to Rs.3991, an increase of 26.9 per cent.

6.29 Among the blocks, Kadur's performance appears to be outstanding as the rate of growth in income was +59.5 per cent in 1982-83 and +80.0 per cent in 1983-84, over the level in the base year. One must, however, hasten to add that the income figures for 1982-83 and 1983-84 are at current prices. In other words, the rate of growth in income during 1982-83 and 1983-84 noted above may be some what smaller. In the case of Khalghatagi and Gadag, negative growth rates are noticed. This could be considered as fortuitous, arising out of the inherent limitations of a one - time - enquiry through the interview method (due to memory lapse).

6.30 The proportion of income generated through IRDP assets to that of total (of the beneficiaries for a family of five persons) can be seen from table-6.10.

Table-6.10: Proportion of average annual family income generated from IRDP assets to total income. (for a family of five persons)

Block	1982-83			(Income - in Rs.) 1983-84		
	Total Income	Income from IRDP asset	Percentage	Total Income	Income from IRDP asset	Percentage
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Khalghatagi	2880	840	29.2	3060	1080	35.3
Gadag	2880	900	31.3	5280	1740	33.0
Sringeri	3434	935	27.2	3561	964	27.1
Kadur	3599	1757	48.8	4062	2071	51.0
Average for all blocks	3198	1108	34.6	3991	1464	36.7

6.31 The contribution on IRDP assets was Rs.1108 out of a total income Rs.3198 during 1982-83 and Rs.1464 out of Rs.3991 during 1983-84; percentage contribution being 34.6 and 36.7 respectively. Thus, a substantial portion of income of the beneficiary families was generated through IRDP assets. Among blocks, the performance of Kadur was note worthy as the contribution of IRDP assets to total income was as high as 48.8 per cent in 1982-83 and 51.0 per cent in 1983-84.

6.32 Thus, the programme has helped the beneficiary families to raise their income fairly although their income from other sources was reported to have declined marginally.

Employment Generation:

6.33 The volume of additional employment (for the working members of beneficiary families before IRDP assets were provided) after getting benefit under the programme is indicated in table-6.11, it reflects the change in volume of employment per worker in the latest year (1983-84) over the base year.

Table-6.11: Employment Position-working members of Beneficiary Families before and after getting Benefit under the Programme.

Block	(Employment in Mandays)		
	Employment before getting benefit	Employment after getting benefit	Percentage change
1	2	3	4
Kalghatagi	291	293	0.7
Gadag	244	290	18.9
Sringeri	237	258	8.9
Kadur	283	293	3.5
Average for all blocks	264	284	7.6

6.34 The programme does not seem to have any significant impact on employment level of the working members of beneficiary families. The average number of mandays of employment per working member of the beneficiary family which was 264 before the IRDP benefit, rose to 284 after benefit, or by 7.6 per cent. Among the selected blocks, the corresponding rates of growth in employment ranged from 0.7 per cent in Kalghatagi to 18.9 per cent in Gadag.

6.35 The low generation of additional employment may be attributable to the type of benefits provided. Animal husbandry activities constituted a major component of the IRDP, that too provision of milch animals, which did not result in creation of much additional employment, as the animals did not need much constant care.

Beneficiaries crossing the Poverty Line:

6.36 Details of beneficiary families which crossed the poverty line as at the end of 1983-84 are shown in table-6.12.

Table-6.12: Beneficiary families crossing the poverty line - by end of 1983-84.

Block	(Number)					
	Total beneficiary families selected	of Col.2 families with family income above Rs. 3500 initially	of Col.2, families below poverty line (Col.2-Col.3)	Family with family income above Rs. 3500 as at the end of March 84	Family with family income increase in above (Rs. 3500 (Col.3) - Col.5)	Percent of families crossing the poverty line $\frac{\text{Col.6}}{\text{Col.4}} \times 100$
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Kalghatagi	29	6	23	8	2	8.7
Gadag	28	4	24	12	8	33.3
Sringeri	27	7	20	11	4	20.0
Kadur	28	5	23	16	11	47.9
All blocks	112	22	90	47	25	27.7

6.37 Of the 112 beneficiary families selected in all the four blocks for the study 22 (or 19.6 per cent) were above the poverty line at the time of identification itself. By the end of 1983-84, this number had gone up to 47 or 42.0 per cent of the total beneficiaries.

6.38 In other words, out of 90 beneficiaries who were below poverty line at the time of identification, 25 additional families had crossed the poverty line by end of March 1983-84 which means 27.7 per cent of the families had crossed the poverty line over a period of about three years. The corresponding figures for the selected block are: Kadur 47.9 per cent, Gadag 33.3 per cent, Sringeri 20.0 per cent and Khalgatagi 8.7 per cent. The performance in the blocks of maidan area, in terms of families crossing the poverty line, is quite impressive.

Beneficiaries' Views:

6.39 The selected beneficiaries were asked to give their views on some of the aspects of the programme. Their views are summarised below:

6.40 To the query whether a survey of their households was conducted, all the beneficiaries except two replied in the affirmative. The two beneficiaries could not recollect whether a survey was conducted.

6.41 To the question whether any economic benefit plan for the family was prepared, 34 beneficiaries (30.0 per cent of the total) said yes, 41 said no and 37 beneficiaries were not aware of it. Although 34 beneficiaries said that economic benefit plan for the family was prepared, no such plans were infact prepared as admitted by the implementing officers themselves.

6.42 Regarding delay in processing of applications and sanctioning of assistance/credit, only 4 beneficiaries (3.6 per cent) felt that there were abnormal delays ranging, from 2 to 4 months, which was ascribed to bank authorities. This appears to contradict the opinions of the implementing officers and bank officials themselves. While the implementing officers felt that



banks delayed sanctioning of applications, the Banks reacted that dumping of large number of applications at a time, caused delays in processing and sanctioning of applications.

- 6.43 A majority of the beneficiaries had to visit the block office and the banks 2 to 5 times for obtaining the benefit. A few of them had visited more than 5 times while one beneficiary had stated that he had to go 15 times. The expenditure on all such visits ranged from Rs.5 to Rs.100 per visit. The average expenses per applicant was about Rs.25. A few beneficiaries also stated that they had to spend additional amounts for getting the assistance sanctioned (at banks). One of them clearly stated that he had to bribe the bank officials for getting the loan sanctioned.
- 6.44 The implementing authorities and bank officials should see <sup>that</sup> the beneficiary is not unnecessarily inconvenienced by quickly disposing of his application. The beneficiaries should not be made to visit the bank and block offices frequently for getting sanction of their applications. Delays may lead to corrupt practices as complained by a beneficiary.
- 6.45 More than 50 per cent of the beneficiaries (61) agreed that the benefit provided under the programme helped them in realising additional income. 17 of them specifically stated that the additional income was due to sale of milk. 26 beneficiaries stated that there was no increase in the income. Of the latter two had misused the assets by selling the bullocks provided to them. One had sold the bullocks at a loss of Rs.500. Most of the beneficiaries who were provided with sheep and goat units reported loss due to death of animals from diseases. A few of the beneficiaries

who had been provided with milch animals stated that they were not getting any income as the animals were not yielding milk.

- 6.46 Thirteen of the selected beneficiaries stated that they were given cash for purchasing the assets. It is surprising why cash was paid to the beneficiaries inspite of clear instructions to the implementing authorities to provide the benefits only in kind as payment of cash may lead to misuse.
- 6.47 Fifteen beneficiaries, mainly from ISB sector, stated that the assistance provided was not adequate and they had to make their own arrangement to mobilise additional resources. In case where the assistance sought is more than what is permissible, the authorities should sanction the maximum assistance admissible after verifying the genuineness of the proposals.
- 6.48 It was observed that the procedure of repayment of loans, particularly the number of instalments to be paid was not known to a large number of beneficiaries. This may be also one of the reasons for poor recoveries. It should, therefore, be the responsibility of not only the bank officials but also the implementing officers to inform the beneficiaries regarding repayment procedures, such as; value of instalments, frequency and due dates of instalment so that the beneficiaries may make arrangements for repayment of loans promptly. Infact, a small book-let of instructions on the subject would be useful if distributed to beneficiaries at the time of sanction of benefits.
- 6.49 So far as repayment of loans was concerned, 32 beneficiaries stated they had no overdues, while the rest of the beneficiaries (71.4 per cent of the total) had

not repaid the loans promptly. Some of them stated they were not aware how much or when they had to pay. A few of them, however, tried to evade the issue by not giving a direct answer. The implementing officers should take an active role in collecting the dues from the beneficiaries, as otherwise future operations would be affected. A sense of prompt repayment will have to be inculcated in the beneficiaries which goes a long way in the continued implementation of the programme successfully.

- 6.50 So far as the availability of technical guidance, inputs and marketing facilities were concerned, there were very few complaints. This was obviously so because the main activity assisted was animal husbandry. There was no need, most of them felt, for assistance for marketing their main product, viz., milk, which was sold either locally or in the neighbouring areas. Most of the beneficiaries were satisfied with the available marketing outlets/facilities.

Non-Beneficiaries:

- 6.51 A study of non-beneficiaries, who had been identified in the household survey as below the poverty line, was also conducted with the objective of finding out whether they were aware of the type of assistance provided under the programme and whether they had made any attempt to get the benefit sanctioned. For the purpose, 20 non-beneficiaries, at the rate of 5 per block, were selected and their views gathered.
- 6.52 It was observed that all the selected non-beneficiaries were fully aware of the programme and the extent of assistance provided under it.

- 6.53 Except four non-beneficiaries (20 per cent of the total), all the others had made attempts to secure assistance under the programme, at one time or the other. Of the 4 non-beneficiaries who did not make any attempt to secure assistance, one was of the view that the loan would be a burden on him and may not yield much returns.
- 6.54 While a majority of these non-beneficiaries who had made attempts to secure assistance could not mention the reasons for not getting the benefit sanctioned, several of them were hopeful that the assistance would be provided in the near future, which was based on the assurances made to them. However, there were a few cases where non-beneficiaries stated that although their applications were recommended by the implementing authorities, the bank officials did not sanction the loan under one pretext or the other. One non-beneficiary mentioned that because he could not get a surety, assistance was not sanctioned to him. In another case, the non-beneficiary had provided surety to a person who had defaulted and as a result he was not sanctioned assistance. There was one instance where the non-beneficiary stated that the implementing authorities had not recommended assistance to the people in the village, since the repayment position in the village was very poor.
- 6.55 The implementing officers should also ensure that no deserving person is denied the benefit just because he had provided surety to a defaulter or other beneficiaries in the village had not repaid the loans. Also, Bank Managers should be clearly informed that on no account surety for sanction of loans under the programme should be insisted upon.

6.56 Although the above instance might be isolated cases, there will be quite a large number of non-beneficiaries who had not yet been provided with assistance under the programme. In such cases, the implementing officers must clearly explain to the concerned the reasons for non-inclusion or delay in sanction of the benefit whenever people approach them in this regard.

6.57 The distribution of non-beneficiary families according to size of income (below poverty line and above) as in 1980-81 and 1983-84 is shown in table-6.13 below:

Table-6.13: Distribution of Non-beneficiary families (family of 5) by income - 1980-81 and 1983-84.

Block	(Number)					
	Non-beneficiary family selected (1980-81)	of Col.2 families with income above Rs.3500 initially (1980-81)	of Col.2 families below poverty line (Col.2-3) (1980-81)	Families with income above Rs.3500 as at the end of March 84	Increase in families with income above Rs.3500 (Col.5-Col.3)	Percent of families crossing the poverty line (6/4x100)
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Kalghatagi	5	-	5	-	-	-
Gadag	5	1	4	3	2	50.0
Sringeri	5	-	5	-	-	-
Kadur	5	1	4	3	2	50.0
Total:	20	2	18	6	4	22.2

6.58 The information presented here corresponds to that presented in respect of IRDP beneficiaries in table-6.12. It is seen that 22.2 per cent of the non-beneficiaries (in the 4 selected blocks) have crossed the poverty line between 1980-81 and 1983-84, as compared to corresponding figure of 27.7 per cent for IRDP beneficiaries. However, not much significance could be attached to these figures as these estimates are based on very small samples (of 5 non-beneficiaries per selected block).



## CHAPTER - VII

### Views of Implementing Officers and Bankers

- 7.1 For eliciting views on various aspects of the programme and also in order to know the problems in its implementation, discussions were held with several officers directly connected with the implementation of the programme at the DRDS and block levels.
- 7.2 Regarding household survey, several officers felt that the data collected was not satisfactory. In many blocks, collection of data was entrusted to village accountants. There were a few instances where people well below the poverty line had not been identified. It may be added that, as revealed in Chapter-VI (Table-6.12), quite a few beneficiaries, who were above the poverty line, were also identified, deliberately or other-wise, as being below poverty line.
- 7.3 Proper identification of families below poverty line was also difficult as there were no clear cut/fool-proof guidelines for estimating family income. Hence, a majority of them felt that a resurvey should be got done preferably through gramasevaks after providing proper and adequate training to them.
- 7.4 Most of them also pointed out that the income limit of Rs.3,500/- for determining the poverty line was fixed about five years ago. Because of inflation, it was necessary, they felt, to revise upward the income limit to atleast Rs.5,000/-. However, their does not appear to be any need for this for the following reasons; (i) As already seen, there is some amount of under statement of incomes on the part of prospective beneficiaries and (ii) Other things being equal, priority must be given to much poorer sections from among those whose income is less than Rs.3,500.
- 7.5 The five year-perspective plan was stated to have been prepared as per guidelines by the DRDS authorities of Dharwad district. But, it was not clear



whether such a plan had been prepared for Chikmagalur district.

- 7.6 So far as annual block plans were concerned, these had been prepared for all the years but the involvement of block staff in their preparation appears to be minimal or non-existent. Mostly, the DRDS themselves were preparing annual block plans.
- 7.7 While implementing, however, it was not possible to follow the annual plans in toto. Deviations from the plan became necessary which were due to various reasons, like, the selected villages being more than 8 kms. away from the nearest bank, in which case the banks did not agree to provide loans. This problem could have been overcome if the financial institutions had been involved at the time of formulating the plans. While there was some sort of involvement of financial institutions at the DRDS level, it was not so at the block level, so far as preparation of annual plans was concerned. Hence, it would be advisable to involve all the banks with the block authorities while preparing the annual plans which will result in a better sense of commitment on the part of all concerned and help implementation of the programme effectively.
- 7.8 One of the important guidelines for the implementation of the programme was that instead of individual beneficiary oriented programmes, the family should be taken as the unit and the requirements and activities of the family as a whole should be taken into consideration for deciding the type and quantum<sup>of</sup>/benefit to be provided. However, this was not followed as revealed during discussions, and in almost every case individual beneficiary-oriented programmes were taken up. Some of the implementing officers were of the view that due to non-co-operation from the banks, family-oriented programmes (involving more than one asset/loan therefor per family) could not be taken up. If

the bankers are reluctant to provide loans for family-oriented programmes, this problem needs to be resolved in the co-ordination committee meetings with the bankers at the DRDS level.

