

10th Meeting of the
Project Board of District
Primary Education
Programme (DPEP)
Mission.

URGENT
PROJECT BOARD MEETING (25.7.2002)

No.F. 22-3/2002-DPEP.4
Government of India
Ministry of Human Resource Development
(Department of Elementary Education & Literacy)

New Delhi, 19th July, 2002

Subject: 10th Meeting of the Project Board of District Primary Education Programme (DPEP) Mission.

The undersigned is directed to refer to this Department's letter of even number dated 16th July, 2002 regarding 10th Meeting of the Project Board of District Primary Education Programme (DPEP) Mission to be held on 25th July, 2002 at 10.00 a.m. under the chairmanship of Sh. S.C. Tripathi, Secretary(Elementary Education and Literacy), Ministry of Human Resource Development, in the **Committee Room (No.112, 'C' Wing, Gate No. 6), Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi.** A copy of the Agenda Notes is enclosed for perusal (Appraisal Notes on AWP&B in respect of Haryana, Orissa, West Bengal, Jharkhand and National Component will be sent separately).

2. You are requested to kindly make it convenient to attend the meeting.



(S.K. Bansal)

Under Secretary (EE)

Tel: 338 8037

Fax: 338 1355

To:

- (1) **Shri V. Laxmi Ratan**, Principal Adviser (Education), Planning Commission, Yojana Bhavan, New Delhi
- (2) **Shri R.N. Choubey**, Joint Secretary(Plan Finance), Department of Expenditure, North Block, New Delhi
- (3) **Ms. Veena S. Rao**, joint Secretary, Women and Child Development, Shastri Bhawan, 'A' Wing, New Delhi .

NIEPA DC



D12106

- (4) **Ms. Rajwant Sandhu**, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment, Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi .
- (5) **Mrs. Anjali Duggal**, Joint Secretary(IP), Ministry of Information & Broadcasting, Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi .
- (6) **Shri K. Chandramouli**, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Labour , Sharm Shakti Bhavan, New Delhi .
- (7) **Shri V.K. Pipersenia**, Financial Advisor (HRD), Department of Education, Shastri Bhavan, New Delhi.
- (8) **Prof. J.S. Rajput**, Director,-NCERT, 17-B, Sri Aurobindo Marg, New Delhi.
- (9) **Prof. B.P. Khandelwal**, Director- NIEPA, 17-B, Sri Aurobindo Marg, New Delhi.
- (10) **Dr. Mohd. Miyan**, Distance Education project (DPEP), I.G.N.O.U, New Delhi
- (11) **Shri Alok Mehta**, Dainik Bhasker, INS Building, Rafi Marg, Room No. 304, New Delhi / A – 16 Navbharat Times Aparts, Mayur Vihar, Phase – I, Delhi – 91
- (12) **Mrs. Uma Tuli**, Chief Commissioner for Persons with Disabilities, IPH Building, Vishnu Digamber Marg, New Delhi-110 002

Copy to :-

PPS to Secretary (EE & L)

PS to JS (EE) / Dir (RS) / Dir (SP) / Dir (JZ) / Dir (PK) / Dir (AK) / DS (PG) / DEA(PKM) / DEA(C) / US(NS) / US(JL) / US (SKK) / US (AP) / US(Chaturvedi)/ US (Prasad) / EO(G) / US(BMS) / US(BS) / US(SSA)

LIBRARY & DOCUMENTATION CENTRE
 National Institute of Educational
 Planning and Administration
 17-B, Sri Aurobindo Marg,
 New Delhi 110016
 DOC, No. D-12106
 Date 28-11-2003

10th Meeting of the Project Board of District Primary Education Programme (DPEP) Mission

AGENDA ITEMS

Agenda Item No.	Particulars
1.	Confirmation of the minutes of the 9 th Meeting held on 3 rd August, 2001.
2.	Action Taken on the decisions of the 9 th Meeting.
3.	Progress Overview of DPEP and major developments after the last meeting of the Project Board.
4.	Measures taken to rectify the high PTR in certain project States
5.	Approval for the Annual Work Plan and Budget of DPEP States for the year 2002-03.
6.	Any other item with the permission of the chair.

APPENDICES

Appendix – A	Minutes of the 9 th Project Board Meeting
Appendix – B	Summary Statement of Physical and Financial progress under DPEP
Appendix – C	Summary Statement of AWP & B for 2002- 03
Appendix – I to XXIII	Appraisal Reports & financial Statements on AWP & B of DPEP States and National Component

**10th Meeting of the Project Board of District
Primary Education Programme (DPEP) Mission**

**Confirmation of the minutes of the 9th Meeting
held on 3rd August, 2001**

The minutes of the 9th Meeting of the Project Board held on 3rd August, 2001 were circulated vide Office Memorandum No. 22-4/2000-DPEP.4 dated 16.8.2001. No Comments were received from the Project Board Members/participants. The minutes are submitted for confirmation by the Project Board (*Appendix - A*)

AGENDA ITEM No. 2

**10th Meeting of the Project Board of District Primary
Education Programme (DPEP) Mission**

**Action Taken Report on the decisions taken in the 9th meeting
of the Project Board of DPEP Mission held on 3rd August, 2001**

S.No.	Observations made/decisions taken in the 9 th meeting of the Project Board	Action Taken
1.	In future, the details of items/activities on which excess expenditure has been incurred over and above the approved project cost, along with reasons for the same may be indicated.	This has been taken care of in the Appraisal Notes on the AWP&B proposals.
2.	Position about physical and financial achievements against project targets may be included in the agenda notes in a summarised form.	This has been complied with and a Summary Statement has been included in the Agenda Item No. 3. (Appendix B).
3.	The problem of redeployment of teachers and measures taken to rectify the high PTR in certain States should be covered in greater detail.	A separate Agenda Item No. 4 has been included to cover this aspect.
4.	State-wise presentations should cover major achievements regarding enrolment, retention etc., and the focus areas of AWP&B.	The presentations on AWP&B proposals cover these aspects.
5.	State-wise presentations should first be made before a sub-group of the Project Board to facilitate a more meaningful discussion and a summary of the proposals could be then taken up in the Board meeting.	Matter has been reviewed and it has been decided with the approval of Secretary (EF&L) that due to urgency of the matter, the AWP&B of DPEP should be placed directly before the Project Board as per prevailing practice.

AGENDA ITEM No. 3

10th Meeting of the Project Board of District Primary Education Programme (DPEP) Mission

Progress Overview of DPEP and major developments after the last Project Board Meeting held on 3rd August, 2001

Physical & Financial Progress:

With total project outlay of Rs. 8,110 crores, DPEP now covers 5.13 crore children; 11 lakh teachers and 377,000 schools in 273 districts spread over 18 States, namely, Assam, Haryana, Karnataka, Kerala, Maharashtra, Tamil Nadu, Madhya Pradesh, Chattishragh, Gujarat, Himachal Pradesh, Orissa, Andhra Pradesh, West Bengal, Uttar Pradesh, Uttaranchal, Bihar, Jharkhand and Rajasthan .

The Expenditure Finance Committee (EFC) in its meeting held on 17.8.2001, approved the proposal for utilisation of savings under IDA Credit and EC Grant for phase-I of DPEP amounting to Rs. 548 crores. The amount will be utilised for various on-going activities in the existing DPEP-I districts of 8 States namely, Assam, Haryana, Karnataka, Kerala, Maharashtra, Tamil Nadu, Madhya Pradesh & Chattishragh. The proposal also includes undertaking certain activities in the 62 non-DPEP districts of the above States.

A meeting of the Education Secretaries/State Project Directors of the various DPEP States was held on 24-25th September, 2001 under the chairmanship of Secretary (EE&L) at India Habitat Centre, New Delhi. During the meeting, the progress of programme implementation with reference to physical and financial indicators and future strategies to bring about further improvements in the programme, particularly in the light of making elementary education a Fundamental Right, were discussed.

The total approved AWP&B for DPEP for 2001-02 was Rs. 2300 crores, against which the approximate expenditure incurred by the project States is Rs.1300 crores.

Government of India has released an amount of Rs. 4055.70 crores, the concerned project States have contributed Rs. 730.00 crores and an expenditure of Rs. 4570.00 crores is reported as per reimbursement claims upto 31.3.2002. However, as per PMIS Reports, the expenditure upto 31.3.2002 is Rs. 4714 crores, which takes into account the expenditures which were in the pipeline but could not be claimed due to time taken in adjustments.

Universal Access

- DPEP has so far opened about 23,000 new primary schools, 76,000 EGS centres and alternative schools to universalise access. Many states have already achieved the programme objective of providing access for all children to primary schooling. By next year, all unserved habitations in DPEP states are likely to be covered by formal or alternative schools. Most of the DPEP states have initiated activities for mainstreaming out-of-school children through bridge courses of different duration.
- School improvement grant of Rs.2000 to VECs/SMCs is being provided to all Alternative Schools in addition to the formal schools to bring out qualitative improvement in the functioning of AS centres.

Physical Infrastructure

- The infrastructure stock created under DPEP thus far is considerable – the works either complete or in progress are as follows: 43,000 (out of 49,000) school buildings, 44,000 (out of 52,000) additional classrooms, 14,300 (out of 16,600) resource centres, 13,000 (out of 21,000) repair works, 44,000 (out of 64,000) toilets, and 17,000 (out of 29,000) facilities for drinking water. Most of the DPEP-I states (except Karnataka and Kerala) have started substantial number of new works on after enhancement of the civil works ceiling from 24% to 33.33%.

Gender

- Phase-I districts have seen a quantum improvement in the percentage of girls' enrolment, with 31 districts of 39 having achieved the DPEP goal of a gender difference of less than 5%. The remaining eight districts located in the states of Karnataka, Kerala and Madhya Pradesh; marginally fall short of this objective. Thirty of the 81 Phase-II districts are yet to bridge the gender gap. While 24 districts are close to achieving this target, 6 districts in Bihar, Madhya Pradesh and Uttar Pradesh are still a matter of concern.

Integrated Education for Disabled

- In all over 4,00,000 children with special needs (CWSN) have been identified out of which 308,000 have been enrolled. This number is more than that achieved by any other inclusive education programme in the country. Over 9,00,000 teachers have been oriented to IED and states are also making special efforts to provide long term and quality training to teachers so that adequate resource support is available to every child in IED.

Learning Achievement

- With DPEP coming close to its end in the Phase I districts, Terminal Assessment Survey (TAS) was conducted in these districts in 2001, to assess whether the DPEP objectives relating to student achievement have been achieved. Based on BAS (1994) and MAS (1997) a reasonable assessment could be made of the success of DPEP as far as this parameter is concerned. The TAS was conducted in 49 districts in the 8 DPEP I states and covered 80697

students and 7587 teachers. Comparison with the MAS results reveals that significant improvement in most of the districts at all levels, both in mathematics and language.