7.9 Selection of beneficiaries for assistance under the programme was made through credit camps organised periodically at different villages in the block. After the selection of beneficiaries, loan applications were built up. Revenue officials, mainly the villages accountants, were also involved in selection of beneficiaries and preparation of loan applications. After the loan applications were built up, they were sent to the concerned banks for sanction of loans through the block authorities. The implementing officers felt that many of the Bank Managers, with the exception of some of the Grameena Banks, were too rule-minded. While some officers felt that the Banks were reluctant to cover more villages, a few other felt that the banks were in the habit of adopting too many villages with the result they were unable to cover all of them. It was stated that the bankers were reluctant to entertain IRDP loan applications during the period when crop loans were being advanced. During the months of December and January also Banks were not entertaining loan applications, as they were pre-occupied with annual accounts. This led to delays in sanction of loans.

7.10 The Banks had, as revealed during discussions, also their own reasons for delays in sanctioning of loans. After the credit camps were held, the applications received from prospective beneficiaries were forwarded (by Block authorities) to banks for sanction. As, usually, the number of applications would be large the banks took a long time for processing the applications. Sometimes, the target for coverage under the programme had to be increased under instructions from higher authorities which would result in a large number of

applications being dumped on banks causing delays in the processing of these applications.

- 7.11 In addition, natural factors were also responsible for delays in some areas. In Sringeri block, due to heavy rains during monsoon months, people were not coming forward to attend the credit camps and to avail of the benefit under the programme. Hence, credit camps had to be held only after monsoon was over which resulted in large a number of applications being forwarded to banks for sanction.
- 7.12 To avoid bunching of applications, which puts a strain on the banks who have to attend to IRDP loans in addition to their normal activities, and also to avoid frequent but wasteful visits by prospective beneficiaries to block offices and banks in quest of their loans, the block authorities must evenly space the forwardal of applications to banks, keeping in view the availability of assets and the timely requirements of the same by the beneficiaries. In fact, a calendar/time-schedule for forwarding the applications of particular beneficiaries may be worked out, on the basis of the above considerations, in consultation with Bank Managers at the credit camps themselves. And, the beneficiaries should also be informed about the likely date on which their applications would be sanctioned. The applications should be forwarded by the Block Authorities to the banks, according to this calendar.
- 7.13 The implementing officers also mentioned that Banks did not normally accept all the applications sent to them. Some of the applications were rejected by Banks, if the beneficiaries were found to be defaulters to any of the banks or societies. Such cases varied between 5 to 20 per cent of the total applications. Such cases should not have been forwarded

by the Block authorities to the Banks. This results in unnecessary work and also gives rise to a feeling of dis-satisfaction among the concerned. As such, Block Authorities must properly screen the applications before sending them to Banks.

- 7.14 A common complaint from most of the implementing officers was that the banks did not always agree with the choice of benefit to be provided. To overcome this problem, it would be better if the choice of the benefit to be provided is decided by the implementing authorities and the beneficiary in consultation with the bankers at the credit camps. The Bank Manager should be made to feel that he is actively associated with the programme. However, it should be seen that choice of the beneficiary is given due respect and he should not feel that some unwanted asset is being thrust upon him. If the implementing officers and the bankers feel that the choice of the beneficiary is not practical or viable, this should be properly explained to the beneficiary and he should be convinced about the usefulness of the alternative asset selected for him.
- 7.15 Another complaint was that in the case of SC/ST beneficiaries, some of the banks did not sanction the maximum amount admissible for village industries, services and business, although there were instructions in this regard by the Deputy Commissioners. The matter should be taken up in the co-ordination committee meeting at the district level with the bankers. The bankers should be convinced about the need to provide maximum loans, depending upon the requirements, particularly to SC/ST beneficiaries.
- 7.16 A major problem, probably not visualised in the beginning, has arisen in the wake of the implementation of the IRD programme. This is in relation to availability of assets, particularly the milch-animals. A majority

of the beneficiaries opted for only milch-animals. This has resulted in huge demand for animals leading to a scarcity of animals of good breed and yield. Because of this scarcity, even local animals of non-descript breed with low yields have been distributed. In some areas, the beneficiaries themselves would not choose improved animals on the fear that these animals might not thrive under local conditions. While the NABARD has fixed a minimum yield of 5 litres per day for the animal to be economically viable a majority of the animals supplied would yield around 3 litres per day. With such low yield, the beneficiary's economic condition would/will not improve and also, he would not be in a position to repay the loan.

- 7.17 Another unpleasant fall-out of large demand for milch animals is the high/unreasonable escalation in their prices, due to scarcity. The implementing officers had no choice but to pay the price demanded by the seller due to non-availability of animals.
- 7.18 If the programme should really benefit the people below poverty line, it is necessary to encourage beneficiaries to take up other economic activities instead of allowing most of them opting for milch animals. Wherever milch animals are provided they should be of good breed and yield higher quantities of milk. They should be supplied in only such areas where their adaptability to local conditions is proved.
- 7.19 However, if it is the intention to continue the Animal Husbandry programme on the present scale or even at 50 per cent of this level, long-term arrangements will have to be thought of for ensuing availability of quality animals. For this purpose, Government may chalk out a perspective plan for production of heifers if necessary by starting adequate number of cattle breeding stations.

- 7.20 It must be added here that the present arrangement for procurement and distribution of animals namely, from private sources (from one person to another) would not result in any tangible additions to wealth or income of society. On the other hand, it results in some costs to the society, involved in such fortuitous transfers of ownership. This would also point to the need for making some long-term arrangements for ensuring availability of quality animals as mentioned above.
- 7.21 According to NABARD norms, each beneficiary receiving milch animal should be provided with a second unit. But, it appears that many of the banks were putting a condition that only when the beneficiary repays the loan advanced for the first animal, loan for the second animal would be sanctioned. This is an unreasonable condition as the beneficiary might not be in a position to repay the loan due to the uneconomic nature of the benefit provided to him. In such circumstances, providing another unit may help him in improving his economic condition and viability. Hence, this question should be taken up in the co-ordination committee and the bankers should be impressed on the need to advance loans for the second unit without any pre-condition.
- 7.22 So far as follow-up of assets is concerned, only the banks were doing it regularly. Some of the implementing officers stated that follow-up was being done, once in 3 months, to ensure that the benefits provided were properly maintained and used. However, many officers felt that staff was not adequate for regular follow-up. Even on the fewer occasions when follow-up was done, they had to mainly depend upon the revenue staff.
- 7.23 A special verification of assets was taken up in Dharwad district. In Gadag block, it was found that

out of 1454 assets verified in May 1984, 255 assets had been misutilised and 40 animals were dead possibly for lack of care. This works out to a misutilisation (and loss of assets) to an extent of 20.6 per cent of the total assets, which must be considered high. In other blocks misutilisation of assets was estimated to vary between 7 per cent to 25 per cent.

7.24 The block authorities should see that misutilisation of assets, which are provided at considerable cost to the Government, are not only reduced but altogether eliminated.

7.25 As already seen, no additional staff has been sanctioned at the block level for implementing the IRD programme. It would be therefore difficult to ensure proper follow-up, without additional staff. Under animal husbandry programme alone, there will be, as already seen, 300 to 400 applications per annum. The number of follow-up cases will be accumulated from year to year and it will be at least 2 to 3 times this number every year. Processing of 300 to 400 fresh applications per year and doing follow-up work in respect of a minimum of 600 to 900 previous cases, depending upon the size of the block, will have to be done by the existing lone animal husbandry extension officer. In addition, this extension officer will have to look after the work in relation to agricultural sector to the extent supplying of bullocks is involved. Obviously, it would be a task of a tall order. In the case of other activities/assets also, the additional work thrown up by way of processing fresh applications and following up old cases would naturally involve considerable additional work load. Therefore, the staff at the block level will have to be suitably strengthened, if necessary after conducting a work study.

- 7.26 It is also suggested that since bankers are also doing follow-up work, co-ordination with them will help improve effectiveness of follow-up.
- 7.27 Some of the implementing officers expressed their helplessness to prevent misutilisation of assets, as according to them, they had no powers to take action, when misuse of assets was detected and proved. Therefore, adequate powers to take suitable action in cases of misuse should be delegated/given to the block development officers. This will act as a deterrent to misuse of assets.
- 7.28 The percentage of recovery of loans as estimated by the implementing officers varied between a mere 25 per cent to 75 per cent. In some blocks, official informal committees have been formed to help the bankers in recovering loans. In a few cases, block and revenue officials were also involved in recovery of loans.
- 7.29 As the success of the programme mainly depends upon the active participation of banks which in turn depends on the percentage of recovery, it is essential that the implementing officers should co-operate with the banks in improving the percentage of recovery.
- 7.30 There were instances where the recovery of loans advanced for activities like, dairying, sheep rearing, etc., was very poor. The reasons in such cases should be investigated and, if it is due to the uneconomic nature of the assets provided, supply of such assets should not be made in future.
- 7.31 As per the guidelines for implementing the programme, a survey of existing infrastructure was to be conducted in each block. However, such a survey as reported by the implementing officers, was not undertaken in any of the blocks.
- 7.32 So far as the infrastructure provided under the programme is concerned, it included establishment of milk



routes, provision of vans to dairy societies, assistance for establishment of chilling plants, establishment of fodder farms, establishment of food mixing plants, assistance to BAIF, supply of mobile veterinary clinics and establishment of community work-sheds. It can be seen that except the last item all the other infrastructure pertained only to animal husbandry activities as this was the major component of the programme.

7.33 But, it was reported that several milk societies were not functioning satisfactorily due to non-supply of milk to them by beneficiaries. It would be advisable to study in detail whether the infrastructure created was being properly made use of or not so that the investments made on them do not go waste. If there are any problems in the utilisation of infrastructure already created, these should be remedied.

7.34 Some of the implementing officers pointed out that health coverage by the Animal Husbandry and Veterinary Services Department was not adequate. Many of the veterinary dispensaries were without surgeons and medicines. Such instances should be specifically brought to the notice of the Animal Husbandry and Veterinary Services Department for immediate remedial action. Similarly, the Animal Husbandry and Veterinary Services Department may also avail of the IRDP assistance for creation of infrastructure needed, to the maximum extent possible.

7.35 So far as co-ordination between IRDP functionaries on the one hand and implementing departments and banks on the other, it was reported to be very good at the DRDS level. However, it was not so at the block level. Many of the implementing officers at the block level (BDOs) complained about the attitude of other departments involved in the programme. But, the departmental officers, who had to attend

to the programme in addition to their normal activities, considered IRDP work load as burdensome and so they were unable to cope up with IRDP work. But the implementing officers were particularly unhappy about non-co-operation from banks, inspite of personal contacts with bank managers to thrash out problems.

7.36 As the successful implementation of the programme largely depends on the whole-hearted co-operation of all concerned, it is necessary that all problems of co-ordination should be periodically discussed at the co-ordination committee meetings to ensure full co-operation of all agencies and departments involved in the implementation of the programme. Suitable measures will have to be taken to ensure proper co-ordination at the block level.

7.37 It is to be mentioned again that for implementation of the programme at the block level, no separate staff is provided. The block staff have to attend to the programme in addition to their normal work. The staff of revenue and other implementing departments are also involved. The programme envisages appointment of cluster supervisors, one for each cluster of villages, from among the existing staff, so that all the work connected with that cluster is entrusted to one person which will help better implementation. It was observed that in many blocks cluster supervisors had not been appointed either due to vacancies or other reasons. Appointment of cluster supervisors should, therefore, be done immediately. But, basically, additional technical supporting staff, is needed and necessary action, as pointed out already may be taken.

7.38 The posts of animal husbandry extension officer in some of the blocks were found to be vacant. As the major component of the programme involves animal husbandry activities, these posts should be filled

up immediately. The DRDS authorities might also take to up this matter with the Department of Animal Husbandry and Veterinary Services.

- 7.39 For monitoring the implementation of the programme and its results/impact, a 'patrika' had been introduced. This patrika was to be distributed to all the beneficiaries at the time of providing the benefit. The patrika would embody information regarding the background of the beneficiary, details of the asset provided, subsidy, and loan provided, time taken for sanction of loans, raw-materials and infra-structural facilities provided, annual income derived from the asset and loan repayments. The material for the patrika was required to be contributed periodically by the implementing staff. The distribution work was taken up recently and many of the beneficiaries were yet to be provided with the patrika. Even in cases where the patrika was already distributed, full details, particularly those relating to income generation aspects had not been provided for in the patrika. The implementing officers themselves accepted this fact. Without this information, the very purpose of introducing the patrika would be defeated. Suitable instructions must be issued to the implementing officers to see that relevant details in the patrika were filled-in regularly, by obtaining the correct data about income generation and loan repayments. This would help in making a correct assessment of the number of persons who had crossed the poverty-line through assistance under the IRDP programme.

- 7.40 During discussions with DRDS authorities, it was pointed out that there was only one post of Assistant Statistical Officer in the DRDS which was not adequate as the volume of data to be handled, progress reports to be prepared etc., was very heavy.

Hence, creation of additional posts of one post of Assistant Director of Statistics and two posts of Statistical Inspectors needs to be seriously considered. This will go a long way in streamlining the monitoring of the programme more effectively with improved documentation. It may be added that the Government of India guidelines had provided, with a view to ensure effective monitoring, for strengthening the administrative set up at the DRDS level by creation of one post of Assistant Planning Officer (Monitoring), two posts of Investigators and one post of Second Division Clerk (vide No.18016/3/80-IRD(I) dated 13.1.1981).

Views of Bankers:

- 7.41 The IRDP programme can be considered as a joint venture of the DRDS and the Banks. While the DRDS would provide the subsidy and were responsible for the implementation of the programme, the banks would provide a major portion of the finance (credit) under the programme, varying from 50 to 75 per cent as loans, to beneficiaries. The success of the programme would, therefore, mainly depend on the willing and whole-hearted co-operation and involvement of the banks. The relationship between the DRDS and banks should be that of equal partners. Against this background, several bank managers in the selected blocks were requested to offer their views on the implementation of the programme, their involvement and problems etc.
- 7.42 Although banks had to finance the schemes, their involvement in the identification of beneficiaries and preparation of annual plans would appear almost negligible. While, identification had to be done through door to door survey in which bank officials should not participate due to obvious reasons, atleast they should have been involved in the preparation of the annual plans. This would also help in greater co-operation by the bank officials when actual implementation took place.