The DPEP goal of reducing difference in achievement levels between girls and boys has been realized in 44 out of 49 districts in language and 40 districts in mathematics in Class I. In Class III this goal has been achieved in 14 out of 15 districts in language and in all 15 districts in mathematics. In Class IV, 31 out of 34 districts have reduced the gender gap to less than 5% in both language and mathematics.

Similarly, progress has been recorded in reducing the achievement difference between SC/ST and others, details of which are available in the report, which will be present later this morning. On the goal of increasing the achievement by 25% over the baseline level, the success has been moderate with 24 out of 49 districts achieving the goal in language in Class I. However, better results are visible in mathematics where 37 districts have achieved the goal

State-wise physical and financial achievements are given at **Annex-A**.

Expenditure and Disbursement (IDA Credits)

DPEP-I (IDA Credits)

- The cumulative expenditure upto 31/3/2002 is Rs.892.70 crores which, 82% of the SAR target of Rs.1086.75 crores and 71% of the revised project cost of Rs.1258.58 crores. Against the cumulative SAR target of US \$ 260.3 million, a disbursement of US \$175.736 (68%) million upto 31/3/2002 has been achieved. Reimbursement claims to the tune of Rs.23.75 crores equivalent to US \$ 4.800 million are awaiting disbursement.

Madhya Pradesh (EC Grant)

- The cumulative expenditure upto March, 2002 is Rs.584.04 crores which is about 80% of EFC approved revised project cost of Rs.734.01 crore.

DPEP-II(IDA Credit)

The Project has performed well in terms of expenditure. Against the SAR Target of Rs.165.80 crores, the project has incurred an expenditure of Rs.1770.96 crores and has thus exceeded the SAR Target upto 31/3/2002. Against the EFC approved project cost of Rs.242.64 crores it has achieved about 71

- Against the SAR Target of US \$ 355.40 million the cumulative disbursement upto 31/3/2002 works out to US\$ 283.17 million (an achievement of about 80%). Reimbursement claims for Rs.97.61 crores equivalent to US \$19.700 million are in the pipeline.

DPEP-III (Bihar / Jharkhand)

- The expenditure remains at low level. The Project has incurred an expenditure of Rs.217.90 crores (including an expenditure of Rs.11.73 crores on UNICEF funded activities) against the EFC approved cost of Rs.651.17 crores (33%) upto 31/3/2002. Due to low level of expenditure the disbursement level is also low. Against the SAR target of US \$ 126.30 million upto 31/3/2002, the project has achieved a disbursement of US \$ 31.762 million (25%). Reimbursement claims for Rs.25.33 crores equivalent to US \$ 5.160 are in the pipeline. Restructuring of the project, including extension of the project period is under consideration.

APERP (Education Component)-Andhra Pradesh

The Project has achieved an expenditure of Rs.318.63 crores upto 31/3/2002, which is about 56% of the EFC approved cost of Rs.571.50 crores. The cumulative disbursement upto 31/3/2002 is US \$ 58.472 million against the SAR target of US \$ 113.295 million. The achievement is about 52%. Reimbursement claims for Rs.12.28 crores equivalent to US \$ 2.5 million are awaiting disbursement.

DPEP –IV Rajasthan

The project has reported an expenditure of Rs.112.61 crores upto 31/3/2002, which is about 27% of the EFC approved cost of Rs.411.14 crores. The disbursement upto 31/3/2002 is US\$ 15.908 million against the SAR target of US\$ 46.800 million which is about 34%. Reimbursement claims for Rs.17.93 crores equivalent to about US \$ 3.650 million are in the pipeline.

Rajasthan Phase – II

- It is a newly sanctioned project and is in the initial stages of implementation and has reported an expenditure of Rs.9.95 crores upto 31/3/2002. Reimbursement claims for Rs.8.69 crores equivalent to US \$1.800 million are in the pipeline.

UP DPEP-III (includes Uttaranchal)

- The project has reported an expenditure of Rs.350.11 crores upto 31/3/2002 against the EFC approved cost of Rs.847.30 crores. Thus achieving 41% of the target. Against the SAR target of US \$ 88.212 million upto 2001-2002 a disbursement of US \$ 59.119 million has been achieved which is 67%. Reimbursement claims for Rs.24.21 crores equivalent to about US\$ 5.000 are in the pipeline.

DFID Aided Projects

AP DPEP

Against the EFC approved cost of Rs.172.73 crores the project has incurred an expenditure of Rs.151.95 crores 88%. This has generated reimbursement claims of Rs.129.16 crores. Against this the DFID have disbursed £ 18.939 million upto 31/3/2002 against the total grant of £42.5 million. One reimbursement claim for Rs.9.87 crores is awaiting disbursement. Additional funds have become available due to exchange rate variation and the State Society has been asked to prepare plans for utilisation of the DFID grant.

West Bengal District Primary Education Project

Phase – I

- Against the EFC approved cost of Rs.196.30 crores, the Project has incurred an expenditure of Rs.113.52 crores (about 58%) upto 31/3/2002. This expenditure has generated reimbursement claims to the tune of Rs.96.49 crores. The DFID has disbursed £ 13.273 million upto 31/3/2002 against the total Grant of £ 37.7 million. Reimbursement claims for Rs.4.65 crores await disbursement. Additional funds have become available due to exchange rate variation and the State Society has been asked to prepare plans for utilisation of the DFID grant.

Phase-II – WB DPEP –LC Grant - £ 30.00 million

- Against the EFC approved cost of Rs.214.00 crores the project has incurred an expenditure of Rs.26.76 crores (about 13%) upto 28/2/2002. This has generated reimbursement claims of Rs.22.74 crores. The DFID have disbursed £ 2.582 million upto 31/3/2002. Claims for Rs.6.06 crores await disbursement.

DPEP Gujarat Phase-I - Netherlands Grant – TF – 020916

- Against the EFC approved Project Cost of Rs.9567.45 lakhs, the project has achieved an expenditure of Rs.9694.17 lakhs upto 31/3/2002 and thus exceeded the approved project cost. Against the total grant funds of US \$ 25.8 million, the disbursement upto 31/3/2002 is US \$ 17.696 million leaving a balance of US \$ 8.104 million in the Grant Fund. A reimbursement claim for Rs.90.42 lakhs is in the pipeline. Additional funds have become available due to exchange rate variation and the State Society has been asked to prepare plans for utilisation of the DFID grant.

DPEP Gujarat Phase-II – Netherlands Grant – TF – 027772

- The project has commenced from 19/6/2001 and has reported an expenditure of Rs.348.90 lakhs upto 31/3/2002. Reimbursement claims for Rs.295.33 lakhs are in the pipeline.

Statewise / Phase wise EFC approved Cost / Expenditure upto 31/3/2002

A statement showing statewise / phase wise approved project cost & expenditure upto 31/3/2002 is at **Annexure – B**.

II. Technical Workshops / Seminars / Studies :

Research, & Evaluation

- **The 8th meeting-cum-workshop of Research and Evaluation Coordinators** of the DPEP states was held at the Indian Institute of Management, Bangalore, from September 26 to 28, 2001. The meeting was attended by 19 participants from 10 DPEP states. The special theme for discussion in this meeting was "Conducting Impact Studies in the Context of DPEP". The participants presented a progress report of research and evaluation work in their states and also their plans of future research activities.
- **A study on Causes of High Dropout Rate at the primary level of education** was undertaken in 6 DPEP states (Assam, Bihar, Madhya Pradesh, Orissa, Uttar Pradesh & West Bengal) in which the dropout rates were quite high. For the study, the required data have already been collected from selected samples of schools, teachers and parents in two districts of each state that were chosen for the study. At present, data analysis is going on. The reports of the study are expected to be ready by the end of August, 2002.
- **A study on Causes of High Repetition Rate** is being undertaken in 9 DPEP states (Assam, Bihar, Gujarat, Haryana, Himachal Pradesh, Karnataka, Orissa, Tamil Nadu and West Bengal) in which the overall repetition rate was found to be high (7.5% or more). A meeting of R&E Coordinators of these states was held in March, 2002 to discuss the objectives and approach to the study. The study will be conducted by the states with their own resources, but common methodology and tools will be used for data collection. It is expected that the study will be completed within 6 months, that is, by December, 2002.
- **The second volume of Research Abstracts** of DPEP sponsored studies is under preparation. Abstracts of studies conducted in the different DPEP states are being compiled and edited. The volume is expected to be ready for publication within three months.

Community Mobilisation

- The Community Participation and VEC Development Unit is in the process of developing indicators to monitor the nature and extent of community participation. Two rounds of consultations have already been carried out – one with the other component units of TSG (DPEP) on 25 February, 2002 while the other with a group of Resource Persons at national level on 23 March 2002. As per recommendations of the Consultations, a diagnostic study is being designed to capture the activities carried out in every state before getting into the process of development of the indicators.
- The Unit has also carried out a longitudinal study to document the process of community participation in West Bengal over a year (2001-2002). The last slag of fieldwork is over (April 2002) and the draft report is being prepared.

MEDIA/PUBLICITY

- A database has been created of all the journalists covering education beat in all the national dailies, magazines and periodicals. Articles on DPEP have been released through PTI, UNI, UNIVARTA, BHASHA and other wire services.
- At the national level, the two monthly newsletters “Chunouti (Hindi) and “DPEP Calling (English) continue to be published. At the state level, several states continue to publish their regular newsletters and magazines.
- DPEP audio spots have been broadcast on FM channels at the national level. At the state level, states use the radio for broadcasting of news reports, educational programmes, and discussions. DPEP Assam, for instance has reserved slots in AIR Assam for the broadcasting of their educational programmes at regular intervals.
- At national level, DPEP has produced a number TV spots that had been telecast on Doordarshan. Efforts have now been initiated to telecast TV spots in Satellite Channels free of cost, under social cause advertisement.
- A Website on DPEP has been developed and sufficient information has been posted on the site. The site can be reached at www.education.nic.in/htmlweb/eleedu4.ht.
- Several of the DPEP states continue to use audio-video material as teaching aids in classrooms. Such materials include audio-cassettes for training of regional languages to children, also audio/video cassettes for training of the teachers. Even documentary films have been produced and shown in schools (e.g. in Tamil Nadu and Himachal Pradesh). A separate audio-visual library exists in TSG Media Unit that stores the audio-video material on DPEP prepared at the state and national level.
- DPEP now has rich depository of audio-video material in states on various subjects for various stakeholders. Most of the states have developed and produced a number of audio-video cassettes and distributed to BRC/CRC centres. These are used for training and for creating awareness. Example: 'Ahban'r Surere' - video (Haryana), 'Baa Thengi Kaliyoke' - audio (Karnataka), 'Patanotsavam' -video (Kerala), 'Bal Geet' -audio (M.P.), 'Anpadh Nahi Rehena' -video (M.P.), Anand Dai Shikksha' (Maharashtra), 'Meena' -video (Andhra Pradesh & Gujarat), 'Shiksha Geet', Abhiyan Geet' and 'Munia Beti' -audio (Bihar), 'Diwas Swapna' - audio (Gujarat).