- 7.43 A few bank officials were of the view that the number of villages/clusters allotted to them under the programme was too large leading to delays and other operational difficulties. To obviate this, villages/clusters should be so allotted that all the bank branches in the block got more or less equal work load.
- 7.44 The problem of bunching of applications, that is, large number of application being dumped in one consignment, was experienced by almost all the banks. One bank had received 100 applications at a time. The problem of bunching of applications was particularly severe during the year end. Some of the banks returned the applications to block authorities requesting them to send the applications later. All of them suggested that, to avoid delays in processing, sending of applications should be evenly spaced. Hence, it is recommended that the block authorities should avoid sending a large number of applications to the banks at a time. They may work out some spacing arrangement in consultation with the concerned bank managers.
- 7.45 One bank manager, however, expressed the opinion that under normal conditions not more than 5 applications could be processed in a day. Even on this reckoning, a bank can process a minimum of 100 applications per month (assuming only 20 working days in a month). Assuming around 800 applications per block per annum (as against the target of 600) and assuming a minimum of 5 working branches per block, each branch will not have more than 160 applications, on an average, per annum. This means not more than 2 months are required in a year to process and dispose off these applications in the normal course, or 4 months at the most keeping in view the time required for supplying clarifications in respect of possible queries. Considered in this context, complaints from the banks that

applications in large numbers are dumped on them at a time does not appear to be tenable. Therefore, the District Co-ordination Committee must go into this question in detail, find out the truth and work out a realistic arrangement in this regard.

- 7.46 The normal time taken by the banks for sanction of loans after the applications were received varied between a few days to one month. However, this depended on the other work load of the bank and the number of applications received.
- 7.47 Rejection of applications by the banks varied between 5 per cent in one bank to 50 per cent in a few banks. Such large number of rejections were due to the applicants being defaulters of the banks. Some times applications were rejected, if, in the opinion of the banks, the assets proposed by the implementing officers, were not viable. A few bankers were of the view that since they were advancing the bank funds on their responsibility, their decision on the choice of assets should be final. However, it would be better if the bank managers and implementing officers sit together and decide, of course, in consultation with the beneficiaries on the type of assets to be provided. Both the bankers and implementing officers should avoid any misunderstanding on this account in the larger interest of the programme. There were also cases of applicants not being interested in the assets proposed.
- 7.48 To reduce such large number of rejections, which would cause considerable wasteful paper work, the implementing authorities should decide the assets to be provided, in each case, in consultation with the bank officials concerned.
- 7.49 There were a few complaints that the banks were

insisting on production of no due-certificates and also security. While many bank managers agreed that they were insisting on no due-certificates so that habitual defaulters were not sanctioned loans, they also said that only the assets provided under the programme were required to be hypothecated and no other security was asked for loans upto Rs.5,000/-. Only in one bank branch, photographs of beneficiaries were collected for later identification, if the need arose, as it had to face certain problems with regard to identification in a few cases.

7.50 Affixing of photographs on the loan applications appears to be a foolproof method for identifying the beneficiaries. Hence, the implementing authorities themselves may obtain and affix the photographs before forwarding the applications. However, the cost should be met from IRDP funds and the beneficiaries should not be asked to bear the cost.

7.51 Some of the bank managers complained that the beneficiaries colluded with the brokers who brought animals for sale by inflating the prices. Involvement of brokers in purchasing animals should be discouraged and purchases should be made directly from the buyers by the purchasing committee members to the maximum extent possible.

7.52 All the bank managers were unanimous in their opinion about the quality of animals supplied being not upto the mark. They were particularly unhappy that the norms (of daily milk yield) fixed by the NABARD were flouted just to meet the targets under the programme, thereby sacrificing the quality of the animals. Although they agreed that this was dictated by practical considerations, like; non-availability of crossbred animals, they would not approve of the action. They stated while the NABARD had fixed 5 litres of milk as the yield per day, the animals supplied under the

programme were hardly yielding 2 - 3 litres per day.

- 7.53 In the case of sheep also, they felt, that sheep were being supplied without having regard to their breed/ quality as there was no local supply, particularly in Kadur taluk. Again, in Kadur, buffaloes were being bought from far off places like Davanagere for distribution. The prices paid for the animals were also abnormal.
- 7.54 In view of unanimous opinion of the banks regarding inferior quality of animals available for supply and their abnormal prices, a decision has to be taken on whether to continue the supply of milch animals under the programme on the present basis. As this is a major component of the programme throughout the state and any decision in this regard has to be taken keeping in view the situation obtaining in all the districts, the Government may take a decision on this in consultation with all the DRDS and participating banks, as also the Department of Animal Husbandry and Veterinary Services .
- 7.55 The banks were doing a good job so far as follow-up was concerned. After providing the assets the bank officials visited each beneficiary periodically, the periodicity varying between one month to 6 months, to physically verify the maintenance of assets. Misuse of assets was noticed in all the blocks. While it was 5 to 10 per cent in one block, in another block viz., Kadur there was maximum misutilisation in one village where many of the beneficiaries had sold the assets. In such cases, the beneficiaries tried to avoid meeting the bank officials, when the latter went for inspection or the beneficiaries offered lame excuses regarding the whereabouts of the assets provided. The bank officials felt that unless the lacunae in the legal provision to take action against misuse of assets was remedied nothing could be done.



- 7.56 Hence, it is suggested that provision may be made for prosecution or summary recovery of loan and subsidy with penal interest in cases of proved misutilisation of assets when detected. The DRDS and block authorities should have adequate powers to take action.
- 7.57 The recovery of loans was stated to be very bad in many cases, which varied between 25 per cent to 50 per cent. Only one bank branch in Kalghatagi block reported 75 per cent recovery of loans. A few bank managers also stated that whatever recovery was there, it was due to providing the second animal to the same beneficiary. As the bank insisted on full repayment of the first loan before sanctioning the second unit, the beneficiaries repaid the first loan in anticipation of getting the second animal.
- 7.58 One bank branch was able to give asset-wise overdues. It (overdues) was 100 per cent for goats, 80 per cent for buffaloes and 40 to 50 per cent for bullocks.
- 7.59 The Bank Managers felt that unless the Government functionaries co-operated fully it would not be possible for them to improve the recovery position. Some of them emphatically said that the implementing officers were only interested in organising credit camps and when once the loans were disbursed, they never showed any interest in recovery. They went on to suggest that recovery camps should be conducted periodically by the implementing officers along with the bank officials.
- 7.60 As the success of the programme is linked with the co-operation of the bank officials, who in turn will be encouraged by good recoveries, it is suggested that all the implementing officers should co-operate with the bank officials in recovering the dues. If necessary, recovery camps, as suggested by the bank officials, may be held and pressure should be brought

on defaulters by the officers and also through influential local leaders to repay the dues. More time can be given to those persons who have genuine difficulties in repayment, due to the assets provided being not viable, etc. The implementing authorities should desist from recommending such assets which were found to be non-viable.

- 7.61 Whenever an animal supplied under the programme died, the veterinary doctor had to inspect the dead animal and issue a death certificate so that the bank could claim insurance. The Bank Managers complained that some times there was undue delay in issuing the certificates which caused difficulties in claiming the insurance. Hence, it is suggested that the Department of Animal Husbandry and Veterinary Services should instruct its doctors to inspect the dead animal and issue the death certificate immediately after a report regarding the death is made. There should be no room for delay in issuing such certificate.
- 7.62 According to the NABARD norms, a second animal might be supplied to the beneficiary so as to make the unit yield continuously and thus become more viable. But, the banks would sanction the second unit only in the case of non-defaulters of first loan. This would defeat the very purpose for which the second unit was to be provided and causes untold hardships to genuine defaulters. Hence, the banks should liberalise sanctioning the second loan to genuine defaulters, after conducting an investigation into causes of default, if necessary.
- 7.63 The normal procedure for payment of subsidy is that the DRDS deposits advance subsidy with the banks which is adjusted while sanctioning loans to beneficiaries. However, some bank managers stated that depositing of subsidy had been discontinued. As a

result, the banks sanctioned both loan and subsidy and charged interest on subsidy portion also till the subsidy is released by the DRDS. If this statement is correct, it would be an unnecessary burden on the poor beneficiaries. To avoid this, the DRDS may continue to make advance deposits of subsidy with the banks.

A few other aspects of the programme:

- 7.64 A visit to a few beneficiary households and discussions with them gave an impression that the identification of beneficiaries had not been done properly. It would appear that most of the beneficiaries belonged to the lower middle income group, if not to the middle income group, rather than being below the poverty line. Hence, it is necessary to correctly assess the family income while identifying beneficiaries. The computation of family income should not only include income from the lands but also from other sources, such as, through enquiry from neighbours, local leaders etc.
- 7.65 As already stated, the method of selecting beneficiaries was through credit camps organised in villages periodically. To have a first hand knowledge of the way in which credit camps were conducted, one such credit camp was visited in a selected block. In the credit camp, it was observed that the village accountant had prepared a list of prospective beneficiaries and the assets to be provided to them, in consultation with a local leader. The list was presented to the officers at the camp who accepted it without any scrutiny or discussions with the beneficiaries.
- 7.66 The implementing officers should prepare the list of beneficiaries, assets to be provided to them, etc., without leaving everything to the discretion of lower functionaries. The implementing officers should

actively associate themselves and take particular care while selecting assets to the prospective beneficiaries.

- 7.67 It was observed that the representative of the bank present at the credit camp was merely interested in reducing the loan applied for in every case irrespective of the actual requirement. The implementing officers had to plead before him for enhancement of the loan.
- 7.68 The banks should not blindly adopt a narrow approach. The bank managers should not also feel that their role is limited only to bargaining, may be in the interest of their banks. They should actively associate themselves in credit camps to see that the beneficiary gets not only the required asset but also the required amount.
- 7.69 The assets are required to be procured through the purchase committee at the block level and provided to the beneficiary. But, in the credit camp visited, it was observed that the beneficiaries had themselves selected the animals and had brought sellers and their animals to the credit camp. It was quite possible that such an arrangement might lead to some clandestine arrangements between the seller and the buyer to inflate prices. The seller and buyer could thus share the spoils. In fact, it was observed that most of the sellers were quoting the maximum loan plus subsidy admissible as the price of the animals, irrespective of their breed, age, yielding ability, etc.
- 7.70 To avoid cheating and misuse of Government and bank funds by the combine of sellers and beneficiaries, the purchase committee at the block level should only undertake the work of selection of animals and it should not be left to the discretion of the beneficiaries. The animal husbandry extension officer and

the veterinary doctors in the block should play a greater role in the selection and fixing of prices.

- 7.71 In one of the villages in Kalghatagi block the local people, including some beneficiaries, felt that the manager of a local bank was inflating the prices of animals by Rs.500/- in collusion with a broker. While the animal yielded about 2 litres of milk per day, its price was never below Rs.2,000/-.
- 7.72 It is quite possible that the rise in the price of the animals was genuine due to too many beneficiaries opting for milch animals. However, the implementing officers, including the bank managers, should not only be honest but also appear to be honest. To avoid such accusations, which may lead the gullible poor people to lose faith in the programme, the implementing officers should stop supplying animals of poor quality whose price bears no relationship with the yield.
- 7.73 In Kadur taluk, it was observed that a few of the SC families had been provided with buffaloes against their desire to have sheep, while they had no lands to grow fodder, neither there was a grazing ground in the vicinity. The reason for not providing sheep was their non-availability. As the beneficiaries had no source of fodder they had to buy it from others. According to their estimate, it would cost Rs.4/- per day to feed the buffalo. As they had no other sources of income, there was no money left to buy fodder resulting in dwindling milk yield. The animal became a burden on the poor families. These families did not want to own a second buffalo even if it was offered to them.
- 7.74 Although such cases were few in the villages visited, it might be quite possible that many more such instances might have gone unnoticed by the authorities.

In such circumstances, the asset provided instead of being a source of income, would become a burden. To avoid recurrence of supply of unsuited assets, it is suggested that the block authorities should take greater care while selecting the assets. The beneficiaries' resources and their ability to maintain the assets should be carefully investigated before deciding upon the type of assets to be provided to them.

- 7.75 In Kadur taluk, again, it was informed by the local people of a few villages that sheep and goat units provided under the programme had failed in a majority of cases due to high incidence of diseases. One of the reasons for this could be the purchase of animals from outside areas (because of non-availability locally) which could not adopt themselves to local conditions.
- 7.76 To avoid such failures and consequent losses, the purchase committee at the block level should carefully evaluate the adaptability of animals from outside to local conditions. It should be the responsibility of the animal husbandry extension officer of the block and the veterinary doctor to see that animals with doubtful adaptability are not supplied to beneficiaries.



## CHAPTER - VIII

### Some discussions and conclusions

- 8.1. Some of the important findings of the foregoing chapters are discussed and their policy implications are indicated in this chapter. In addition, a few other points, not arising out of the findings, have also been touched upon here.
- 8.2. The IRD Programme was initiated in the year 1978-79. Since then instructions/guidelines have been issued by the Government of India to State Government and district authorities from time to time. These instructions cover all operational aspects of the programme from planning to monitoring, from administrative to technical. Some of the instructions issued are in the nature of amplifications/amendments to instructions issued earlier. These piece-meal instructions/guidelines have been brought together in a single place and issued in July 1982 by the Government of India. By and large, these instructions are arranged in chronological order of the circulars issued from time to time. Thus, in many cases, the original circular and amendments appear at different places in the volume which may not facilitate easy reference.
- 8.3. The IRD Programme is quite a complex programme. This fact is also reflected by the volume of instructions issued from time to time. Proper communication of the programme objectives, strategies, operational steps, etc., down the administrative hierarchy is a sine qua non for the successful implementation of this complex yet vital programme of rural development. In view of this, it is necessary that the volume of instructions/guidelines is thoroughly revised so as to make it comprehensive and systematic. It may be suggested that the revised volume must provide guidelines relating to different aspects of the programme



arranged in a logical manner instead of merely, as is done now, reproducing the original circular instructions issued from time to time.