Outdoor Publicity:

- As most of the DPEP districts are rural and backward outdoor publicity has a special role to play in DPEP. States use a range of outdoor publicity vehicles including posters, hoardings, cinema slide, postal articles, post offices, railway stations, bus panels, floating balloons, fairs and melas, exhibitions, metal posters on trees, competitions etc: widely.

Advertising:

- DPEP also does social advertising through Doordarshan, Satellite channels, cable channels and AIR, mostly free of charge. Advertising in print media is also done.

Traditional Media:

- Apart from using print media and electronic media, folk and traditional media and local art forms are widely used in all states for community mobilisation. Puppet shows, nukkad natak, melas, kalajathas, are among the other vehicles used for creating awareness. Other examples are: chinara mela (Karnataka), shiksha paati (M.P.), folk festival (A.P. & West Bengal) khel utsav and mushairas (Bihar) and Haat (Gujarat). These have been found to be particularly beneficial in sending the message across. Apart from these, certain DPEP initiatives like metric melas, VEC melas, maa-beti melas are also part of the networking initiative to mobilise the community and ensure the participation of all community members.
- In Maharashtra, personal testimony of illiterate village women as against girls who study was found to be very effective in motivating girls' education. In Karnataka, DPEP districts in the state brought together theatre activists to create some highly effective street theatre. Plays and songs were developed in a series of workshops with reputed theatre persons, writers, artists and teachers. Dalit writer K Ramiah was commissioned to collect stories and poems in workshops with traditional village storytellers.

Government Media Agencies:

- Various government media agencies have been extending their co-operation in putting the DPEP message across to the mainstream media. For example, Ministry of Information and Broadcasting has assured media support of all its units including Doordarshan, AIR, Song and Drama division, DAVP, Directorate of Field Publicity and Press Information Bureau (P.B). Government of India conducted press tours to Assam and Karnataka in January-February, 1999 to highlight achievements of the project. SPDs were co-opted as members in the Inter-Media Publicity Co-ordination Committee (IMPPC) constituted by the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting to co-ordinate media activities and to launch multi-media campaign in states in thrust areas.

Review/Supervision Missions:

14th Joint Review Mission:

The 14th Joint Review Mission (JRM) of DPEP comprising representatives of Government of India and external funding agencies namely, Department For International Development (UK, World Bank, European Commission, UNICEF and Netherlands visited the DPEP States of Andhra Pradesh, Assam, Bihar, Gujarat, Himachal Pradesh, Jharkhand, Karnataka,

Orissa, Rajasthan, Tamil Nadu, Uttar Pradesh and West Bengal. The Mission was led by European Commission and took place from November to 17th December 5, 2001. The Mission in its Aide-Memoire have observed that many DPEP States and districts have started addressing issues regarding universal access in a more holistic manner and mainstreaming of out-of-school children is becoming a major activity in a number of DPEP States. The programme is also progressing satisfactorily towards achievement of its objectives.

15th Joint Review Mission

- The Mission visited the 13 States viz. Andhra Pradesh, Assam, Bihar, Gujarat, Haryana, Karnataka, Kerala, Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra, Orissa, West Bengal, Rajasthan, Chattisgarh, Uttaranchal and Jharkhand to review the progress of programme implementation. The Mission has noted that DPEP has created an unprecedented enthusiasm in the area of Primary Education, it has brought forth a new set of vital issues of ownership, capacity building, planning, educational management and equity. The Mission has also mentioned about the emergence of rich diversity of quality inputs in terms of textbooks, teaching learning material (TLM), training packages and evidence of a changing classroom climate towards the more child-centred approach. The Mission also took note of the variety of interventions under DPEP to reach out to the marginalised and deprived children and that the programme has enlarged the scope of equity. The Mission has inter-alia recommended that taking note of the gains of DPEP, the Project States may develop and articulate the vision for sustainability.

Internal Review Missions:

- Based on the recommendation of 14th Joint Review Mission, Internal Supervision Missions to Chhattisgarh, Jharkhand and Bihar were organised in March/April 2002 to take stock of the situation pertaining to implementation level in these three states.

Alternative Schooling :

- The AS Programme under DPEP has grown substantially over these years. In the process of making efforts for UPE, the DPEP states have realised that without a comprehensive programme of AS the goal of UPE can not be achieved.
- Currently there are 75,812 Alternative Schools of different types covering 31,43,950 children in the DPEP states. 209 residential bridge courses are also in operation in the states of Andhra Pradesh and Rajasthan. These residential camps are run on a permanent basis as long as children continue joining these camps. As and when children acquire appropriate competencies they are mainstreamed. About 500 *Ashramshalas* and *Residential Hostels* in tribal areas are operational in co-ordination with Tribal Welfare Department in Madhya Pradesh, Chattisgarh, Orissa and Gujarat, which also cover around 20,000 children.

- In Orissa 369 Girls Hostels with capacity of 40 seats in each hostel has been started in collaboration with the SC/ ST Development Department. Through these hostels 11,320 girls from SC/ST communities have been brought in the fold of primary education.
- It has significantly contributed towards bringing out of school children in the fold of primary education. Diverse strategies keeping in view the heterogeneous nature of out of school children have been evolved in different states. The emphasis has been given on developing context specific strategies. Decentralization, innovation and flexibility have been the hallmark of AS programme under DPEP.

STATE-WISE BREAK UP OF ALTERNATIVE SCHOOLS WITH ENROLMENT

Sl.No.	Name of State	Total No. of Centres	Total No. of Children
1.	Madhya Pradesh	22,058	(old figure) 11,30,219
2.	Chhatisgarh	5573	3,04,451
3.	Tamil Nadu	933	18,956
4.	Kerala	297	(old figure) 7,108
5.	Karnataka	The state has adopted single track strategy of mainstreaming through Bridge Courses	
6.	Haryana	1,080	25,000 (approx.)
7.	Maharashtra	3,336	83,095
8.	Assam	2386	1,29,622
9.	Himachal Pradesh	39	352 (approx.)
10.	Orissa	5,892	1,35,662
11.	Andhra Pradesh	2214	35,183 (approx.)
12.	Gujarat	2282	52,010
13.	Uttar Pradesh	5251	1,61,602
14.	Uttaranchal	494	7,418
15.	Bihar	2923	57,804
16.	Jharkhand	1215	28,131
17.	West Bengal	11077	4,31,741(DPEP)
18.	Rajasthan	8760	5,60,408
	Total	75812	31,68,762

Intervention in Makhtabs and Madrasas

- Intervention in Maktab / Madarasas is one of the most difficult and important areas of work from the gender and social equity point of view. A sizeable number of girls belonging to Muslim community attend Makhtab and Madrasas. Their education in Madrasas has often been restricted to 'Deeni Taleem'. In consultation with the local communities and Moulvis, formal school textbooks have been introduced in the Madrasas. Wherever qualified Maulavis are available, they have been trained in transaction of the formal curriculum. Wherever qualified Maulavis are not available, with community's consent local teachers have been appointed. Childrens are given free text books and TLMs. Wherever community has expressed need for appointing Urdu teachers in Madrasas, Urdu teachers have been appointed.

* this includes 4,211 EGS centres for which enrolment figure has been averaged @ 20 learners / centre.

- There has been significant effort to improve functioning of Madrasas in Assam, Madhya Pradesh, Uttar Pradesh and Rajasthan. Currently under DPEP 1,202 Madrasas have been adopted.

State-wise break up of Madrasas undertaken for Improvement

	Madhya Pradesh	Uttar Pradesh	Assam	Rajasthan	Total
Current year	547	412	111	132	1202

Children who migrate with their families

- Migration has been a very common cause across the states for children dropping out from the schools. During lean agricultural season families migrate in search of employment. Children also migrate with the family in many cases. Andhra Pradesh, Maharashtra, Gujarat and Orissa are the DPEP states, which have undertaken work with this category of children. Keeping in view the magnitude of the problem of migration, work in this area needs upscaling after a detailed review of the ongoing efforts.
- In this context efforts made in Bolangir district of Orissa have been exemplary. Parents have been persuaded to leave their children behind while they migrate. 28 residential schools were started to cover these children. DPEP provided fund for dinner, breakfast, TLM and teachers' honorarium. Lunch was provided from MDM scheme.

Deprived Urban Children

- A sizeable number of children in urban areas are out of school. There has been a rapid growth of urban population in the last few decades. Due to lag of growth in urban infrastructure a very large percentage of the urban population today live in slums. Many of these slums are unrecognised and lack of basic facilities like potable water, toilets, schools etc.
- The DPEP states of West Bengal, Kerala, Andhra Pradesh, Assam, Bihar, Maharashtra and Uttar Pradesh are working for the education of the Deprived Urban Children. While Andhra Pradesh has started work with platform and street children, Maharashtra has been working with the children working in slaughterhouses in the Parbhani district. Bihar has been working with the children of *beedi* workers and also of sex workers. Kerala has started work with children who work in restaurants.
- Many slums lack facilities of schools. *EGS centres can be started in slums but lack of proper space for running schools is one of the difficulties. EGS scheme does not provide for rent for building. Finding space for running of schools in slums in most cases is almost an impossible task.*

Adolescent Girls

The DPEP states of Andhra Pradesh, Bihar, Uttar Pradesh, Assam, Rajasthan, Orissa and Gujarat have initiated strategies for bringing adolescent girls in the ambit of primary education. Bihar and Jharkhand have a sizeable programme (Agna Vidyalaya) specially meant for the adolescent girls. The DPEP states of Andhra Pradesh, Uttar Pradesh, Orissa and Rajasthan have adopted strategies of long duration residential camps for covering adolescent girls. Other states are yet to initiate work in this area.

EGS for Unserved Habitations

Almost all the states have made concerted efforts to provide schooling facilities in the pattern of EGS for unserved habitation. The DPEP states of Chattisgarh, Rajasthan, Uttar Pradesh, Orissa and Uttaranchal have added a large number of EGS centres during the last one year. Many states have been able to universalise access to primary education by opening EGS schools. With the opening of EGS centres in unserved habitations, DPEP states will be able to universalise access to primary education for all the habitations with minimum of 15 children.