- 8.4 A feeling that the IRD Programme is backed up only by financial planning is inescapable. This is borne out by the way in which the animal husbandry programme-supply of milch animals is being implemented. Material Planning, particularly, the backward and forward linkages, so also manpower planning do not seem to have been taken note of.
- 8.5 A majority of the target group under the IRD Programme is labourers, i.e., wage earners. But, most of the benefits (assets) extended under the IRDP to them involves some kind of managerial ability on their part. Beneficiaries whose thinking and action are conditioned by/oriented to wage earning cannot be converted easily into managers. This fact has also been borne out by the findings, in the previous chapter, relating to the extent of misutilisation and mismanagement of assets. It is therefore worth examining whether a policy/strategy modification is called for in favour of augmenting income of the target group through 'wage-income' rather than 'asset-derived-income'. In fact, this approach may go to reinforce, through concomitant enhanced allocations, the existing employment oriented and asset creating programmes, resulting in more useful assets, like, school and hospital/dispensary buildings, irrigation tanks, social forestry, rural communications, rural godowns etc., which are starved of funds at present.
- 8.6 The present strategy of taking the existing skills for occupations of the beneficiaries into account for providing assistance under the IRDP seems to operate against their interest in as much as it tends to confirm and perpetuate their present status. Essentially, this means tying them down to agriculture

- and allied activities, whereas the need of the hour is to relieve pressure on land and diversify the rural economy.
- 8.7 The various steps in the planning and operation of the IRD Programme, as per the guidelines of the Government of India, are summarised at para 3.13 of this report. Most of these steps have not been either followed, or not properly followed, as the findings, in relation to the selected blocks, indicate.
- 8.8 The IRD Programme is being implemented at the peripheral level without any additional staff. The only staff provided is of the DRDS at the district level. Naturally, the quality of implementation of the programme, including follow-up and monitoring, has suffered.
- 8.9 Arrangements for co-ordination exist at the district level, but, not at the block level, the cutting edge level. This has affected the programme considerably in all its aspects - planning, implementation, follow up and recovery.
- 8.10 The household survey, for identifying prospective beneficiaries, and the infrastructure survey, to identify the development potentialities of the block, constitute the kingpin in the entire gamut of planning and implementation of the IRD Programme. But, as already seen, these surveys do not seem to have been carried out properly. In fact, no infrastructure surveys have been carried out in any of the four blocks selected for detailed study. So far as the household surveys are concerned, many deficiencies have been noticed in the surveys conducted in the selected blocks. More important among them are: (i) surveys were conducted one year after the initiation of the IRDP, (ii) information on number and

proportion of SC/ST families identified was not available, (iii) occupational distribution of identified families was not available, (iv) income distribution of identified families was not available in some of the blocks and (v) many of the identified families were above the poverty line and vice-versa. Therefore, household surveys must have to be conducted more systematically in future.

- 8.11 The identification of the prospective beneficiary on the basis of the annual family income (from all sources) constitutes the starting point. A family (of five persons) annual income of Rs.3,500/- is taken as the dividing line; families above which are not considered eligible for IRDP assistance.
- 8.12 No comprehensive guidelines have been laid down for estimating annual family income. This has resulted in improper identification of beneficiaries. Therefore, there is need for issue of proper guidelines in this regard.
- 8.13 As the case study of beneficiaries in the four selected blocks has revealed, IRDP survey income estimates are under statements. This may be attributable to lack of comprehensive instructions. As a result, the number of eligible families is larger than what it should have been.
- 8.14 It is also revealed (from beneficiary survey) that quite a number of the IRDP beneficiaries had annual income exceeding Rs.3,500/-
- 8.15 At the planning stage also, a number of deficiencies have been observed: (a) Block plans as such have not been prepared by the block agency. Neither the banks are involved in this work. The block plans have been actually prepared at the district level by the DRDS. Unless the block plans are prepared by the block agency in association with the concerned banks,

implementation of the IRD Programme would suffer;

(b) As revealed by the beneficiary survey, and as also admitted by the implementing officers themselves, IRDP assistance is planned and extended on individual basis rather than family basis. In other words, 'family economic plan' is not, inspite of the guidelines, prepared by the block agency; (c) As a result, the assets/assistance provided under the IRDP have no relation to the initial income level. In other words, the gap (G) between the income limit and the actual income level does not seem to have been taken into account in deciding on the asset to be provided. The guidelines are also silent as to the extent of assistance to be provided in relation to 'G' - whether it should be to generate additional income only to the extent of 'G' - or a multiple of it. (d) The guidelines have also not specified the 'time frame' within which the beneficiary family is to be lifted above the poverty line - Whether in one year, or two years or three years.

8.16 Judged from expenditure, so far the programme appears to be successful in the state in as much as expenditure in the state amounts to 121.0 per cent of allocations over 1980-84. It is so in most of the districts also. Of the four selected blocks, except Gadag and Sringeri, expenditure amounts to 397.6 per cent in Kalghatagi and 265.2 per cent in Kadur blocks. In actual terms, expenditure incurred over a period of 3 years (1981-84) in Kalghatagi amounts to Rs.87.47 lakhs as compared to Rs.22.00 lakhs of allocations, and the corresponding figures for Kadur being Rs.71.62 lakhs and Rs.27.00 lakhs for the four year period 1980-84. It is not understandable how such huge amounts have been spent against the limited allocations. This would tantamount to lack of financial discipline. This apart, the quality of implementation, it goes without

saying, would seriously suffer. This is more so in the context of the general complaint voiced by the block authorities that there was no additional/adequate staff for implementing the IRD Programme and much less for follow-up. This would call for strict enforcement of financial discipline and administrative control by the Department concerned.

- 8.17 In terms of physical achievement (families assisted) also, the programme has fared well in the state in as much as achievement over the period 1980-84 exceeds the corresponding target by 37.5 per cent. However, in quite a number of districts it is not so. In the selected blocks also achievements exceeded targets in all the blocks except Sringeri. As can be seen that in most cases physical targets are exceeded by a larger margin as compared to the corresponding performance on the expenditure side. This would indicate that premium might have been placed in achieving targets in terms of numbers (quantity) at the cost of quality as already observed. The monitoring and supervisory functions at all levels should be tightened to prevent their repetition in order to ensure more uniform/even and quality performance over the districts.
- 8.18 The guidelines lay down that about one third (200 out of 600 per annum per block) of the beneficiaries must be provided with assistance under ISB. But in reality, this has not been the case. In the selected four blocks, the proportion of assistance (expenditure) under ISB to the total is found to be as low as 6.3 per cent in Gadag, 9.3 per cent in Kalghatagi and 27.9 per cent in Sringeri. It is only in Kadur, assistance for ISB accounts for 38.2 per cent bettering the target. In terms of number of beneficiaries also, the share of ISB is far below the prescribed minimum; the relevant figures being 5.6 per cent in Gadag, 15.2

per cent in Kalghatagi, 13.8 per cent in Kadur and 33.4 per cent in Sringeri. For the state as a whole it is 11.6 per cent. The very idea of prescribing these minimum seems to be for encouraging secondary and tertiary activities and thereby diversifying the rural economy. But this objective is not realised in a majority of the blocks. Therefore, appropriate corrective action may be taken.

- 8.19 Another distortion noticed in the implementation of IRD Programme relates to the undue importance given to the animal husbandry programme (particularly supply of milch animals). Both in terms of number of beneficiaries and quantum of assistance extended, the animal husbandry programme accounts for the largest proportion. This is so in the state as a whole, in the districts and practically all the blocks selected for detailed study. The consequences of such a tilt in favour of animal husbandry programme have been already elaborated elsewhere. Therefore, necessary corrective action has to be taken in this regard.
- 8.20 According to the guidelines, administrative expenses should not exceed 7.5 per cent of the total expenditure (subsidy plus all others). From the limited information available, administrative expenses exceeded the limit of 7.5 per cent in quite a few districts. This will have to be looked into.
- 8.21 The guidelines also lay down that 30 per cent of the total beneficiaries must be SC/ST families. It is only in two selected blocks viz., Kalghatagi and Kadur this objective was achieved, the relative figures being 33.2 per cent and 42.4 per cent. In the case of Sringeri, it is 11.5 per cent, Gadag 25.5 per cent and for the state 24.3 per cent. Action must be taken to ensure adequate coverage of SC/ST families.

8.22 Though the number of families assisted exceed targets in the state (and in a majority of districts) and in three out of the four selected blocks, the number assisted in relation to the total number of families identified indicates that the programme has still a long way to go. In smaller blocks, the coverage of families is larger in percentage terms and smaller in bigger blocks. For instance, the per cent of families assisted to total families identified is 42.0 per cent. in Kalghatagi and 38.2 per cent in Gadag. In contrast, the corresponding figure for Kadur is 9.0 per cent. As it is the physical target (number of families to be assisted) for the block is uniform; 600 per block per annum. This does not take into account the size of the block in terms of population. This does not appear to be rational enough (This has resulted perhaps due to treating the block as co-terminus with the taluk in the state. Whereas in other states, a taluk will have more than one block in which case a bigger taluk will have a bigger target). Therefore, there is a need to revise the basis of targetting, keeping in view the size of the block, rather the taluk.

8.23 Sanctions - starting from processing of applications, deciding upon the appropriate asset etc., - are considerably delayed. Better understanding/co-ordination between the block authorities and banks is absolutely essential if delays are to be cut down and qualitative improvement in the implementation of the programme is to be brought about. Necessary action in this direction is called for.

8.24 Follow-up is also wanting. This has led to misutilisation of assets to a considerable extent. The block authorities must devote adequate time and effort for follow-up work. Otherwise, the very objective of the IRD Programme will be defeated.

- 8.25 Another area which calls for attention is recovery. The recovery of loans is some what poor. Overdues are mounting. A programme like IRDP whose success hinges on timely and adequate flow of credit (from financial institutions), prompt recoveries only will help continued/sustained implementation of the programme. As it is, the block authorities do not seem to have given adequate attention to this aspect as expressed by the bankers. Necessary steps may be taken in this regard.
- 8.26 Monitoring and documentation, particularly at the block and the district level are not satisfactory enough. While it was difficult to get certain basic information from the blocks, information supplied (for common years and areas) by different agencies would not agree. Evidence for poor monitoring has also been presented and discussed already. To cite a few more cases; (i) information on quantum of credit advanced was not available in three out of four selected blocks, (ii) amount of subsidy and amount of credit advanced were equal in Kalghatagi and Kadur blocks which cannot be the case as established elsewhere, (iii) expenditure (subsidy) per beneficiary ranged from Rs.14,000/- to Rs.46,000/- over the years under the minor irrigation programme in Kalghatagi which is unbelievable, similar was the case in Kadur in respect of ISB and (iv) information on administrative expenses was not available (even at the state level and a few districts).
- 8.27 Unless systematic monitoring and documentation procedures are adopted and scrupulously followed, it would be difficult to ensure that the programme is running on right tracks. Urgent action is needed in this regard.
- 8.28 In terms of employment generation, the IRDP does not seem to have any significant impact on the



beneficiary families.

- 8.29 The average annual income of an average family of five persons of the selected beneficiaries at the time of identification is found to be Rs.3145, which rose to Rs.3990 during 1983-84 (at current prices), or a rise of 27 per cent over a period of about 3 years (table-6.9). If increases in prices over the period is taken into account, practically there will be no growth of income in real terms.
- 8.30 The share of the income derived from IRDP assets is 37 per cent of the family income during 1983-84 at current prices. As the growth in total income (from IRDP assets + others) is only 27 per cent, there is a decline of income from other activities to an extent of 10 per cent.
- 8.31 It is also seen that of the selected beneficiaries, 27.7 per cent had crossed the poverty line (table-6.12) by 1983-84, i.e., over a period of 3 years, incomes reckoned at current prices. If price increases are taken into account as pointed out above, very few families will have crossed the poverty line.
- 8.32 From the foregoing (paras 8.29 to 8.31 and para 6.29), the IRD Programme does not seem to have made any impact by way of improving family incomes of the beneficiaries in real terms. As already pointed out, deficiencies in planning, organising and implementing the IRDP activities will have contributed to this state of affairs. Perhaps, a few changes in policies and strategies, as suggested in para 8.5 above may be necessary to bring about an improvement in the situation.

Table-1: Annual allocation and amounts released under the IRDP

(Rs. in lakhs)

Sl. No.	District	1980-81			1981-82			1982-83			1983-84		
		Allo- cation	Amount relea- sed	Per- cen- tage	Allo- cation	Amount relea- sed	Per- cen- tage	Allo- cation	Amount relea- sed	Per- cen- tage	Allo- cation	Amount relea- sed	Per- cen- tage
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
1.	Bangalore	55.00	65.20	118.6	66.00	57.75	87.5	88.00	88.00	100.0	88.00	88.00	100.0
2.	Belgaum	50.00	43.45	86.9	60.00	53.25	88.8	80.00	70.00	87.5	80.00	80.00	100.0
3.	Bellary	40.00	40.62	101.6	48.00	48.00	100.0	64.00	64.00	100.0	64.00	48.00	75.0
4.	Bidar	25.00	24.35	97.4	30.00	26.25	87.5	40.00	40.00	100.0	40.00	40.00	100.0
5.	Bijapur	55.00	31.95	58.1	66.00	49.50	75.0	88.00	58.00	100.0	88.00	88.00	100.0
6.	Chickmagalur	35.00	8.89	25.4	42.00	42.00	100.0	56.00	56.00	100.0	56.00	56.00	100.0
7.	Chitradurga	45.00	22.50	50.0	54.00	54.40	100.7	72.00	72.00	100.0	72.00	72.00	100.0
8.	Dakshina Kannada	40.00	93.36	223.4	48.00	44.40	92.5	64.00	64.00	100.0	64.00	64.00	100.0
9.	Dharwad	85.00	57.50	67.7	102.00	94.35	92.5	136.00	136.00	100.0	136.00	136.00	100.0
10.	Gulbarga	50.00	53.95	107.9	60.00	45.00	75.0	80.00	50.00	62.5	80.00	112.20	140.3
11.	Hassan	40.00	27.00	67.5	48.00	36.00	75.0	64.00	64.00	100.0	64.00	64.00	100.0
12.	Kodagu	15.00	14.50	96.7	18.00	16.65	92.5	24.00	24.00	100.0	24.00	24.00	100.0
13.	Kolar	55.00	30.95	56.3	56.00	57.75	87.5	88.00	79.75	90.6	33.00	66.00	75.0
14.	Mandya	35.00	25.80	73.8	42.00	38.85	92.5	56.00	52.85	94.4	56.00	56.00	100.0
15.	Mysore	55.00	87.08	158.3	66.00	68.14	103.2	88.00	88.00	100.0	88.00	88.00	100.0
16.	Raichur	45.00	11.00	24.4	54.00	40.50	75.0	72.00	40.50	56.3	72.00	72.00	100.0
17.	Shimoga	45.00	31.50	70.0	54.00	40.50	75.0	72.00	72.00	100.0	72.00	72.00	100.0
18.	Tumkur	50.00	15.00	30.0	60.00	55.50	92.5	80.00	80.00	100.0	80.00	80.00	100.0
19.	Uttara Kannada	55.00	37.50	68.2	66.00	57.83	87.6	88.00	88.00	100.0	88.00	88.00	100.0
	STATE:	875.00	722.10	82.5	1050.00	926.62	88.3	1400.00	1317.10	94.1	1400.00	1394.20	99.6

Source: Rural Development and Panchayat Raj Department.

Table-2: Expenditure incurred on the IRD Programme.