Mainstreaming

A sizeable number of children are out of school in habitations where schooling facilities exist. Mainstreaming them after certain period of bridging is an important intervention under DPEP. Most of the DPEP states have initiated activities for mainstreaming children through bridge courses of different duration. In Andhra Pradesh this has been going on at a very large scale for the past few years. The DPEP states of Karnataka, Uttar Pradesh, Orissa, Maharashtra, West Bengal, Rajasthan and Gujarat have also initiated large campaigns for mainstreaming through bridge courses. Tamil Nadu has also planned for Bridge Courses to cover children who have still remained out of school.

National Coordinators' Meeting (13-16 March 2002), Pune.

- A 4 days National Coordinators' Meet to review the progress in the area of Alternative Schooling was held at Pune. Some of the important issues discussed in this meeting were:-
 - to review the status of universalising access in DPEP districts
 - to review the coverage of children who are in specially difficult circumstances like, child labour, street children, children of sex workers, children who migrate with the families, urban deprived children etc.
 - to review the status of mainstreaming and the follow up of the mainstreamed children to ensure their retention and completion of full primary cycle
 - to review the quality related issues in Alternative Schooling programme and
 - to discuss and finalise the formats for proposed MIS of Alternative Schools.

Civil Works

1. **A National Evaluation of Civil Works** has been launched since February 2002 to critically evaluate all aspects of the civil works programme under DPEP. This would help fine-tune planning and implementation strategies for future DPEP works and also civil works under other similar programmes. The overall objective of the proposed evaluation is to review across states, the following:
 - Strengths and weaknesses of the planning, design development and implementation process followed for civil works.
 - The quality of the final product (school, classrooms, resource centers) with respect to its functionality and usability and
 - Highlighting good practices
- Evaluation in the states of Assam, Tamil Nadu, Himachal Pradesh, Uttar Pradesh, Rajasthan, Andhra Pradesh, Haryana, Karnataka and West Bengal are complete and preliminary findings are available. Evaluation for the rest nine states would be conducted in July/ August 2002. The synthesis report is expected to be ready by October.
2. The 5th National Workshop on Civil Works was held at Jaipur from 25th to 29th September 2001. Apart from taking stock on progress, innovations etc. across the states, the workshop discussed the following topics:
 - Ironing out of weaknesses in the planning process for Civil Works,
 - Areas to focus on in the National Civil Works Evaluation at State, District and Field levels,
 - Rainwater Harvesting as a viable alternative for provision of usable water in schools,
 - Local building techniques in Rajasthan, as well as alternative materials for Doors and Windows.

The physical progress of civil works as on 31.3.2002 is given in Annex-C.

Pedagogy

- **The third and final workshop of the Resource Enhancement Programme for state level resource Persons was organised from 25th December, 2001 to 5th January, 2002 at V.V. Giri National Labour Institute, Noida. Around 80 participants from M.P., Haryana, H.P., Bihar, Rajasthan, U.P. & Orissa have been exposed to atleast two workshops of this program. A repeat of the third workshop is scheduled in near future.**
- In an attempt to respond to the felt and emerging need for building capacities at different levels to undertake the task of pedagogical renewal, a multi pronged scheme for capacity building, "Enhance" was formulated in May 2001. It is flexible, as it allows state agencies to make their own plans and proposals as per their local specific needs. It has not been possible to operationalise this scheme because of the reservations of the Finance Department.

- **The fourth school based quality improvement program** was initiated in eight schools in the Shankarpally mandal of Rangareddy district (Andhra Pradesh) in June 2001. It is now being **extended to about 150 schools spread over 14 mandals in Rangareddy district and an additional mandal is being taken up in Nalgonda district.** The program is being supported by MV Foundation.
- **A sharing workshop on School-based Quality Improvement programs** was held in March, 2002, in New Delhi. Uttar Pradesh, West Bengal, Himachal Andhra Pradesh, Uttaranchal and Chhatisgarh participated.
- **A Workshop on “Effective use of Library Books to develop Reading and Writing Abilities of Children in Primary Classes”** was held in February 2002, in Pune. West Bengal, Maharashtra, Andhra Pradesh, Kerala, Himachal Pradesh & Uttar Pradesh participated in the workshop. About 15-16 districts were represented.
- A synthesis document **“Inside the School”** was brought out based on the eight case studies on the classroom processes which were taken up in seven Phase I states and Andhra Pradesh.
- **Pupil evaluation studies** were conducted in four DPEP states, Uttar Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh, Karnataka and Kerala and two NGOs Ekalavya and Digantar from August 2001 onwards. These were shared in a national level workshop in March, 2002 in which all DPEP states were invited.
- Keeping in view the acute MGT condition in more than half of the schools of all states except Kerala a workshop on Multi-grade Teaching was organized at Rishi Valley, Andhra Pradesh from 5th to 9th March 2002.
- Publication of **“Issues in Primary Education”** began in 1997 as a means for raising significant concerns in Primary Education. It has a print run of 2000 each in English and Hindi. The 9th issue has been released in October 2001.

**Statement indicating the progress made under the
District Primary Education Programme (DPEP)
under the major parameters.**

DPEP - Phase - I - States

Sl. No.	Project State	Enrolment Trends (Formal Schools)		GER % (Formal schools)		Share of Girls enrolment to Total enrolment	
		1995-96	2000-01	1995-96	2000-01	1995-96	2000-01
1	Assam	352000	497000	79.1	80.7	45.7	48.3
2	Haryana	432000	513000	62.4	75.4	45.8	47.5
3	Karnataka	1050000	1165000	96.3	96.8	47.1	48.2
4	Kerala	477000	428000	90.5	94.2	48.6	48.7
5	Madhya Pradesh	3028000	3664000	80.1	97.6	42.7	45.8
6	Maharashtra	1448000	1720000	95.8	103.4	47.7	48.1
7	Tamil Nadu	1079000	1078000	82.5	84.1	48.0	49.0

**Statement indicating the progress made under the
District Primary Education Programme (DPEP)
under the major parameters.**

DPEP - Phase - II / III / IV - States

Sl. No.	Project State	Enrolment Trends (Formal Schools)		GER % (Formal schools)		Share of Girls enrolment to Total enrolment	
		1997-98	2000-01	1997-98	1999-2000	1997-98	2000-01
1	Assam	680000	689000	77.7	67.7	47.2	48.7
2	Bihar	3730000	3662000	77.6	68.4	40.7	41.4
	Jharkhand						46
3	Gujarat	742000	924000	89.3	102.4		43.8
4	Haryana	328000	365000	67.6	75.7	47.6	46.3
5	Himachal Pradesh	180000	185000	125.9	114.7	48.2	49
6	Karnataka	1574000	216000	93.4	101.3	47.9	48.2
7	Kerala	390000	380000	NA*	NA*	49.3	49.3
8	Madhya Pradesh	2330000	2580000	82.9	92.3	43.7	45.5
	Chhattisgarh						49.0
9	Maharashtra	1082000	1085000	103.5	97.2	47.4	47.9
10	Orissa	1087000	1135000	88.6	84.3	46.0	47.0
11	Tamil Nadu	412000	409000	84.5	88.2	48.7	49.0
12	Uttar Pradesh	3650000	4550000	107.2	88.2	38.9	43.3
	Uttaranchal						50.2
13	West Bengal	2296000	2645000	NA*	NA*	48.0	49.0
14	Andhra Pradesh	NA*	6706000.00	NA*	NA*	NA*	47.7

* Data not yet available

Annex.A (ii)

**Statement indicating the progress made under the
District Primary Education Programme (DPEP)
upto 31.3.2002**

S. No.	Project state	Expenditure upto 31.3.2002 (Rs. in Crores)	No. of new Primary Schools opened	No. of Alternative Schooling / EGS Centers opened	No. of Additional Teachers appointed	
					Regular Teachers	Para - Teachers
1	Andhra Pradesh	558.01	5227	2214	6291	8914
2	Assam	228.50	30	2386	--	2332
3	Bihar	209.72	1109	2923	804	1803
4		92.71	295	2282	--	10876
5	Haryana	181.42	15	1080	--	3450
6	Himachal Pradesh	92.93	808	39	1589	339
7	Karnataka	420.41	1250	--	5018	--
8	Kerala	156.49	59	297	--	297
9	Madhya Pradesh	725.63	4209	22058	--	40639
10	Maharashtra	287.49	868	3336	3062	3294
11	Orissa	138.77	720	5892	1440	2573
12	Tamil Nadu	216.26	406	935	1771	--
13	Uttar Pradesh	813.58	5883	5251	6467	37837
14	West Bengal	158.96	--	11077	--	--
15	Rajasthan	122.27	--	8760	--	752
16	Jharkhand	77.31	919	1215	--	1139
17	Uttaranchal	30.88	251	494	130	847
18	Chhattisgarh	202.79	1152	5573	--	11339
	Total	4714.13	23201	75812	26572	126431

Annex.A(III)

**Statement indicating the progress made under the
District Primary Education Programme (DPEP)
upto 31.3.2002**

Sl. No.	Project State	No. of Block Resource Centres functional	No. of Cluster Resource Centres functional	Civil Works completed and in progress			
				No. of New School Buildings	No. of Additional classrooms	Toilet facilities provided	Drinking Water facilities provided
1	Andhra Pradesh*	990	5664	8463	14691	803	963
2	Assam	56		1426	1375	2126	1986
3	Bihar	152	1894	658	1114	1035	588
4	Gujarat	55	482	253	346	859	90
5	Haryana	55	544	377	1568	4439	1600
6	Himachal Pradesh	33	230	787	21	486	403
7	Karnataka	112	1206	1032	176	791	791
8	Kerala	55	627	268	1056	469	345
9	Madhya Pradesh	236	4325	16550	4548	0	0
10	Maharashtra	73	189	873	2060	4416	2917
11	Orissa	170	885	990	778	1240	333
12	Tamil Nadu	106	1023	0	1785	2006	2072
13	Uttar Pradesh	645	6365	8118	10637	20527	3520
14	West Bengal**	326	324	703	1619	0	0
15	Rajasthan	132	1041	616	1098	3998	1312
16	Chhattisgarh	134	1949	1278	661	0	0
17	Jharkhand	55	476	423	768	281	439
18	Uttaranchal	38	280	233	118	749	0
	Total	3423	27504	43048	44419	44225	17359

* Andhra Pradesh has Mandal Resource Centres & Teacher Centres in place of Block Resources Centres(BRCs) /Cluster Resource Centres(CRCs)

** West Bengal has Circle Resource Centres (CLRCs) in place of BRCs/CRCs.

Statement showing Statewise EFC approved cost – Expenditure under various IDA Credits and DFID Grants

(Rs. in lakhs)

Sl. No.	Name of the State	DPEP-I				DPEP-II			DPEP-III		
		EFC approved Cost		Exp. Upto	%age	EFC approved Cost	Exp. Upto	%age	EFC approved Cost	Exp. Upto	%age
		Original	Revised	31st March, 2002	31st March, 2002		31st March, 2002	31st March, 2002			
1	Assam	12951.18	16227.62	11564.77	71.60	15633.32	10770.7	68.90			
2	Haryana	14812.45	17159.04	12915.61	75.27	9547.25	6360.5	66.62			
3	Karnataka	13497.98	21480.18	18160.85	84.55	28017.09	23656.4	84.44			
4	Kerala	9189.72	9448.83	8462.72	90.00	9458.52	7195.4	76.07			
5	Maharashtra	18592.37	23592.13	18190.79	77.11	15771.79	9526.2	60.40			
6	Tamil Nadu	12597.21	18224.00	15901.41	87.00	9244.32	5724.8	61.93			
7	Madhya Pradesh	50220.37	57136.27	44067.51	77.13	38110.48	27271.4	71.56			
8	Chhattisgarh	15600.42	16264.42	14336.83	88.15	7998.82	4654.1				
9	Himachal Pradesh					12928.11	9170.4	70.93			
10	Orissa					23011.99	13513.6	58.72			
11	Orissa-II					31382.46					
12	Gujarat					9567.44	9694.1	101.32		348.90	
13	Uttar Pradesh					66987.60	48864.1	72.95			
14	National Component	6633.59	5775.18	4073.54	70.54	1987.00	694.2	34.94			
15	Andhra Pradesh					17272.60	15195.0	87.97			
16	West Bengal					19630.29	11352.1	57.83			
17	West Bengal-II					21427.04	2675.5	12.49			
18	APERP					57150.00	31863.3	55.75			
19	Bihar								43535.74	15392.14	35.36
20	Jharkhand								21581.26	7731.00	35.80
21	Rajasthan								41114.47	11261.20	27.39
22	Rajasthan-II								37242.79	994.56	2.67
23	UP DPEP-III								77011.10	32372.75	42.04
24	Uttaranchal								7718.48	3088.00	40.00
		154095.3	185307.70	147674.03	80.00	395126.12	238182.3	60.28	228203.84	71188.55	31.95

Note:- National Component (2661-IN) upto Feb, 2002.
Chhattisgarh-II expenditure upto Dec, 2001.

Total Expenditure under DPEP = Rs.454088.59 lakhs.

Civil Works progress														
State wise and component wise status as on 31.03.2002														
State	BRC/MRC/		CRC		Addl. Classroom		New/ Bldgless		Repairs		Drinking water		Toilets	
	Target	comp	Target	comp	Target	comp	Target	comp	Target	comp	Target	comp	Target	comp
Assam	79	58	353	306	1450	1053	1446	996	2423	1756	2198	1688	2147	1749
Haryana	53	51	544	435	1675	1015	392	265	1387	686	1741	1360	4770	3411
Karnataka	107	64	1034	810	178	161	1059	848	212	206	796	752	796	752
Kerala	62	60	448	376	1073	900	276	234	779	426	445	237	566	321
Madhya Pradesh	236	233	0	0	4551	4490	16486	12155	1259	1345	0	0	0	0
Maharashtra	73	19	0	0	2144	1326	887	598	3105	1158	4362	2488	5800	3766
Tamil Nadu	105	105	0	0	1785	1595	0	0	0	0	2072	1280	2006	1744
Andhra Pradesh	993	899	0	0	15046	13551	8692	7614	0	0	1231	720	1342	709
Gujarat	23	19	0	0	346	343	310	251	933	933	710	90	1500	858
Himachal Pradesh	33	6	342	194	51	19	1031	564	802	297	802	365	612	446
Orissa	86	58	014	859	778	497	990	532	1916	1645	333	197	1240	1156
West Bengal*	326	168	0	0	1705	1375	827	475	672	522	0	0	0	0
Bihar	140	108	1181	643	1652	408	1981	136	71	0	5167	481	6203	583
Uttar Pradesh**	623	478	6365	4253	17134	8136	10495	5035	12171	0	7897	3051	23106	14557
Rajasthan***	133	0	1719	639	1058	485	1668	376	7301	1991	4564	958	12682	2607
Chhatisgarh	134	134	0	0	667	654	1278	1014	0	0	0	0	0	0
Jharkhand	52	49	521	280	1557	210	1013	119	363	14	1494	307	1106	136
Uttaranchal	38	6	131	127	118	109	243	158	0	0	0	0	749	663
Total	3296	2515	13552	8922	52968	36327	49074	31370	33394	10979	33812	13974	64625	33458

* including expansion districts

** including DPEP-III

10th Meeting of the Project Board of District Primary Education Programme (DPEP) Mission

Approval for the Annual Work Plan and Budget of DPEP States for the year 2002-2003.

As a part of decentralization of processes under DPEP, all the DPEP States are conducting appraisal of AWP & B themselves. The DPEP Bureau has conducted a sample review districts plans based on the appraisal criteria.

A summary of the AWP & B proposals inter-alia indicating the achievements made so far, the highlights of the programme activities during 1999-2000, the financial statements indicating the expenditure incurred so far, the spillovers and fresh activities for the year 2002-2003 alongwith the analysis of civil works and management cost are appended with this note (Appendix-C).

It has been observed that certain States are yet to release their full 15% share. The position in this regard is being closely monitored and matter has also been taken up with the concerned State Governments at appropriate level. Meetings were also held by Secretary(EE&L) with the Education Secretaries of various States to review the progress of various elementary education schemes and during discussions the issue regarding release of state share was also brought to their notice.

In respect of certain states expenditure upto March, 2002 are based on anticipated figures. The position about spillovers during 2002-2003 could, therefore, change and would be suitably modified on the basis of the firmed up figures of expenditure in the previous year.

Budget provision for 2002-2003

BE 2002-2003 for DPEP is Rs. 1380.00 crores. Out of this, an amount of Rs. 576.70 crores has already been released to the State Societies to ensure that implementation of on-going activities could be carried on smoothly.

Closure of DPEP Phase-I and II

DPEP Phase-I (EC assisted) in Madhya Pradesh and Chattisgarh would be closing on 31.12.2002. The IDA assisted DPEP Phase-I and DPEP Phase-II in the States of Assam, Kerala, Haryana, Maharashtra, Tamil Nadu, Karnataka, Madhya Pradesh, Chattisgarh, Himachal Pradesh, Orissa, Gujarat and Uttar Pradesh would close on 30.6.2003. The AWP&B in respect of these States have, therefore, been prepared upto the project closing dates.

National Component

At the time of launching DPEP in 1994, the need for ensuring availability continuous basis of technical services needed for the programme management was recognized. In fact, the Staff Appraisal Report of the funding agency (IDA) specifically mentions that the DPEP Bureau assisted by full time senior technical and professional expert contract and supplemented by short term consultants as per needs to provide key technical services in the fields of Appraisal, Supervision, Monitoring & MIS, Finance and Procurement, Civil Works and Research & Evaluation. This arrangement of securing technical services envisaged in addition to the services to be provided by NCERT and NIEPA towards development of teacher in-service training, pedagogic improvement and school statistics. Following the negotiations with IDA for credit for DPEP-I, a consultancy contract with ED was signed by Government of India on 5-1-1995 initially for the period upto 31-3-97, obtaining approval of IFD. This contract was further extended from time to time with concurrence of the IFD and the present contract is for the period upto 31.3.2002. **The World Bank has agreed to extend the project period of DPEP-I upto 30.6.2003 i.e. it will run along with DPEP-II, and they have also agreed to extend the contract with TSG-Ed upto 30.6.2003.**

The Annual Work Plan & Budget of TSG-Ed.CIL for the period 1.4.2002 to 30.6.2003 is estimated at Rs. 556.77 lakhs. No additional allocation under the Credit is being sought and the expenditure would be met out of the balance available under the existing contracted amount.

In the discharge of its functions, the TSG Ed.CIL has over the years been providing services in the following areas:-

- Technical assistance in the preparation of State and district sub-projects and appraisal thereof;
- Organising internal DPEP review missions, co-ordination of biannual joint review missions with the funding agencies;
- Monitoring and reporting on DPEP inputs, physical targets and implementation progress;
- Supervision of civil works, identification of cost effective technology, development of improved school construction designs and technical assistance to States and District projects;
- Establishing and monitoring research and evaluation contracts with research organizations and individuals in-service teacher training and textbook development;
- Forging linkages between community and programme activities, specially school support and improvement in order to instill a feeling of ownership;
- Technical support to States in providing access and quality primary schooling to out-of-school children through use of micro-planning for assessment of needs and diversification, flexibility and local specificity of the strategies;
- Helping the States in identifying specific issues and the deterrents to girls' education and to address them through mechanisms designed to monitor regular contact between community and the schooling systems;

- Developing strategies for orienting all general teachers in the selected catchment area to sensitise them to the problems and needs associated with special education of disabled children; and
- Review and monitoring of procurement and disbursement activity and assisting the States in the preparation of various types of reports relating to procurement and claim applications for seeking reimbursement from the funding agencies.

In so far as institutional support by NCERT, NIEPA, IGNOU and NSPDART (an organisation of LBSNAA, Mussorie) is concerned, their services are being utilised for specific interventions for capacity building, training, evaluatory studies etc. No consultancy fees is being paid under the project direct to the personnel of these organisations and for all purposes they are governed by the rules and regulations of their organisations for the purpose of remuneration, TA/DA etc. Activities to be performed by these ensured that there is no duplication of efforts amongst the various organisations. **Activities for DPEP also do not form part of the normal agenda of these organisations/**

NCERT's services are being utilised to develop in-service teacher training designs and materials and their evaluations, assisting states in capacity building for adapting the training designs and materials in state specific situations, improving the educational research and evaluation capacity of national and state research organisations, organising international conferences and seminars, conducting baseline and mid-term learning achievement surveys and to assist with capacity building for text book and learning development material, etc.

NIEPA is assisting in upgrading planning and management skills, to develop competencies in the areas of compilation of educational statistics, implementation of state and district school statistics information system, carrying out need based researches in access, retention, drop-outs etc.

Services of NSP-DART, Mussoire are being availed for training DPEP functionaries from the States/Districts in the area of planning appraisal, costing, etc.

IGNOU is assisting in the implementation of the component of Distance Education component for teacher training.

Earlier services of NCERT & NIEPA were being availed of through sub-contract with Ed.CII.. However, from 1.4.1999 funding to these organisations is being done directly through MHRD.