		(Rs. in lakhs)											
		1980-81			1981-82			1982-83			1983-84		
Sl. No.	District	Relea- ses made	Expen- diture (Subsi- dy & Admve. Expen- ses)	Per- cen- tage	Relea- ses made	Expen- diture (Subsi- dy & Admve. Expen- ses)	Per- cen- tage	Relea- ses made	Expen- diture (Subsi- dy & Admve. Expen- ses)	Per- cen- tage	Relea- ses made	Expen- diture (Subsi- dy & Admve. Expen- ses)	Per- cen- tage
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
1.	Bangalore	65.20	77.01	118.1	57.75	57.74	100.0	88.00	113.60	129.1	88.00	103.96	118.1
2.	Belgaum	43.45	52.12	119.9	53.25	72.20	135.6	70.00	30.86	115.5	80.00	123.36	154.2
3.	Bellary	40.62	25.89	63.7	48.00	25.13	52.4	64.00	105.03	164.1	48.00	79.34	165.3
4.	Bidar	24.35	36.04	148.0	26.25	29.25	111.4	40.00	48.31	120.8	40.00	63.61	159.0
5.	Bijapur	51.95	63.85	199.8	49.50	80.82	163.3	88.00	108.42	123.2	38.00	145.83	165.8
6.	Chickmagalur	08.89	25.89	291.3	42.00	60.01	142.9	56.00	83.49	149.1	56.00	55.57	99.2
7.	Chitradurga	22.50	19.12	85.0	54.40	54.17	99.6	72.00	99.77	138.6	72.00	51.82	72.0
8.	Dakshina Kannada	93.96	92.30	99.0	44.40	113.23	265.0	64.00	144.03	225.1	64.00	71.46	111.7
9.	Dharwad	57.50	105.00	182.6	94.35	91.61	97.1	136.00	137.28	100.9	136.00	234.33	172.7
10.	Gulbarga	53.95	46.32	85.9	45.00	30.38	67.5	50.00	120.05	240.1	112.20	182.38	162.6
11.	Hassan	27.00	20.67	76.5	36.00	34.41	95.6	64.00	64.03	100.1	64.00	112.15	175.2
12.	Kodagu	14.50	03.09	21.3	16.65	24.10	144.7	24.00	35.75	149.0	24.00	36.62	152.6
13.	Kolar	30.95	52.62	170.0	57.75	62.27	107.8	79.75	75.42	94.6	66.00	78.62	119.1
14.	Mandya	25.80	25.70	99.6	38.85	61.19	157.5	52.85	46.67	88.3	56.00	67.16	119.3
15.	Mysore	87.08	129.32	149.1	68.14	121.90	173.9	88.00	90.11	102.4	38.00	115.82	131.6
16.	Raichur	11.00	19.24	174.9	40.50	16.42	40.6	40.50	60.84	150.2	72.00	102.65	142.6
17.	Shimoga	31.50	23.97	76.1	40.50	40.30	99.5	72.00	125.11	171.0	72.00	106.50	147.9
18.	Tumkur	15.00	60.00	400.0	55.50	90.93	163.7	80.00	77.94	97.4	30.00	111.57	139.5
19.	Uttara Kannada	37.50	38.72	103.3	57.83	73.24	135.3	88.00	107.82	122.5	88.00	90.91	103.3
STATE:		722.10	917.46	127.1	926.62	1144.20	123.5	1317.10	1722.63	130.8	1394.20	1934.31	138.7

Source: Rural Development and Panchayat Raj Department.

Table-3: Allotment and expenditure under the IRD Programme

(Rs. in lakhs)

Sl. No.	District	1980-81			1981-82			1982-83		
		Allotment	Expenditure	Percentage	Allotment	Expenditure	Percentage	Allotment	Expenditure	Percentage
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1.	Bangalore	55.00	77.01	140.0	66.00	57.74	87.5	88.00	113.60	129.1
2.	Belgaum	50.00	52.12	104.2	60.00	72.20	120.3	80.00	80.86	101.1
3.	Bellary	40.00	25.89	64.7	48.00	25.13	52.4	64.00	105.03	164.1
4.	Bidar	25.00	36.04	144.2	30.00	29.25	97.5	40.00	48.31	120.8
5.	Bijapur	55.00	63.85	116.1	66.00	80.82	122.5	88.00	108.42	123.2
6.	Chickmagalur	35.00	25.89	74.0	42.00	60.01	142.9	56.00	83.49	149.1
7.	Chitradurga	45.00	19.12	42.5	54.00	54.17	100.3	72.00	99.77	138.6
8.	Dakshina Kannada	40.00	92.39	231.0	48.00	113.23	235.9	64.00	144.08	225.1
9.	Dharwad	85.00	105.00	123.5	102.00	91.61	89.8	136.00	137.28	100.9
10.	Gulbarga	50.00	46.31	92.6	60.00	30.33	50.6	80.00	120.05	150.1
11.	Hassan	40.00	20.67	52.0	48.00	34.41	71.7	64.00	64.03	100.1
12.	Kodagu	15.00	3.09	20.6	18.00	24.10	133.9	24.00	35.75	149.0
13.	Kolar	55.00	52.62	96.0	66.00	62.27	94.4	88.00	75.42	85.7
14.	Mandya	35.00	25.70	73.4	42.00	61.19	145.7	56.00	46.67	83.3
15.	Mysore	55.00	129.82	236.0	66.00	121.90	184.7	88.00	90.11	102.4
16.	Raichur	45.00	19.24	43.0	54.00	16.42	30.4	72.00	60.84	84.5
17.	Shimoga	45.00	23.97	53.3	54.00	40.30	74.6	72.00	123.11	171.0
18.	Tumkur	50.00	60.00	120.0	60.00	90.83	151.4	80.00	777.94	97.4
19.	Uttara Kannada	55.00	33.72	70.4	66.00	78.24	118.6	88.00	107.82	122.5
STATE:		875.00	917.46	104.9	1050.00	1144.20	109.0	1400.00	1722.63	123.1

Table-3: Allotment and expenditure under the IRD Programme(Concl'd..)

(Rs. in lakhs)

Sl. No.	District	1983-84			Total		
		Allotment	Expenditure	Percentage	Allotment	Expenditure	Percentage
1	2	12	13	14	15	16	17
1.	Bangalore	38.00	103.96	118.1	297.00	352.31	118.6
2.	Belgaum	80.00	123.36	154.2	270.00	328.54	121.7
3.	Bellary	64.00	79.34	124.0	216.00	235.39	109.0
4.	Bidar	40.00	63.61	159.0	135.00	177.21	131.3
5.	Bijapur	88.00	145.88	165.8	297.00	398.97	134.3
6.	Chickmagalur	56.00	55.57	99.2	189.00	224.96	119.0
7.	Chitradurga	72.00	51.82	72.0	243.00	224.88	92.5
8.	Dakshina Kannada	64.00	71.46	111.7	216.00	421.16	195.0
9.	Dharwad	175.00	234.93	172.7	459.00	568.82	123.9
10.	Gulbarga	80.00	182.38	228.0	270.00	379.13	140.4
11.	Hassan	64.00	112.15	175.2	216.00	231.31	107.1
12.	Kodagu	24.00	36.62	152.6	81.00	99.56	122.9
13.	Kolar	88.00	78.62	89.3	297.00	263.93	90.6
14.	Mandya	56.00	67.16	119.9	189.00	200.72	106.2
15.	Mysore	88.00	115.82	131.6	297.00	457.65	154.1
16.	Raichur	72.00	102.65	142.6	243.00	199.15	82.0
17.	Shimoga	72.00	106.50	147.9	243.00	293.88	120.9
18.	Tumkur	80.00	111.57	139.5	270.00	340.34	126.1
19.	Uttara Kannada	88.00	90.91	103.3	297.00	315.69	106.3
STATE:		1400.00	1934.31	138.2	4725.00	5719.60	121.0

Table-4: IRDP - Percentage of expenditure on administration 1982-83.

(Rs.in lakhs)			
District	Total expenditure under IRDP	Expenditure on administration	Percentage of Col. 3 to 2
1	2	3	4
1. Bidar	48.31	4.54	9.4
2. Chitradurga	99.77	4.96	5.0
3. Dakshina Kannada	144.08	6.65	4.6
4. Dharwad	137.28	7.45	5.4
5. Hassan	64.08	5.62	8.8
6. Kodagu	35.75	3.89	10.9
7. Kolar	75.42	4.87	6.5
8. Mandya	46.67	6.02	12.9
9. Mysore	90.11	5.50	6.1
10. Raichur	60.84	13.35	21.9
11. Shimoga	123.11	6.10	5.0
12. Tumkur	77.94	6.80	8.7
13. Uttara Kannada	107.82	5.48	5.1
STATE (13 districts)	1111.18	81.23	7.3

Source: District Rural Development Societies

Table-5: Credit Disbursed by Financial Institutions under the IRD Programme

(Rs. in lakhs)

Sl. No.	District	Credit Disbursed				
		1980-81	1981-82	1982-83	1983-84	(Total) 1980-84
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1.	Bangalore	502.10	80.50	292.28	178.11	852.99
2.	Belgaun	68.63	210.18	207.38	246.66	732.35
3.	Bellary	44.80	129.33	218.34	216.15	608.63
4.	Bidar	80.21	55.61	105.96	109.36	351.14
5.	Bijapur	95.41	187.95	250.28	373.35	906.99
6.	Chikmagalur	64.32	106.11	183.29	102.36	456.08
7.	Chitradurga	21.87	80.20	249.01	95.35	446.93
8.	Dakshina Kannada	212.20	215.71	302.73	141.40	872.04
9.	Dharwad	200.00	171.34	390.57	579.98	1341.89
10.	Gulbarga	101.66	59.76	322.58	343.43	827.43
11.	Hassan	125.75	74.79	109.31	229.22	537.57
12.	Kodagu	6.90	10.68	83.39	55.28	156.25
13.	Kolar	150.00	164.54	335.15	142.73	792.42
14.	Mandya	95.77	71.56	83.07	116.17	366.30
15.	Mysore	277.80	224.56	140.09	201.40	843.85
16.	Raichur	44.11	27.43	163.73	204.85	440.12
17.	Shimoga	35.63	59.93	285.09	167.10	547.75
18.	Tumkur	240.68	211.05	187.21	174.89	813.83
19.	Uttara Kannada	120.91	198.35	218.58	174.09	711.93
STATE:		2286.75	2339.37	4128.54	3852.38	12607.04

Source: Rural Development and Panchayat Raj Department.

Table-6: Total Investments under the ID Programme

(Rs. in lakhs)

Sl. No.	District	1980-81			1981-82			1982-83		
		Total Expenditure	Credit Disbursed	Total	Total Expenditure	Credit Disbursed	Total	Total Expenditure	Credit Disbursed	Total
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1.	Bangalore	77.01	302.10	379.11	57.74	80.50	138.24	113.60	292.28	405.88
2.	Belgaum	52.12	68.63	120.75	72.20	210.18	282.38	80.86	207.38	288.24
3.	Bellary	25.89	44.80	70.69	25.13	129.39	154.52	105.03	218.34	323.37
4.	Bidar	36.04	80.21	116.25	29.25	55.61	84.86	48.31	105.96	154.27
5.	Bijapur	63.85	95.41	159.26	80.82	187.95	268.77	108.42	250.28	358.70
6.	Chickmagalur	25.89	64.32	90.21	60.01	106.11	166.12	83.49	183.29	266.78
7.	Chitradurga	19.12	21.87	40.99	54.17	80.20	134.37	99.77	249.01	348.73
8.	Dakshina Kannada	92.39	212.20	304.59	113.23	215.71	328.94	144.08	302.73	446.21
9.	Dharwad	105.00	200.00	305.00	91.61	171.34	262.95	137.28	390.57	527.85
10.	Gulbarga	46.32	101.66	147.98	30.38	59.76	90.14	120.05	322.58	442.63
11.	Hassan	20.67	123.75	144.42	34.41	74.79	109.20	64.08	109.81	173.39
12.	Kodagu	3.09	6.90	9.99	24.10	10.68	34.78	35.75	83.39	119.14
13.	Kolar	52.62	150.00	202.62	62.27	164.54	226.81	75.42	335.15	410.57
14.	Mandya	25.70	95.71	121.47	61.19	71.29	132.48	46.67	83.07	129.74
15.	Mysore	129.82	277.80	407.62	121.90	224.56	346.46	90.11	140.09	230.20
16.	Raichur	19.24	44.11	63.35	16.42	27.43	43.85	60.84	163.73	224.57
17.	Shimoga	23.97	35.63	59.60	40.30	59.93	100.23	123.11	285.09	408.20
18.	Tumkur	60.00	240.68	300.68	90.83	211.05	301.88	77.94	187.21	265.15
19.	Uttara Kannada	38.72	120.91	159.63	78.24	193.35	276.59	107.32	218.58	326.40
STATE:		917.46	2286.75	3204.21	1144.20	2339.37	3483.57	1722.63	4123.54	5851.17



Table-6: Total Investments under the IRD Programme (Concl.)  
(Rs. in lakhs)

Sl. No.	District	1983-84		1980-84			
		Total Expenditure	Credit Disbursed	Total	Total Expenditure	Total Credit	Total Investment
1	2	12	13	14	15	16	17
1.	Bangalore	103.96	178.11	282.07	352.31	852.99	1205.30
2.	Belgaum	123.36	246.66	370.02	328.54	732.85	1061.39
3.	Bellary	79.74	216.15	295.49	235.39	608.68	844.07
4.	Bidar	63.61	109.36	172.97	177.21	351.14	528.35
5.	Bijapur	145.88	373.35	519.23	398.97	906.99	1305.96
6.	Chickmagalur	55.57	102.36	157.93	224.96	456.08	681.04
7.	Chitradurga	51.82	95.85	147.67	224.88	446.93	671.81
8.	Dakshina Kannada	71.45	141.40	212.86	421.16	872.04	1293.20
9.	Dharwad	243.93	579.98	814.91	568.82	1341.89	1910.71
10.	Gulbarga	182.58	343.43	525.81	379.13	827.43	1206.56
11.	Hassan	112.15	229.22	341.37	231.31	537.57	763.88
12.	Kodagu	36.62	55.28	91.90	99.56	156.25	255.81
13.	Kolar	78.62	142.73	221.35	268.93	792.42	1061.35
14.	Mandya	67.16	116.17	183.33	200.72	366.30	567.02
15.	Myso re	115.82	201.40	317.22	457.65	843.35	1301.50
16.	Raichur	102.65	204.85	307.50	199.15	440.12	639.27
17.	Shimoga	106.50	167.10	273.60	293.88	547.75	841.63
18.	Tumkur	111.57	174.89	286.46	340.34	813.83	1154.17
19.	Uttara Kannada	90.91	174.09	265.00	315.69	711.93	1027.62
STATE:		1934.31	3852.38	5786.69	5718.60	12607.04	18325.64

Source: Rural Development and Panchayat Raj Department.