Approval of the Project Board is solicited to the AWP&B proposals for 2002-03 in respect of various DPEP States as per the summary statements given at *Appendix- C and the Appraisal Notes at Appendix-I- XXIII*, subject to the adjustments to be carried out by the States in the light of observations made in the appraisal notes.

Minutes of the 9th Meeting of the Project Board of the District Primary Education Programme (DPEP) Mission held on August 3, 2001 at 2.30 P.M. under the Chairpersonship of Shri B.K. Chaturvedi, Secretary [Elementary Education & Literacy] Ministry of HRD at Shastri Bhavan, New Delhi.

The 9th meeting of the Project Board of DPEP Mission was held on 3.8.2001 under the Chairmanship of Secretary (EE&L), MHRD. The list of participants is given at *Annex. I*.

2. Secretary (EE&L) while welcoming the participants requested Joint Secretary (Elementary Education) to proceed with the agenda items for discussion.

Agenda Item No. 1 : Confirmation of the minutes of the 8th meeting of the Project Board of DPEP Mission held on 13.7.2000.

Since the members of the Project Board had no comments on the minutes of the last Project Board Meeting, the minutes were confirmed.

Agenda Item No. 2 : Action Taken on the decisions of the 8th meeting.

Project Board noted with satisfaction the action taken on the decisions of the last Project Board meeting held on 13.7.2000.

Agenda Item No. 3: Progress Overview of DPEP

Shri Sumit Bose, Joint Secretary (EE), MHRD made a brief presentation on the achievements of DPEP since the last Project Board meeting. The salient features of the presentation and the discussions held thereon are as follows:-

(i) Coverage:

JS(EE) mentioned that the programme has been extended to another 23 districts taking the total coverage to 271 districts in 18 States.

(ii) Access:

Presenting the physical progress JS(EE) stated that so far the programme has added 10,000 formal schools, 56,000 Alternative Education Centres. He further informed that Access was no more a major issue in DPEP, enrolment was near universal in phase-I districts. Share of girls' enrolment had considerably improved, which was more than 45%, except in Bihar, Gujarat and U.P.

(iii) Focus Group:

JS(EE) informed that Index of Social Equity (ISE) for SCs was more than 100 in phase-I districts. Secretary (EE & L) desired to know how the ISE was calculated. JS(EE) clarified that ISE was worked out as the ratio of children of a particular social group enrolled with reference to the proportion of children of that social group in the population. He further informed that the index exceeded 100% due to enrolment of under age / over age children. Shri S. K. Panda, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Social Justice & Empowerment pointed out that ISE of 100 alone could not be an indicator of progress since general category students may have shifted to private schools. He also enquired about provision of education in Madarasas and Makhtabs. Shri Amit Kaushik, Director (EE) clarified that there was a provision of additional teacher to impart modern education along with the religious teachings in such institutions. Prof. Mohd. Miyan of IGNOU said that there was a growing acceptance to such instructions. Ms Deepa Das, Chief Consultant, TSG – Ed.CIL further added that teaching learning material had to be some times appropriately adapted to ensure wide acceptability within these institutions.

(iv) Retention:

Joint Secretary (EE) continuing with his presentation said that repetition rate was constantly declining and gender disparities in learning achievements have almost closed. Secretary (EE & L) asked whether district-wise / State-wise repetition rates were available for a comparison with the non-DPEP districts. Ms. Rashmi Sharma, Director (EE) referring to the Access and Retention study clarified that district-wise data were available and each year the enrolment data under DPEP was updated and analysed. However, it was difficult to compare the position

between DPEP and non-DPEP districts due to various factors like wide variations in the base line data and the time lag in the availability of educational statistics from the non-DPEP districts. **Secretary (EE & L) desired that at least an attempt should be made to conduct a study on comparison between DPEP and non-DPEP districts for understanding the situation better.**

(v) **Community Mobilisation:**

JS(EE) informed that over 20 lakhs Village Education Committees (VECs) have been constituted and members of such community trained for participation in educational activities.

(vi) **Pedagogy:**

On pedagogical renewal process, JS(EE) apprised the Board that text books of classes I – V have been renewed or are under renewal in most states. Training on joyful learning to teacher was near completion. All Cluster Resource Centres and Block Resource Centres have been made functional. A study on classroom practices called 'Inside the School' was conducted and disseminated. Secretary (EE & L) desired to know teachers deployment as per PTR norms and instructed that **the secular trends / statistical data should be collected and analysed indicating the percentage of schools with single teacher and those with more than the desired PTR.**

(vii) **Civil Works:**

JS(EE) informed that the ceiling of 24% of the project cost has been increased to 33-1/3 % with certain conditionalities. Civil works is almost complete in DPEP-I districts and in phase-II the same has been targeted for completion this year. It was also brought out that under DPEP conscious attempts have been made to reduce the cost of construction by use of local materials and adopting cost effective alternative technologies. Older buildings are being retrofitted with child friendly elements. An evaluation of all aspects of civil works is planned in the coming six months. Secretary (EE & L) desired to know the agency proposed for evaluation of the civil works. Shri Saurav Banerjee, Chief Consultant (Civil Works), TSG - Ed.CIL informed that evaluation will be done by TSG-Ed.CIL by involving outside resource persons, including NBCC, HUDCO etc.

(viii) Alternative Schooling:

On Alternative Schooling JS(EE) said that emphasis was on covering difficult and marginalized groups like children of migrating families, child labours, street children, adolescent girls, children of sex workers etc. Secretary(EE&L) desired to know the percentage of children covered under AS. JS(EE) stated that about 20 lakh children were enrolled under AS in DPEP districts and mentioned that it was difficult to indicate the percentage of children covered under AS as in addition to DPEP, States were also implementing other schemes such as NFE, EGS, Bridge Courses, etc. Shri K. Chandramouli, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Labour stated that the figure of child labour was about 11.28 million although some higher figures were also quoted and desired that there should be consistency in the figures reported by different Departments.

(ix) IED:

As regards Integrated Education for Disabled, it was informed that an agreement has been reached between Rehabilitation Council of India and DPEP for training general teachers. Substantial progress has been made in providing aids and appliances to disabled children. Several States have applied for assistance under IEDC Scheme of Department of Secondary Education and Higher Education. About 6 lakh teachers have been trained in IED through regular in service teacher training programmes.

(x) Girls Education:

Regarding Girls Education, JS(EE) brought out that several initiatives were undertaken for improving enrolment, retention and learning achievement of girls. ECCE strategy under DPEP included extended timings of Anganwadi centres to coincide with primary school, training of Anganwadi workers, provision of teaching learning material for Anganwadi centres, academic support, etc. More than 10,000 ECCE centres have been set up so far in non ICDS areas. Secretary (EE&L) stated that the reasons for drop-out of girl children were mainly due to family factors, sibling care, etc. Ms. Rashmi Sharma, Director(EE) mentioned about the community interventions to address this problem.

(xi) MIS:

About the Management Information System, JS(EE) informed that the national EMIS report was being generated regularly every year. Revised EMIS up to upper primary stage has been finalised, which will be used for data collection during the current year. 5% sample check of EMIS data was conducted through external agency, following up on a similar exercise undertaken in 1997-98.

(xii) Expenditure:

Presenting the position of expenditure and disbursement, JS(EE) informed that cumulative expenditure till 31st March, 2001 was about Rs. 3274 crores. Expenditure during 2000-01 was about Rs. 942 crores. Cumulative disbursement up to 31-3-2001 was Rs. 2760 crores. An amount of Rs. 400 crores was released to the State Societies in the beginning of the current financial year.

(xiii) Supervision:

JS(EE) mentioned about the supervision mechanism of DPEP under which bi-annual Joint Review Missions comprising representatives of GOI and external funding agencies were conducted. 14th JRM was due in November, 2001. Internal Review Missions were conducted as and when necessary.

(xiv) Issues:

Finally, JS(EE) brought out the following major issues before the Project Board:-

- The proposal to utilise savings in 7 DPEP-I states was awaiting EFC approval. Approval of AWP&B for 2001-02 of these States, exceeding the project outlay would be subject to the EFC approval.
- This would be the last AWP&B of DPEP-I states, unless the project period was extended.
- The State component Plan of 3 newly constituted States will be subject to the approval of Ministry of Finance, whole the proposal has already been submitted.
- Slow implementation in Bihar and Jharkhand was a matter of concern. The projects in these States need to be restructured.

- With this year's proposals, expenditure in DPEP-II states whether (Karnataka and Gujarat) will exceed the EFC outlay.
3. Director (Finance) made the following observations / suggestions:-
- i) Referring to the excess expenditure by certain States over and above the approved project cost, he desired that details of items / activities on which excess expenditure has occurred, alongwith reasons for the same, should have been presented.
 - ii) Position about physical and financial achievements against the original project targets should have been included in the agenda.
 - iii) The problem of redeployment of teachers and measures taken to rectify the high PTR in certain States should have been covered in greater details.
4. JS(EE) stated that the requisite information was available in the Progress Overview document enclosed with the Agenda Notes. **However, it was agreed that in future the desired information would be included in the Agenda Notes seperately in a summarised form.**

Agenda Item No. 4: Plans for Utilisation of savings under DPEP-I :

JS(EE) highlighted the proposal about the utilistion of savings under the IDA credit and EC grant for DPEP-I. He also mentioned about the request made to the World Bank and EC for further extension of the project period. It was also mentioned that the EFC note on the proposal has already been circulated. It was observed that the allocation for certain district would exceed 40 crores ceiling if the savings were to be utilised. Secretary(FE&L) enquired how the amount will be utilised since only 4-5 months period will be available for implementation. JS(EE) stated that European Commission had already informally indicated that they would extend the project period, while a request for extension had also been made with the World Bank. **The approval would be subject to agreements of funding agencies to extend the project period.**

Agenda Item No. 5: Annual Work Plan & Budget of DPEP States for 2001-02

Due to constraint of time, presentations of only nine Project States were made on a sample basis namely, Kerala, Himachal Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh, Chhattisgarh, Rajasthan, Uttar Pradesh, Assam, Andhra Pradesh and Bihar. The members were informed that the requisite details about the AWP&B proposals of all DPEP States alongwith the appraisal / review thereof were included in the agenda notes. The following comments / observations were made :-

Kerala :

- Decline in enrolment and classrooms.
- Increase in management cost.
- Taking over of tribal welfare schools – it was decided that this should be without taking over financial liability.
- Representative of SJ & Empowerment enquired about quality intervention about SC/ST. JS(FE) clarified that quality improvement interventions under DPEP were targeted to all children, including SC / ST children.
- For providing internet connections to BRCs it was clarified that the proposals did not include procurement of additional computers as the same were already available.

Himachal Pradesh :

- Decline in enrolment
- IFD raised the question about equipments being booked under Planning and Management. It was clarified that this was required for the newly instituted SIEMAT.

Madhya Pradesh :

- Rs.40 crores ceiling being exceeded by certain districts.
- Civil works were planned on the basis of the revised ceiling of 33% on the revised project cost.

- **Secretary (EE&L) desired that in future a check list for appraisal should be prepared and sent to the States so that non-admissible items are not covered and the issues about excess expenditure are also tackled.**

Uttar Pradesh :

- Uniformly high PTR in the State. Teacher recruitment measures were being taken. Shortfalls proposed to be met by appointment of Shiksha Mitras, which would improve the position.
- Secretary(EE&L) enquired what the state was doing to address the problem of high female drop out rate. Ms. Rashmi Sharma, Director (EE) and Ms. Deepa Das, Chief Consultant (Gender), TSG, Ed.CIL mentioned about the cluster approach, involvement of localized groups for tracking down the drop out children.
- Secretary(EE&L) asked why the EGS scheme was not succeeding and we were not getting adequate proposals from States. JS(EE) stated that this was due to the reason that now a large number of districts were covered under DPEP and the first charge for funding EGS centres was from DPEP.

Assam :

- **The State should not exceed the management cost ceiling. However, the State would look into this aspect and rework the management cost after analyzing the position about booking of non management expenditure under management cost.**

Andhra Pradesh :

- Civil works cost under phase-II will be restricted to 33.33%.
- Under phase-I, expenditure on civil works exceeds 33.33%. Approval is subject to the condition that booking of expenditure under DPEP-I is restricted to 33.33%, subject to the fulfilment of prescribed conditions.

Bihar :

- Secretary(EE&L) desired that a study on comparison of achievement in enrolment and retention between DPEP and non-DPEP districts should be made.
- Director, Finance desired to have the break up of costs under different components and raised the question about large amounts booked for VEC training etc.

National Component

- The cumulative expenditure till date and AWP&B for 2000-01 would be less than the EFC approved expenditure.

5. **Concluding the meeting, Secretary(EE&L) desired that next time we should present achievements on major parameters like enrolment, retention, etc. and the focus areas in the AWP&B. He also desired that there should be a standardized check list for appraisal of AWP&B, which should be shared with the project state to avoid the problem of excess expenditure and exceptions. Presentations should also be done on a uniform pattern. He also directed that in future State-wise presentations could be made before sub-groups of the Project Board to facilitate a more meaningful discussion and a summary of the proposals could be then taken up in the Board meeting.**

6. Subject to the observations as mentioned above, the AWP&B for 2001-02 of various States and national component as given in Annex-II was approved. **The State Implementation Societies will make necessary adjustments in the AWP&B in the light of observations made in the Appraisal / Review Notes and communicate the revised activity wise provisions to the Bureau.**

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

List of participants in the 9th Meeting of the Project Board of the District Primary Education Programme (DPEP) Mission held on August 3, 2001.

MINISTRY OF HUMAN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT
(DEPARTMENT OF ELEMENTARY EDUCATION & LITERACY)

1. Shri B.K. Chaturvedi, Secretary (Elementary Education & Literacy)..... *In Chair*
2. Shri. Sumit Bose, Joint Secretary(EE) & Member Secretary, DPEP Mission
3. Shri S.S. Sharma, Director (Finance)
4. Smt Rashmi Sharma, Director (EE)
5. Ms. Shalini Prasad, Director (EE)
6. Shri Job Zachariah, Director (EE)
7. Shri Amit Kaushik, Director (EE)
8. Shri P.K. Mohanty, DEA (EE) & (EE)
9. Shri Praveen Kumar, Deputy Secretary(EE)
10. Smt.Perna Gulati, Deputy Secretary(EE)
11. Shri.S.K.Bansal, Under Secretary (EE)
12. Shri Narender Singh, Under Secretary(EE)
13. Shri V. Peddanna, Under Secretary (EE)
14. Shri S.K. Kapoor, Under Secretary(EE)
15. Smt Anita Prakash, Under Secretary (EE)
16. Shri C.K. Ramaswami, Section Officer (EE)
17. Shri Satish Kumar, Section Officer (EE)
18. Shri C.K. Ramaswami, Section Officer (EE)
19. Shri M.P. Sajeevan, Section Officer

PLANNING COMMISSION

20. Shri J.C. Sharma, Director
21. Ms. Renu Sobti, SRO

Summary of AWP&B for 2001-02 in respect of DPEP States and National Component

(Rs. in Lakhs)						Remarks
S.No.	State	Phase	Spillover from previous year	Fresh activities	Total (Spillover + Fresh activities)	
1	ASSAM	Phase-I	638.98	2193.34	2832.32	(1) Expenditure over and above the approved project cost under DPEP-I will be subject to the approval by the EFC.
		Phase-II	1371.48	2649.45	4020.93	
2	KERALA	Phase-I	236.23	1882.93	2119.16	(2) Excess Expenditure in DPEP-II over and above the EFC approved project cost will be subject to allocation/approval of additional funds
		Phase-II	763.60	2072.73	2836.33	
3	HARYANA	Phase-I	1416.18	4269.21	5685.39	(3) The State Implementation Societies will make necessary adjustments in the AWP&B in the light of observations made in the Appraisal / Review Notes and communicate the revised activity wise provisions to the Bureau.
		Phase-II	1517.04	2408.78	3925.82	
4	KARNATAKA	Phase-I	371.23	2515.79	2887.01	(4) Spillovers will be subject to actuals, depending upon the actual expenditure in the previous year and carry over of activities during the current year.
		Phase-II	1269.25	4189.00	5458.25	
5	MAHARASHTRA	Phase-I	1609.30	5515.07	7124.37	(5) Civil works should not exceed the revised ceiling of 33.3%, subject to the fulfilment of the prescribed conditions for the purpose.
		Phase-II	2532.21	3645.10	6177.31	
6	TAMIL NADU	Phase-I	185.03	5353.11	5538.14	
		Phase-II	1049.28	1824.19	2873.47	
7	MADHYA PRADESH	Phase-I	1421.29	11948.96	13370.25	
		Phase-II	4581.79	9608.29	14190.08	
8	CHATTISGARH	Phase-I	0.00	3553.95	3553.95	
		Phase-II	0.00	2250.94	2250.94	
9	HIMACHAL PRADESH	Phase-II	1235.05	2890.25	4125.30	
10	ORISSA	Phase-I	2545.98	9324.00	11869.98	
		Phase-II	0.00	6593.13	6593.13	
11	GUJARAT	Phase-II	86.60	2574.93	2661.53	
12	ANDHRA PRADESH	DPEP-II	1228.37	5645.23	6873.60	
		AEPR	5238.03	10702.79	15940.82	
13	WEST BENGAL	DPEP-II	816.00	4812.00	5628.00	
		Expn.	1425.00	3801.00	5026.00	
14	UTTAR PRADESH	UP-DPEP-II	1349.36	20548.19	21897.55	
		UP-DPEP-III	3134.61	28709.91	31844.52	
15	UTTARANCHAL	UP-DPEP-III	221.61	2651.90	2873.51	
16	BIHAR	DPEP-III	4326.00	7641.00	11967.00	
17	JHARKHAND	DPEP-III	1765.36	3135.57	4900.93	
18	RAJASTHAN	DPEP-IV	1542.66	10368.55	11911.21	
19	Ed.CIL	DPEP-I	0.00	465.00	465.00	
20	NSDART	DPEP-I	0.00	77.37	77.37	
21	NCERT	DPEP-I	35.80	3.40	39.20	
22	NIEPA	DPEP-I	41.35	31.39	72.74	
23	IGNOU	DPEP-II	0.00	361.00	361.00	
24	Cap. Bldg. (EC)	DPEP-I	0.00	100.00	100.00	
Total			43954.67	186117.45	230072.11	

MINISTRY OF SOCIAL JUSTICE & EMPOWERMENT

22. Shri S.K. Panda, Joint Secretary

MINISTRY OF LABOUR

23. Shri K. Chandramouli, Joint Secretary

DEPARTMENT OF WOMEN & CHILD DEVELOPMENT

24. Ms. Vasudha Gupta, Deputy Secretary

NCERT

25. Prof. Ved Prakash, Head of DPEP, CRG

NIEPA

26. Dr. S.M.I.A. Zaidi

IGNOU

27. Prof. Mohd. Miyan, DEP- DPEP, Project Director

TSG – ED. CIL

28. Dr. R.K. Suri, Project Manager (DPEP)

29. Shri Ved Prakash

32. Shri M.K. Talukdar

33. Shri A.B.L. Srivastava

34. Shri Sourav Banarjee

35. Dr. Deepa Das

36. Ms. Anupriya Chadha

37. Ms. Smita

38. Shri Dayaram

**Statement indicating the progress made under the
District Primary Education Programme (DPEP)
under the major parameters.**

DPEP - Phase - I - States

Sl. No.	Project State	Enrolment Trends (Formal Schools)		GER % (Formal schools)		Share of Girls enrolment to Total enrolment	
		1995-96	2000-01	1995-96	2000-01	1995-96	2000-01
1	Assam	352000	497000	79.1	80.7	45.7	48.3
2	Haryana	432000	513000	62.4	75.4	45.8	47.5
3	Karnataka	1050000	1165000	96.3	96.8	47.1	48.2
4	Kerala	477000	428000	90.5	94.2	48.6	48.7
5	Madhya Pradesh	3028000	3664000	80.1	97.6	42.7	45.8
8	Maharashtra	1448000	1720000	95.8	103.4	47.7	48.1
7	Tamil Nadu	1079000	1078000	82.5	84.1	48.0	49.0

**Statement indicating the progress made under the
District Primary Education Programme (DPEP)
under the major parameters.**

DPEP - Phase - II / III / IV - States

Sl. No.	Project State	Enrolment Trends (Formal Schools)		GER % (Formal schools)		Share of Girls enrolment to Total enrolment	
		1997-98	2000-01	1997-98	1999-2000	1997-98	2000-01
1	Assam	680000	689000	77.7	67.7	47.2	48.7
2	Bihar	3730000	3662000	77.6	68.4	40.7	41.4
	Jharkhand						46
3	Gujarat	742000	924000	89.3	102.4		43.8
4	Haryana	328000	365000	67.6	75.7	47.6	46.3
5	Himachal Pradesh	180000	185000	125.9	114.7	48.2	49
6	Karnataka	1574000	216000	93.4	101.3	47.9	48.2
7	Kerala	390000	380000	NA*	NA*	49.3	49.3
8	Madhya Pradesh	2330000	2580000	82.9	92.3	43.7	45.5
	Chhattisgarh						49.0
9	Maharashtra	1082000	1085000	103.5	97.2	47.4	47.9
10	Orissa	1087000	1135000	88.6	84.3	46.0	47.0
11	Tamil Nadu	412000	409000	84.5	88.2	48.7	49.0
12	Uttar Pradesh	3650000	4550000	107.2	88.2	38.9	43.3
	Uttaranchal						50.2
13	West Bengal	2298000	2645000	NA*	NA*	48.0	49.0
14	Andhra Pradesh	NA*	6706000.00	NA*	NA*	NA*	47.7