Table-6a: Total Investments under the IRD Programme - Average per block by district 1980-84

(Rs. in lakhs)

Sl. No.	District	1980-81			1981-82			1982-83		
		Total Expenditure	Credit Disbursed	Total	Total Expenditure	Credit Disbursed	Total	Total Expenditure	Credit Disbursed	Total
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1.	Bangalore	7.00	27.46	34.46	5.25	7.32	12.57	10.33	26.57	36.90
2.	Belgaum	5.21	6.86	12.07	7.22	21.02	28.24	8.09	20.74	28.83
3.	Bellary	3.24	5.60	8.84	3.14	16.17	19.31	13.13	27.29	40.42
4.	Bidar	7.21	16.04	23.25	5.85	11.12	16.97	9.66	21.19	30.85
5.	Bijapur	5.80	8.67	14.47	7.35	17.09	24.44	9.86	22.75	32.61
6.	Chickmagalur	3.70	9.19	12.89	3.57	15.16	23.73	11.93	26.13	38.11
7.	Chitradurga	2.12	2.43	4.55	6.02	8.91	14.93	11.09	27.67	38.76
8.	Dakshina Kannada	11.55	26.53	38.08	14.15	26.96	41.11	18.01	37.84	55.85
9.	Dharwad	6.18	11.76	17.94	5.39	10.08	15.47	8.08	22.97	31.05
10.	Gulbarga	4.63	10.17	14.80	3.04	5.93	9.02	12.01	32.26	44.27
11.	Hassan	2.58	13.47	18.05	4.30	9.35	13.65	8.01	13.73	21.74
12.	Kodagu	1.03	2.30	3.33	8.03	3.56	11.59	11.92	27.80	39.72
13.	Kolar	4.78	13.64	18.42	5.66	14.96	20.62	6.86	30.47	37.33
14.	Mandya	3.67	13.68	17.35	8.74	10.22	18.96	6.67	11.87	18.54
15.	Mysore	11.80	25.25	37.05	11.08	20.41	31.49	8.19	12.74	20.93
16.	Raichur	2.14	4.90	7.04	1.80	3.10	4.90	6.76	13.19	24.95
17.	Shimoga	2.66	3.90	6.62	4.48	6.66	11.14	13.68	31.63	45.36
18.	Tumkur	6.00	24.07	30.07	9.08	21.11	30.19	7.79	13.72	26.51
19.	Uttara Kannada	3.52	10.99	14.51	7.11	18.03	25.14	9.80	19.87	29.67
STATE:		5.24	13.07	18.31	6.54	13.37	19.91	9.84	23.59	33.43

Note: Total expenditure includes subsidy, expenditure on administration and infrastructure etc.

Table-6A: Total Investments under the IDP Programme - Average per block by district 1980-84  
(Concl.d..) (Rs.in lakhs)

Sl. No.	District	1983-84			1980-84		
		Total Expenditure	Credit Disbursed	Total	Total Expenditure	Credit Disbursed	Total
1	2	12	13	14	15	16	17
1.	Bangalore	9.45	16.19	25.54	32.03	77.54	109.57
2.	Belgaum	12.34	24.67	37.01	32.86	73.29	106.15
3.	Bellary	9.92	27.02	36.94	29.43	76.03	105.51
4.	Bidar	12.72	21.87	34.59	35.44	70.22	105.66
5.	Bijapur	13.26	33.94	47.20	36.27	82.45	118.72
6.	Chickmagalur	7.94	14.62	22.56	32.14	65.15	97.29
7.	Chitradurga	5.76	10.65	16.41	24.99	49.66	74.65
8.	Dakshina Kannada	8.93	17.68	26.61	52.64	109.01	161.65
9.	Dharwad	13.82	34.12	47.94	33.47	78.93	112.40
10.	Gulbarga	18.24	34.34	52.58	37.92	82.75	120.67
11.	Hassan	14.02	28.65	42.67	28.91	67.20	96.11
12.	Kodagu	12.21	18.43	30.64	33.19	52.09	85.28
13.	Kolar	7.15	12.98	20.13	24.45	72.05	96.50
14.	Mandya	9.59	16.60	26.19	28.67	52.37	81.04
15.	Mysore	10.53	18.31	28.84	41.60	76.71	113.31
16.	Raichur	11.41	22.76	34.17	22.11	48.95	71.06
17.	Shimoga	11.83	18.57	30.40	32.65	60.87	93.52
18.	Tumkur	11.16	17.49	28.65	34.03	81.39	115.42
19.	Uttara Kannada	8.26	15.83	24.09	28.69	64.72	93.41
STATE:		11.05	22.01	33.06	32.67	72.04	104.71

Note: Total expenditure includes subsidy, expenditure on administration and infrastructure etc.

Table-7: Physical targets and achievements under IRD Programme, 1980-84

Sl. No.	District	Annual Target of families to be covered	Actual number of families covered							
			1980-81	Percentage	1981-82	Percentage	1982-83	Percentage	1983-84	Percentage
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1.	Bangalore	6,600	11,895	180.2	3,496	53.0	10,303	156.1	9,171	139.0
2.	Belgaum	6,000	1,812	30.2	2,955	49.3	8,191	136.5	12,013	200.2
3.	Bellary	4,800	1,741	36.3	7,138	148.7	10,061	209.6	7,770	161.9
4.	Bidar	3,000	6,074	202.5	2,771	92.4	4,720	157.3	7,145	238.2
5.	Bijapur	6,600	6,920	104.8	8,250	125.0	11,539	174.8	15,860	240.3
6.	Chickmagalur	4,200	1,491	35.5	3,558	84.7	7,880	187.6	5,525	131.5
7.	Chitradurga	5,400	1,768	42.1	2,696	64.2	8,494	202.2	5,690	135.5
8.	Dakshina Kannada	4,800	7,206	150.1	7,464	155.5	10,831	225.6	6,620	137.9
9.	Dharwad	10,200	11,594	113.7	4,061	39.8	16,166	158.5	23,356	278.0
10.	Gulbarga	6,000	5,774	96.2	2,451	40.9	15,134	255.2	20,409	340.2
11.	Hassan	4,800	4,037	84.1	3,944	82.2	7,985	166.4	12,973	270.3
12.	Kodagu	1,800	850	47.2	1,220	67.8	2,842	157.9	3,047	169.3
13.	Kolar	6,600	15,359	232.7	3,337	50.6	11,104	168.2	8,134	124.0
14.	Mandya	4,200	5,335	127.0	3,332	79.3	3,929	93.5	6,614	157.5
15.	Mysore	6,600	10,798	163.6	4,729	71.7	8,304	133.4	10,237	155.1
16.	Raichur	5,400	1,447	26.8	1,486	27.5	6,423	118.9	11,404	211.9
17.	Shimoga	5,400	3,756	69.6	6,348	117.6	14,999	277.8	11,165	206.8
18.	Tumkur	6,000	6,536	108.9	10,514	175.2	8,027	133.8	9,928	165.5
19.	Uttara Kannada	6,600	4,499	68.2	7,710	116.8	11,424	173.1	10,117	153.3
STATE:		1,05,000	1,08,893	103.7	87,460	83.3	1,78,856	170.3	2,02,228	192.6

Table-7: Physical targets and achievements under IRD Programme.  
1980-84. (Contd..)

Sl. No.	District	1980-84		
		Target of families to be covered	Actual number of families covered	Percentage
1	2	12	13	14
1.	Bangalore	26,400	34,865	132.1
2.	Belgaum	24,000	24,971	104.0
3.	Bellary	19,200	26,710	139.1
4.	Bidar	12,000	20,710	172.6
5.	Bijapur	26,400	42,569	161.2
6.	Chicknagalur	16,800	18,454	109.8
7.	Chitradurga	21,600	18,648	86.3
8.	Dakshina Kannada	19,200	32,121	167.3
9.	Dharwad	40,800	60,177	147.5
10.	Gulbarga	24,000	43,768	182.4
11.	Hassan	19,200	28,939	150.7
12.	Kodagu	7,200	7,959	110.5
13.	Kolar	26,400	37,984	143.9
14.	Mandya	16,800	19,211	114.4
15.	Mysore	26,400	34,568	130.9
16.	Raichur	21,600	20,760	96.1
17.	Shimoga	21,600	36,268	167.9
18.	Tumkur	24,000	35,005	145.9
19.	Uttara Kannada	26,400	33,750	127.8
STATE:		4,20,000	5,77,437	137.5

Source: Rural Development and Panchayat Raj Department.

Table-7.: Physical targets and achievements (beneficiaries) - average per block by districts, 1980-84.

Sl. No.	District	(Number)									
		Average number of families covered per block								1980-84	
		1980-81	Percentage to target	1981-82	Percentage to target	1982-83	Percentage to target	1983-84	Percentage to target	Average no. of families covered	Percentage to target
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1.	Bangalore	1,081	180.2	318	53.0	937	156.1	834	139.0	3,170	132.1
2.	Belgaum	181	30.2	296	49.3	819	136.5	1,201	200.2	2,497	104.0
3.	Bellary	218	36.3	892	148.7	1,258	209.6	971	161.9	3,339	139.1
4.	Bidar	1,215	202.5	554	92.4	944	157.3	1,429	238.2	4,142	172.6
5.	Bijapur	629	104.8	750	125.0	1,049	174.8	1,442	240.3	3,870	161.2
6.	Chickmagalur	213	35.5	508	84.7	1,126	187.6	789	131.5	2,636	109.8
7.	Chitradurga	196	42.1	300	64.2	944	202.2	632	135.5	2,072	86.3
8.	Dakshina Kannada	901	150.1	933	155.5	1,354	225.6	828	137.9	4,016	167.3
9.	Dharwad	682	113.7	239	39.8	951	158.5	1,668	278.0	3,540	147.5
10.	Gulbarga	577	96.2	245	40.9	1,513	255.2	2,041	340.2	4,376	182.4
11.	Hassan	505	84.1	493	82.2	998	166.4	1,622	270.3	4,217	150.7
12.	Kodagu	283	47.2	407	67.8	947	157.9	1,016	169.3	3,618	110.5
13.	Kolar	1,396	232.7	303	50.6	1,009	168.2	744	124.0	3,452	143.9
14.	Mandya	762	127.0	476	79.3	561	93.5	945	157.5	2,744	114.4
15.	Mysore	982	163.6	430	71.7	800	133.4	931	155.1	3,143	130.9
16.	Raichur	161	26.8	165	27.5	714	118.9	1,267	211.9	2,307	96.1
17.	Shimoga	417	69.6	705	117.6	1,667	277.8	1,241	206.8	4,030	167.9
18.	Tumkur	654	108.9	1,051	175.2	803	133.8	993	165.5	3,501	145.9
19.	Uttara Kannada	409	68.2	701	116.8	1,039	173.1	920	153.3	3,069	127.8
STATE:		622	103.7	500	83.3	1,022	170.3	1,156	192.6	3,300	137.5

Note: The target per block per year is 600 families.

Table-8: Coverage of SC/ST families under IAD Programme by district, 1980-84.

Sl. No.	District	1980-81			1981-82			1982-83		
		No. of families covered	No. of SC/ST families covered	Per-centage	No. of families covered	No. of SC/ST families covered	Per-centage	No. of families covered	No. of SC/ST families covered	Per-centage
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1.	Bangalore	11,895	2,381	20.0	3,496	1,267	36.2	10,303	4,022	39.0
2.	Belgaum	1,812	360	19.9	2,955	820	27.7	8,191	2,093	25.6
3.	Bellary	1,741	234	13.4	7,138	1,488	20.8	10,061	2,934	29.2
4.	Bidar	6,074	68	1.1	2,771	692	25.0	4,720	1,469	31.1
5.	Bijapur	6,920	1,565	22.6	8,250	1,161	14.1	11,539	3,072	26.6
6.	Chickmagalur	1,491	292	19.6	3,558	-	-	7,880	1,972	25.0
7.	Chitradurga	1,768	614	34.7	2,696	533	19.8	8,494	2,112	24.9
8.	Dakshina Kannada	7,206	1,441	20.0	7,464	1,521	20.4	10,831	3,241	29.9
9.	Dharwad	11,594	2,312	19.9	4,061	880	21.7	16,166	2,880	17.8
10.	Gulbarga	5,774	1,491	25.8	2,451	939	38.3	15,134	5,147	34.0
11.	Hassan	4,037	561	13.9	3,944	312	7.9	7,985	1,937	24.3
12.	Kodagu	850	78	9.2	1,220	359	29.4	2,842	685	24.1
13.	Kolar	15,359	3,006	19.6	3,337	1,093	32.7	11,104	6,117	55.1
14.	Mandya	5,336	453	8.5	3,332	332	10.0	3,929	941	23.9
15.	Mysore	10,798	905	8.4	4,729	1,285	27.2	8,804	2,530	28.7
16.	Raichur	1,447	283	20.0	1,486	291	19.6	6,423	2,311	36.0
17.	Shimoga	3,756	365	9.8	6,348	553	8.7	14,999	2,934	19.6
18.	Tumkur	6,356	1,192	18.2	10,514	2,681	25.5	8,027	2,848	35.5
19.	Uttara Kannada	4,499	132	2.9	7,710	136	1.8	11,424	1,056	9.2
	STATE:	1,08,893	17,743	16.3	87,460	16,343	18.7	1,78,856	50,301	28.1

Table-8: Coverage of SC/ST families under IRD Programme by district, 1980-84 (Concl'd..)

Sl. No.	District	1983-84			1980-84		
		No. of families covered	No. of SC/ST families covered	Percentage	No. of families covered	No. of SC/ST families covered	Percentage
1	2	12	13	14	15	16	17
1.	Bangalore	9,171	3,878	42.3	34,865	11,548	33.1
2.	Belgaum	12,013	3,351	27.9	24,971	6,624	26.5
3.	Bellary	7,770	2,168	27.9	26,710	6,824	25.5
4.	Bidar	7,145	1,646	23.0	20,710	3,875	18.7
5.	Bijapur	15,860	5,286	33.3	42,569	11,084	26.0
6.	Chickmagalur	5,525	1,027	18.6	18,454	3,291	17.8
7.	Chitradurga	5,690	1,499	26.3	18,648	4,758	25.5
8.	Dakshina Kannada	6,620	1,234	18.6	32,121	7,437	23.2
9.	Dharwad	28,356	7,455	26.3	60,177	13,527	24.5
10.	Gulbarga	20,409	6,151	30.1	43,768	13,728	31.4
11.	Hassan	12,973	2,622	20.2	28,939	5,432	18.8
12.	Kodagu	3,047	412	13.5	7,959	1,534	19.3
13.	Kolar	8,184	4,601	56.2	37,984	14,817	39.0
14.	Mandya	6,614	1,950	29.5	19,211	3,676	19.1
15.	Myso re	10,237	2,643	25.8	34,568	7,363	21.3
16.	Rai chur	11,404	3,435	30.1	20,760	6,326	30.5
17.	Shimoga	11,165	3,395	30.4	36,268	7,251	20.0
18.	Tumkur	9,928	2,468	24.9	35,005	9,189	26.3
19.	Uttara Kannada	10,117	751	7.4	33,750	2,075	6.1
STATE:		2,02,228	55,972	27.7	5,77,437	1,40,359	24.3

Source: Rural Development and Panchayat Raj Department



Table-8A: Families identified - total and SC/ST for selected districts - to end of 1982-83.

(Number)				
Sl. No.	District	Total families identified	SC/ST families	Percentage
1	2	3	4	5
1.	Bellary	22,374	6,104	27.28
2.	Chickmagalur	16,905	5,645	33.39
3.	Dakshina Kannada*	15,078	4,567	30.29
4.	Dharwad	74,178	9,316	12.56
5.	Hassan	24,000	5,681	23.67
6.	Kodagu	17,525	3,611	20.60
7.	Kolar	21,743	10,017	46.07
8.	Mandya	96,274	18,061	18.76
9.	Mysore	12,814	4,703	36.70
10.	Shimoga	1,19,140	35,635	29.91
11.	Tumkur	1,88,396	54,295	28.82
STATE (11 districts)		6,08,427	1,57,635	25.91

\* : to end of 1983-84

Source: District Rural Development Societies

Table-9: Percentage distribution of beneficiaries by major sectors.

Name of the Sector	(Percentage)									
	1980-81		1981-82		1982-83		1983-84		1980-84 (Total)	
	Percentage of beneficiaries	Percentage of SC/ST beneficiaries	Percentage of beneficiaries	Percentage of SC/ST beneficiaries	Percentage of beneficiaries	Percentage of SC/ST beneficiaries	Percentage of beneficiaries	Percentage of SC/ST beneficiaries	Percentage of beneficiaries	Percentage of SC/ST beneficiaries
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
Agriculture	27.5	28.5	17.9	12.4	19.1	16.3	18.2	18.4	17.4	20.4
Animal Husbandry	50.8	50.2	63.4	75.8	59.7	70.6	55.8	64.1	68.5	58.1
Minor Irrigation	5.6	3.5	3.8	2.1	2.4	2.6	3.4	2.4	2.5	3.4
Horticulture	1.9	0.5	1.7	0.2	0.7	0.5	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.9
Sericulture	1.5	1.4	1.3	0.3	0.3	0.1	0.4	0.4	0.5	0.9
Fisheries	1.6	-	3.4	2.6	1.4	0.7	0.9	0.3	1.0	1.8
Small Industry Service Business	11.1	10.9	8.5	6.6	16.4	9.2	21.1	14.3	9.9	14.5
TOTAL:	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Note: Based on information available for 15 (out of 19) districts.

Table-10: Per beneficiary investment under IND programme by district, 1980-81.

(in Rs.)

Sl. No.	District	1980-81			1981-82			1982-83		
		Total Expenditure	Credit	Both (Columns 3 + 4)	Total Expenditure	Credit	Both (Columns 6 + 7)	Total Expenditure	Credit	Both (Columns 9 + 10)
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1.	Bangalore	647.4	2539.7	3187.1	1651.6	2302.6	3954.2	1102.6	2836.8	3939.4
2.	Belgaum	2876.4	3787.5	6663.9	2443.3	7112.7	9556.0	987.2	2531.8	3519.0
3.	Bellary	1487.1	2573.2	4060.3	352.1	1812.7	2164.8	1043.9	2170.2	3214.1
4.	Bidar	593.4	1520.6	1914.0	1055.6	2006.9	3062.5	1023.5	2244.9	3268.4
5.	Bijapur	922.7	1378.8	2301.5	979.6	2278.2	3257.8	939.6	2169.0	3108.6
6.	Chickmagalur	1736.4	4317.9	6050.3	1686.6	2982.3	4668.9	1059.8	2326.0	3385.8
7.	Chitradurga	1081.5	1237.0	2318.5	2009.3	2974.8	4984.1	1174.6	2931.6	4106.2
8.	Dakshina Kannada	1282.1	2944.8	4226.9	1517.0	2890.0	4407.0	1330.3	2795.0	4125.3
9.	Dharwad	906.0	1725.0	2631.0	2255.9	4219.2	6475.1	849.2	2416.0	3265.2
10.	Gulbarga	802.7	1760.7	2563.4	1239.5	2438.2	3677.7	793.3	2131.5	2924.8
11.	Hassan	512.0	3065.4	3577.4	872.5	1896.3	2768.8	302.5	1375.2	2177.7
12.	Kodagu	363.5	811.8	1175.3	1975.4	875.4	2850.8	1257.9	2934.2	4192.1
13.	Kolar	342.6	976.6	1319.2	1866.1	4930.8	6796.9	679.2	3018.3	3697.5
14.	Mandya	481.6	1794.8	2276.4	1836.4	2139.6	3976.0	1187.8	2114.3	3302.1
15.	Mysore	1202.3	2572.7	3775.0	2577.7	4748.6	7326.3	1023.5	1591.2	2614.7
16.	Raichur	1329.7	3049.4	4378.1	1105.0	1845.9	2950.9	947.2	2549.1	3496.3
17.	Shimoga	638.2	948.6	1586.8	634.9	944.1	1579.0	820.8	1900.7	2721.5
18.	Tumkur	918.0	3682.4	4600.4	863.9	2007.3	2871.2	971.0	2332.3	3303.3
19.	Uttara Kannada	860.6	2687.5	3548.1	1014.8	2572.6	3587.4	943.8	1913.3	2857.1
	STATE:	842.5	2100.0	2942.5	1308.8	2674.7	3983.5	963.1	2308.3	3271.4

Table-10: Per beneficiary investment under IRD Programme by district, 1980-84 (Concl'd..)

(in Rs.)

Sl. No.	District	1983-84			1980-84		
		Total Expenditure	Credit	Both (Columns 12 + 13)	Total Expenditure	Credit	Both (Columns 15 + 16)
1	2	12	13	14	15	16	17
1.	Bangalore	1133.5	1942.1	3057.7	1010.5	2446.6	3457.1
2.	Belgaum	1026.9	2053.3	3080.2	1315.7	2934.8	4250.5
3.	Bellary	1021.1	2781.8	3802.9	881.3	2278.9	3160.2
4.	Bidar	890.3	1530.6	2420.9	855.7	1695.5	2551.2
5.	Bijapur	919.8	2354.0	3273.8	937.2	2130.6	3067.8
6.	Chickmagalur	1005.0	1852.7	2858.5	1219.0	2471.4	3690.4
7.	Chitradurga	910.7	1684.5	2595.2	1205.9	2396.7	3602.6
8.	Dakshina Kannada	1079.5	2136.1	3215.6	1311.2	2714.9	4026.1
9.	Dharwad	828.5	2045.4	2873.9	945.3	2230.1	3175.4
10.	Gulbarga	893.6	1682.7	2576.3	866.2	1993.3	2859.5
11.	Hassan	864.5	1766.9	2631.4	799.3	1857.6	2656.9
12.	Kodagu	1201.8	1814.2	3016.0	1250.9	1963.2	3214.1
13.	Kolar	960.6	1744.0	2704.6	708.0	2086.2	2794.2
14.	Mandya	1015.4	1756.4	2771.8	1044.8	1906.7	2951.5
15.	Mysore	1131.4	1967.4	3098.8	1323.9	2441.1	3765.0
16.	Raichur	900.1	1796.3	2696.4	959.3	2120.0	3079.3
17.	Shimoga	953.9	1496.6	2450.5	810.3	1510.3	2320.6
18.	Tumkur	1123.8	1761.6	2885.4	972.3	2324.9	3297.2
19.	Uttara Kannada	898.6	1720.8	2619.4	935.4	2109.4	3044.8
STATE:		956.5	1905.0	2861.5	990.3	2183.3	3173.6

Source: Rural Development and Panchayat Raj Department.

Table-11: Operational details of IRDP - Comparative picture  
(Selected Blocks and State)

Item	Unit	Gadag (1981- 84)	Kal- ghata- gi (1981- 84)	Kadur (1980- 84)	Srin- geri (1982- 84)	State (1980- 84)	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
I 1.1	Total villa- ges	No.	61	88	307	49	27,028
1.2	Villages co- vered under IRDP by Mar- ch 1984	No.	50	83	261	NA	NA
1.3	Percentage of 1.2 to 1.1	%	82.0	95.5	88.3	-	-
II	Families identi- fied by March 84	No.					
2.1	Total	No.	7,032	6,843	27,636	4,445	0
2.2	Out of 2.1 SC/ST	No.	NA	NA	6,100	1,982	0
2.3	Percentage of 2.2 to 2.1	%	-do-	NA	22.05	44.6	0
III	Occupational dis- tribution of identified fa- milies	%	NA				
3.1	Cultivators	%	NA	37.3	60.8	54.0	0
3.2	Labourers	-do-	NA	45.2	24.0	40.4	0
3.3	Artisans	-do-	NA	4.2	15.2	5.6	0
3.4	Others	-do-	NA	13.3	-	-	0
3.5	Total	-do-	NA	100.0	100.0	100.0	0

Table-11: Operational details of IRDP - Comparative picture (Contd.)  
(Selected Blocks and State)

Item	Unit	Gadag (1981- 84)	Kal- ghata- gi (1981- 84)	Kadur (1980- 84)	Grin- geri (1982- 84)	State (1980- 84)
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
IV Distribution of identified families according to annual income						
4.1 Upto 500	-	30.9	30.6	3.4	-	
4.2 Rs.501 to Rs.1000	-	42.8	41.7	9.9	13.6	
4.3 Rs.1001 to Rs.1500	-	11.9	13.5	20.7	17.9	
4.4 Rs.1501 to Rs.2000	-	4.4	4.3	17.8	30.0	NA
4.5 Rs.2001 to Rs.2500	-	3.8	3.8	25.0	22.0	
4.6 Rs.2501 to Rs.3000	-	3.3	3.5	14.3	16.5	
4.7 Rs.3001 to Rs.3500	-	2.9	2.6	8.9	-	
4.8 All income ranges	-	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	
4.9 Average annual family income (family of five)						
a) as per IRDP survey	Rs.	925	930	1,901	1,800	
b) as per Evaluation Division Survey	-	4,080	3,360	2,257	2,882	
c) b as percent of a)	-	441.0	361.3	118.7	160.1	
V Families assisted						
5.1 Target by end of March 1984	No.	1,800	1,800	2,400	1,200	4,20,000
5.2 Actual assisted by end of March 84	No.	2,685	2,860	2,425	811	5,77,437
5.3 SC/ST families out of 5.2	No.	685	950	1,027	93	1,40,359
5.4 Percentage of 5.2 to 5.1	%	149.2	158.0	101.0	67.7	137.5
5.5 Percentage of 5.3 to 5.2	%	25.5	33.2	42.4	11.5	24.3
5.6 Percentage of 5.2 to 5.1	%	38.2	42.0	9.0	18.0	NA

Table-11: Operational details of IRDP - Comparative picture (Contd.)  
(Selected Blocks and State)

Item	Unit	Gadag (1981- 84)	Kal- ghata- gi (1981- 84)	Kadur (1980- 84)	Srin- geri (1982- 84)	State (1980- 84)
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
VI Distribution of fami- lies assisted accor- ding to activity	%					
6.1 Agriculture		14.9	25.4	54.8	32.2	17.4
6.2 Minor irrigation		2.2	1.9	-	-	2.5
6.3 Animal husbandry		77.3	57.5	31.4	34.4	63.5
6.4 ISB		5.6	13.0	13.8	33.4	9.9
6.5 Others		-	2.2	-	-	1.7
6.6 All		100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
VII Distribution of SC/ST families assisted accor- ding to activity	%					
7.1 Agriculture		8.3	23.5	55.2	26.9	20.4
7.2 Minor Irrigation		0.2	-	-	-	3.4
7.3 Animal husbandry		84.2	72.1	32.4	45.2	58.1
7.4 ISB		7.3	3.4	12.4	27.9	14.5
7.5 Others		-	1.0	-	-	3.6
7.6 All		100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
VIII Financial assistance extended (subsidy + other expenditure)						
8.1 Target	(Lakh Rs.)	22.00	22.00	27.00	16.00	4,725.0
8.2 Expenditure	-do-	17.34	87.47	71.62	6.66	5,718.60
8.3 Percentage of 8.2 to 8.1		78.8	397.6	265.2	41.6	121.0
8.4 Assistance per beneficiary	Rs.	646	3,058	2,953	821	992

Table-11: Operational details of IRDP - Comparative picture (Concl'd.)  
(Selected Blocks and State)

Item	Unit	Gadag (1981- 84)	Kal- ghata- gi (1981- 84)	Kadur (1980- 84)	Brin- geri (1982- 84)	State (1980- 84)
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
IX Distribution of assistance (amt.) according to activity.	%					NA
9.1 Agriculture		20.1	28.9	37.1	42.3	
9.2 Minor irrigation		10.1	15.4	-	-	
9.3 Animal husbandry		63.5	46.4	24.7	29.8	
9.4 ISB		6.3	7.8	38.2	27.9	NA
9.5 Others		-	1.5	-	-	
9.6 all		100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	
X Total investment (Subsidy + credit)						
10.1 Total	(Rs. lakhs)	NA	174.96	71.62	24.58	18,325.64
10.2 Per capita investment	Rs.	NA	6,116	5,906	3,031	3,174
10.3 Per capita subsidy	Rs.	646	3,058	2,953	821	992
10.4 Per capita subsidy by activity	Rs.					NA
a) Agriculture	Rs.	870	3,476	2,002	1,080	
b) Minor irrigation	Rs.	2,918	24,987	-	-	
c) Animal husbandry	Rs.	531	2,472	2,319	711	NA
d) ISB	Rs.	724	1,819	8,168	685	
e) Others		-	1,982	-	-	

1. Inhabited villages

2. The period of operation covered is indicated in brackets below the block/state.

Note: This table is derived from the other tables.





## A P P E N D I X

### A Quick Study of Costs and Benefits under Integrated Rural Development Programme in Kolar Block - (1983-85)

1. 'Supply of Milch-Animals' is a major component of Integrated Rural Development Programme. Therefore, as an adjunct to the evaluation study on Integrated Rural Development Programme, a more detailed study was conducted in respect of "milch animals" component in Kolar block. The objective was to collect more comprehensive data on costs incurred and benefits derived by the beneficiaries, both under IRDP (milch animals) and their normal activities, prior to and after receiving assistance under the programme.

2. For the purpose, the following five villages were selected randomly: 1) Setty Kothanur, 2) Betta Bejenahalli, 3) Venkatapura, 4) Vadagur and 5) Nadapalli. Seventeen beneficiaries, who had been provided milch animals under the programme, were selected on a random basis from these villages for collecting the required data. Village-wise distribution of selected beneficiaries is: (1) Setty Kothanur - 4 beneficiaries, (2) Betta Benjanahalli - 2 beneficiaries, (3) Venkatapura - 3 beneficiaries, (4) Vadagur - 4 beneficiaries and (5) Nadapalli - 4 beneficiaries.

3. Identification of all the selected beneficiaries had been done during the year 1981-82 and they were provided assistance under the programme during 1982-83. The main occupation of selected beneficiaries, at the time of identification, was agriculture (9 beneficiaries) and agricultural labour (8 beneficiaries). The beneficiaries whose main occupation was agriculture also worked as agricultural labourers.

4. The size of the beneficiary families ranged between 2 and 15, average size being 6 during 1981-82. The corresponding figures for 1983-84 are: 2, 11 and 6. The average size of the beneficiary families increased to 7 during 1984-85. The number of workers in the beneficiary

families ranged between 1 and 5 and the average was 2 during 1981-82, which remained the same during the years 1983-84 and 1984-85.

5. Nine of the selected beneficiaries had been provided graded buffaloes while the remaining beneficiaries had been provided cross-bred cows. The cross-bred cows had been supplied at the rate of one cow per beneficiary and buffaloes had been supplied at the rate of two each to six beneficiaries and one each to three beneficiaries.

6. The average cost of milch animals provided was Rs.3194 per beneficiary. The loan and subsidy components were Rs.2147 and Rs.1047, respectively. The ratio of loan and subsidy works out to 67:33.

7. The average annual costs of production and income during 1981-82 per family at the time of identification, of 9 beneficiary families whose main occupation was agriculture are furnished in Table-A.

Table-A

(Year: 1981-82)

Sl. No.	Item	Cost/Income (in Rs.)	Percentage to total
1.	<u>Costs</u>		
	i) Seeds	58	12.3
	ii) Manure	304	64.5
	iii) Other cultivation charges	70	14.9
	iv) Total cost of inputs	432	91.7
	v) Depreciation	39	8.3
	vi) Total costs	474	100.0
2.	<u>Income</u>		
	i) Gross value of Production		
	a) Main produce	652	
	b) Straw (fodder)	323	
	c) Total	975	
	ii) Net value of production (after deducting total costs)	504	

(Costs include all paid out costs plus imputed value of inputs provided from domestic sources, excluding family labour)

8. The average cost of production per family was Rs.474. The gross value of production was Rs.975 comprising Rs.652 from main produce and Rs.323 from straw (fodder). The low value of main produce was due to low yield because of drought conditions. On the other hand, the comparatively high value of straw (fodder) was due to high prices because of scarcity of fodder caused by drought. The net value of production per beneficiary family was Rs.504 during 1981-82.

9. The average annual income per family of the 17 beneficiary families from all sources, at the time of identification is given in Table-B.

Table-B

(Average income/family: 1981-82)

Sl. No.	Item	Amount (in Rs.)	Percentage
1.	Wage Income	1254	82.0
2.	Agricultural Income	267	17.4
3.	Other Income	9	0.6
4.	Total Income:		
	a) for a family of 6 persons	1530	100.0
	b) for a family of 5 persons	1275	-

10. The average annual income of the beneficiary families was Rs.1530 of which wage income alone accounted for 82 per cent.

11. The annual income for a family of 5 persons during 1981-82 works out to Rs.1275. This was much below the ceiling of Rs.3500 fixed for eligibility for assistance under the programme.

12. The average annual cost of production and income per family during 1983-84 and 1984-85 of 9 beneficiaries whose main occupation was agriculture, are given in Table-C.

13. The total cost of production per family was Rs.687 during 1983-84 and Rs.630 during 1984-85. The gross value of production was Rs.1123 during 1983-84 and Rs.976 during 1984-85. Of this, the value of straw (fodder) was as much as Rs.434 during 1983-84 and Rs.417 during 1984-85. The low value of main output and relatively high value of straw (by-product) are, as mentioned, attributable to drought conditions obtained during 1983-84 and 1984-85.

Table-C

Sl. No.	Item	Cost/Income (Rs.)			
		1983-84	Percentage to total	1984-85	Percentage to total
1.	<u>Costs (i to vii)</u>	687	100.0	630	100.0
	i) Seeds	66	9.6	66	10.5
	ii) Manure	311	45.3	318	50.5
	iii) Other cultivation charges	66	9.6	78	12.4
	iv) Fodder	178	25.9	96	15.2
	v) Feed	22	3.2	28	4.4
	vi) Total cost of inputs	643	93.6	586	93.0
	vii) Depreciation	44	6.4	44	7.0
2.	<u>Income</u>				
	Gross value of production (a to c)	1213		1070	
	a) Main produce	689		559	
	b) Straw (Fodder)	434		417	
	c) Manure (Non-IRDP animals)	90		94	
3.	<u>Net value of Production (1-2)</u>	526		440	

14. The net value of production per family, after deducting all costs, was Rs.526 during 1983-84 and Rs.440 during 1984-85. The latter does not compare favourably with corresponding figure of Rs.504 during 1981-82, the base year.

15. The average annual income (per family) of the 17 beneficiary families under non-IRDP activities, during 1983-84 and 1984-85 is shown in Table-D.

Sl. No.	Item	1983-84	Per- cent- age	1984-85	Per- cent- age
1	Wage Income	1335	82.8	1469	86.3
2	Agricultural Income	278	17.2	233	13.7
3	Total Income				
	(a) For a family of 6 persons during 1983-84 and 7 persons during 1984-85	1613	100.0	1702	100.0
	(b) For a family of 5 persons	1344		1216	

16. The total income per beneficiary family, under non-IRDP activities, was Rs.1344 during 1983-84 which was slightly better than the income at the time of identification (Rs.1275). However, during 1984-85 the income fell to Rs.1216, the reason, as already stated, being prevalence of drought conditions.

17. The costs and income per beneficiary family under IRDP, during the years 1983-84, and 1984-85 are furnished in Table-E.

Table-E

Sl. No.	Item	(Per Family)		(Amount in Rs.)	
		1983-84	Per-centage	1984-85	Per-centage
1.	<u>Costs</u>				
	i) Fodder	247	14.8	259	15.7
	ii) Feed	239	14.4	228	13.8
	iii) Medicines and other related costs	3	0.2	7	0.4
	iv) Total input costs	489	29.4	494	29.9
	v) Repayment of loan and interest	1174	70.6	1159	70.1
	vi) Total costs	1663	100.0	1653	100.0
2.	<u>Income</u>				
	i) From milk production	1645		1135	
	ii) Manure	273		274	
	iii) Net income (after deducting total costs)	+255		-244	
	iv) Net income for a family of 5 persons	+213		-174	

18. The total annual cost per family for maintaining milch animals provided under the programme was Rs.1663 in 1983-84 and Rs.1653 in 1984-85; more than 70 per cent of it consisted of repayment of loan and interest. The gross income per family from milk production was Rs.1645 during 1983-84 and Rs.1135 during 1984-85. The decline in gross income during 1984-85 was mainly attributable to a fall in milk yield. Net income (net of repayment of IRD loan instalment plus interest whether actually paid or not) from IRDP was negative during 1984-85.

19. The total income per beneficiary family (of five persons) from all sources during the years 1983-84 and 1984-85

is presented in Table-F.

Table-F

Sl. No.	Item	(Per family of 5 persons) (Amount in Rs.)	
		1983-84	1984-85
1.	Net income from non-IRDP activities	1344	1216
2.	Net income from IRDP activities	+213 (978)	-174 (828)
3.	Total income from both activities	1557	1042
4.	Total income inclusive of loan instalments	2535	1870

Note: Figures in brackets relate to loan repayment; adjusted for a family of five.

20. It is seen (table-F) that there is an improvement in family income by 22.1 per cent during 1983-84 as compared to the income in the base year (1981-82). However, during 1984-85, there is a 18.3 per cent fall. However, if repayments are not considered as costs (since over a period of three years the beneficiaries would be richer to the extent of value of the assets), the position is altered substantially; an improvement in family income (family of five persons) by 98.8 per cent in 1983-84 and 46.7 per cent in 1984-85 over the base level.

21. Beneficiary family-wise details on income from non-IRDP and IRDP activities etc., during each of the three years (1981-82, 1983-84 and 1984-85) are given in table-G at the end. It is seen that none of the 17 families had an income exceeding the ceiling of Rs.3500 in the base year. Only 2 families have crossed the poverty line both during 1983-84 and 1984-85; whether repayment of IRDP loan instalments is taken into account or not. In other words, 12 per cent of the beneficiaries had crossed the poverty line as a result of IRDP inputs.



22. As can be seen (table-E), IRDP loan instalments constitute a sizeable proportion of the income derived from IRDP assets. This is due to the fact that the IRDP loan with interest is scheduled to be repaid over a period of three years. This high rate of repayment leaves little surplus (table-F) for the beneficiaries. Naturally, they will be unable to meet their consumption expenditure and other obligations.

23. The position is much worse in areas depending on dry land cultivation which are subjected to frequent droughts, as in Kolar. The beneficiaries will perforce become defaulters. In fact, as the IRDP evaluation report and the Kolar experience reveal that defaulters constitute more than 70 per cent of all the sample beneficiaries.

24. This position could be eased a little and the beneficiary made more viable if the period of repayment is increased to atleast five years. As the assets in general, and milch animals in particular (with insurance cover) can be easily expected to last for atleast five years, the period of repayment may be increased to five years.

25. The income of all the 17 beneficiaries during the year of identification (1981-82) and after receiving benefit under IRDP (1983-84 and 1984-85), worked out for a family of 5 persons, is presented in table-G. The detailed costs and benefits of 5 selected beneficiaries during 1981-82, 1983-84 and 1984-85 are presented in table-H.

Table-G - Income of Beneficiaries (Family of 5 persons)-  
Kolar Block

Sl. No.	Income during 1981-82	Income from Non-IRDP activities		Income from IRDP		Total Income		No. of family members during		
		1983-84	1984-85	1983-84	1984-85	1983-84	1984-85	1981-82	1983-84	1984-85
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
<u>(a) Families with Agriculture as main occupation</u>										
1.	1628	1516	1615	383	- 8	1899 (957)	1607 (821)	7	7	8
2.	558	1205	1205	-1213	-1213	- 8 (1625)	- 8 (1600)	4	4	4
3.	904	1100	1039	- 750	- 514	350 (929)	525 (914)	6	7	7
4.	1500	1500	1415	- 394	-1000	1106 (667)	415 (550)	8	9	10
5.	1544	1663	1706	- 628	- 667	1035 (409)	1039 (401)	8	8	8
6.	1615	1580	1690	479	395	2059 (390)	2085 (405)	5	5	5
7.	558	900	564	1417	- 782	2317 (1125)	- 218 (1000)	6	6	7
8.	2152	1912	1575	- 31	- 89	1881 (675)	1486 (700)	9	10	10
9.	1238	1409	1443	259	337	1668 (614)	1780 (467)	15	11	15
<u>(b) Families with Agricultural Labour as main occupation</u>										
10.	1160	1160	1208	-528	- 750	632 (1335)	458 (1083)	5	5	6
11.	2900	2900	2900	7615	4125	10515 (1635)	7025 (3150)	2	2	1
12.	1260	1167	1250	488	452	1655 (846)	1702 (542)	5	6	6
13.	1813	1813	2500	2455	1115	4268 (3308)	3615 (3250)	2	2	2
14.	929	938	1063	-476	- 616	462 (344)	447 (875)	7	8	8
15.	438	438	600	760	958	1198 (844)	1558 (1000)	8	8	7
16.	560	560	600	120	-1040	680 (1350)	-440 (1400)	5	5	5
17.	1000	1000	1125	283	- 175	1283 (2250)	950 (1750)	3	3	4
Average	1275	1344	1216	213	- 174	1557 (978)	1042 (828)	6	6	7

Note: (i) Figures in brackets refer to instalments of repayments of IRD loans - adjusted to a family of 5 persons (this adjustment can only be conceptual. For, a family with two persons paying an instalment of Rs.100 will be deemed to have repaid Rs.250 if the family size is reckoned to be five. But, actually, the family will have repaid only Rs.100).  
(ii) Figures in columns 5 to 3 are net of IRDP instalments.



Table-H: Costs and benefits of five selected beneficiaries during 1981-82, 1983-84 1984-85 (at the  
time of identification and after getting IRDP benefit) - Kolar block

Item	(in Rs.)				
	Beneficiary I	Beneficiary II	Beneficiary III	Benefic IV	Beneficiary V
<b>1. <u>Costs (agriculture)</u></b>					
i) Seeds	100	10	35	-	-
ii) Manure	50	25	500	-	-
iii) Other cultiva- tion expenses	100	30	-	-	-
iv) Total cost of inputs	250	65	535	-	-
v) Depreciation	-	-	50	-	-
vi) Total costs	250	65	585	-	-
<b>2. <u>Income from agricul-     ture</u></b>					
i) Gross value of production					
a) Main produce	75	150	1120	-	-
b) Straw (fodder)	60	60	800	-	-
c) Total	135	210	1920	-	-
ii) Net agricultural income	-115	+145	+1335	-	-
<b>3. Wage Income</b>	1200	1470	2380	725	600
<b>4. Other Income</b>	-	-	-	-	-
<b>5. Total Income</b>	1085	1615	3715	725	600
<b>6. Income worked out to     a family of 5 persons*</b>	904	1615	1238	1813	1000

Table-H: Costs and benefits of five selected beneficiaries during 1981-82, 1983-84 and 1984-85 (at the time of identification and after getting IRDP benefit) - Kolar block (Contd...)

(in Rs.)

Item	Beneficiary I		Beneficiary II		Beneficiary III		Beneficiary IV		Beneficiary V	
	1983-84	1984-85	1983-84	1984-85	1983-84	1984-85	1983-84	1984-85	1983-84	1984-85
<b>7. Costs (agriculture)</b>										
i) Seeds	100	120	100	10	50	50	-	-	-	-
ii) Manure	60	65	25	30	500	500	-	-	-	-
iii) Other cultivation charges	100	160	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
iv) Fodder	-	-	-	-	850	550	-	-	-	-
v) Feed	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
vi) Total cost of inputs	260	345	125	40	400	1100	-	-	-	-
vii) Depreciation	-	-	-	-	50	50	-	-	-	-
viii) Total inputs costs	260	345	125	40	1450	1150	-	-	-	-
<b>8. Income (from agriculture)</b>										
i) Gross value of production										
a) Main produce	150	150	160	-	1120	1150	-	-	-	-
b) Straw (Fodder)	150	150	75	50	800	1000	-	-	-	-
c) Manure (Non-IRDP animals)	-	-	-	-	250	250	-	-	-	-
ii) Net value of production (net agricultural income)	40	-45	110	10	720	1000	-	-	-	-
9. Wage Income	1500	1500	1470	1680	2380	3080	725	1000	600	900
10. Total Income	1540	1455	1580	1690	3100	4330	725	1000	600	900