* Data not yet available

**Statement indicating the progress made under the
District Primary Education Programme (DPEP)
upto 31.3.2002**

S. No.	Project state	Expenditure upto 31.3.2002 (Rs. in Crores)	No. of new Primary Schools opened	No. of Alternative Schooling / EGS Centers opened	No. of Additional Teachers appointed	
					Regular Teachers	Para - Teachers
1	Andhra Pradesh	558.01	5227	2214	6291	8914
2	Assam	228.50	30	2386	--	2332
3	Bihar	209.72	1109	2923	804	1803
4		92.71	295	2282	--	10876
5	Haryana	181.42	15	1080	--	3450
6	Himachal Pradesh	92.93	808	39	1589	339
7	Karnataka	420.41	1250	--	5018	--
8	Kerala	156.49	59	297	--	297
9	Madhya Pradesh	725.63	4209	22058	--	40639
10	Maharashtra	287.49	868	3336	3062	3294
11	Orissa	138.77	720	5892	1440	2573
12	Tamil Nadu	216.26	406	935	1771	--
13	Uttar Pradesh	813.58	5883	5251	6467	37837
14	West Bengal	158.96	--	11077	--	--
15	Rajasthan	122.27	--	8760	--	752
16	Jharkhand	77.31	919	1215	--	1139
17	Uttaranchal	30.88	251	494	130	847
18	Chhattisgarh	202.79	1152	5573	--	11339
	Total	4714.13	23201	75812	26572	126431

**Statement indicating the progress made under the
District Primary Education Programme (DPEP)
upto 31.3.2002**

Sl. No.	Project State	No. of Block Resource Centres functional	No. of Cluster Resource Centres functional	Civil Works completed and in progress			
				No. of New School Buildings	No. of Additional classrooms	Toilet facilities provided	Drinking Water facilities provided
1	Andhra Pradesh*	990	5664	8463	14691	803	
2	Assam	56		1426	1375	2126	1
3	Bihar	152	1894	658	1114	1035	
4	Gujarat	55	482	253	346	859	
5	Haryana	55	544	377	1568	4439	1
6	Himachal Pradesh	33	230	787	21	486	
7	Karnataka	112	1206	1032	176	791	
8	Kerala	55	627	268	1056	469	
9	Madhya Pradesh	236	4325	16550	4548	0	
10	Maharashtra	73	189	873	2060	4416	29
11	Orissa	170	885	990	778	1240	
12	Tamil Nadu	106	1023	0	1785	2006	20
13	Uttar Pradesh	645	6365	8118	10637	20527	35
14	West Bengal**	326	324	703	1619	0	
15	Rajasthan	132	1041	616	1098	3998	13
16	Chhattisgarh	134	1949	1278	661	0	
17	Jharkhand	55	476	423	768	281	4
18	Uttaranchal	38	280	233	118	749	
	Total	3423	27504	43048	44419	44225	173

* Andhra Pradesh has Mandal Resource Centres & Teacher Centres in place of Block Resource Centres (BRCs) / Cluster Resource Centres (CRCs)

** West Bengal has Circle Resource Centres (CLRCs) in place of BRCs/CRCs.

Summary of AWP & B for 2002-03 in respect of DPEP States and National Component

(Rs. In lakhs)

S.No	State	Phase	Spillover from previous year	Fresh activities	Total (Spillover + Fresh activities)	Reference (Appendix No.)
1	ASSAM	Phase - I	544.73	3055.45	3600.18	Appendix - I
		Phase - II	438.96	4227.93	4666.89	
2	KERALA	Phase - I	117.12	834.88	952.00	Appendix - II
		Phase - II	468.51	1600.94	2069.45	
3	HARYANA	Phase - I				Appendix - III
		Phase - II				
4	KARNATAKA	Phase - I	737.86	2097.15	2835.01	Appendix - IV
		Phase - II	1820.26	2326.74	4147.00	
5	MAHARASHTRA	Phase - I	4102.80	3800.96	7903.76	Appendix - V
		Phase - II	1832.45	3349.80	5182.25	
6	TAMIL NADU	Phase - I	915.89	1406.96	2322.85	Appendix - VI
		Phase - II	374.07	1057.70	1431.77	
7	MADHYA PRADESH	Phase - I	6025.14	6930.64	12955.78	Appendix - VII
		Phase - II	1815.87	4607.17	6423.04	
8	CHHATTISGARH	Phase - I	650.00	1729.66	2379.66	Appendix - VIII
		Phase - II	443.00	1193.29	1636.29	
9	HIMACHAL PRADESH	Phase - II	768.79	2525.02	3293.81	Appendix - IX
10	ORISSA	Phase - I				Appendix - X
		Phase - II				
11	GUJARAT	Phase - II	317.42	2821.86	3139.28	Appendix - XI
		Expn.	648.17	2638.71	3286.88	
12	ANDHRA PRADESH	Phase - II	1228.75	9227.14	10455.89	Appendix - XII
		AEPF	2908.64	19369.25	22277.89	
13	WEST BENGAL	DPEP - II Expn.				Appendix - XIII
14	UTTAR PRADESH	UP-DPEP-II	650.44	13948.04	14598.48	Appendix - XIV
		UP-DPEP-III	3951.57	24110.11	28061.68	
15	UTTARANCHAL	UP-DPEP-III	420.70	2219.94	2640.64	Appendix - XV
16	BIHAR	DPEP-III	3498.15	9751.21	13249.36	Appendix - XVI
17	JHARKHAND	DPEP-III				Appendix - XVII
18	RAJASTHAN	DPEP-IV	2204.99	8687.13	10892.12	Appendix - XVIII
		Expn.	1879.31	8738.96	10618.27	
19	Ed.CIL	DPEP-I				Appendix - XIX
20	NSDART	DPEP-I				Appendix - XX
21	NCERT	DPEP-I				Appendix - XXI
22	NIEPA	DPEP-I				Appendix - XXII
23	IGNOU	DPEP-II				Appendix - XXIII
Total			38763.59	142256.84	181020.23	

Appraisals notes in respect of Haryana, Jharkhand, West Bengal, Orissa and National Component would follow

DPEP – Assam

Annual Work Plan & Budget (AWP & B) for 2002 - 03

I. Introduction

DPEP was launched in Assam in four districts – Darrang, Dhubri, Morigaon and Karbi Anglong under Phase-I in 1994 and in five districts – Barpeta, Bongaigaon, Goalpara, Sonitpur and Kokrajhar – under Phase-II in 1996. The EFC approved project of DPEP-I, when initially approved, was Rs. 12951.16 lakhs and DPEP-II Rs 15633.43 lakhs. The EFC approved cost for Phase I has since been revised to Rs 16227.62 lakhs.

The cumulative expenditure of DPEP-I upto 31.3.2002 was Rs. 11864.53 lakhs, which is 91% of the original project cost and 73% of the revised cost. In case of DPEP-II, the total cumulative expenditure upto 31.3.2002 was Rs. 10985.71 lakhs. This was 70% of the project cost.

II. Progress during 2001-2002

The major achievements of the programme during the financial year 2001-02 are as follows:

- A. **Expenditure:** During the financial year 2001-02, Rs. 18.39 crores have been spent by DPEP, Assam for various interventions in the Phase I against the budget provision of Rs. 28.32 Crores, which works out to 65%. In the phase II districts the total expenditure last year was Rs 25.26 crores against a total plan outlay of Rs 40.21 Crores, i.e. 63% of the outlay.
- B. **Teacher Training:** 11337 primary school teachers in Phase I and 15378 primary school teachers of Phase II were trained on various aspects like multigrade teaching, whole school approach methodology, joyful teaching-learning method, etc for at least 10 days each.
- C. **VEC Members Training:** There are 3777 Village Education Committees in the Phase I districts and 5607 in Phase II. All the members of each VEC have been oriented on new teaching-learning methodology, preparation of School Development Programme and role of VEC in educational development of school.
- D. **Functioning of BRC & CRC:** Resource Centres in all the 27 educational blocks have been formed in Phase I along with a total of 418 Cluster Level Resource Centres. Similarly in Phase II, Resource Centres in each of the 29 educational blocks have been formed along with 585 Cluster Level Resource Centres. These centers are functioning effectively for all round development of primary education in blocks and clusters.
- E. **AS Centres:** To cover hitherto uncovered areas, 1302 Alternative School Centres have been opened in the DPEP-I districts and 1088 centres in DPEP-II districts which have been functioning well during the year. The VECs have been made solely responsible for running the centres. In addition to these AS Centres, 57 Moktabs in Phase I and 54 in Phase II have been converted into AS Centres and have been functioning well imparting teaching learning to girl children of Muslim Community.
- F. **ECE:** To prepare the children of age group 3-5 years, DPEP Assam has opened 1009 Early Childhood Education Centres in the four DPEP-I districts and 1428 centres in DPEP-II districts. Evaluation studies have also been conducted during the year to know the knowledge base of the learners of ECE centres joining primary school. It has been observed that children with ECE background are doing well in comparison to their counterparts in school having no ECE background.
- G. **Supply of Resource Materials for teachers and Resource group members and workbook to all students:** Resource materials, comprising of lessons of text book & teacher handbook for class III & IV, were prepared by DPEP, Assam in collaboration with SCERT and supplied to all teachers and Resource Group members at District, Block and Cluster Level. Resource materials on class I & II are presently under trial. Students' workbook for class III & IV have also been prepared and supplied free of cost to all students of nine DPEP districts. In addition to the above,

the learning books to be used in the multi grade and single teacher schools have been distributed in the selected single and multi grade schools.

- H. **Strengthening of SCERT, Assam Textbook Production Corporation, DIET, and SIE:** The SCERT, Assam has been supplied with computer system and personnel as an effort to strengthen the organisation. ASTPPC, SIE & DIET have also been supplied with computers. The personnel/Faculties of SCERT, DIET and SIE were also sent to various national level training for building their capacity.
- I. **Civil works:** There is a huge backlog in the civil works in the State. 1960 items of work are still under progress and 272 have not started at all. The progress under civil works is as follow:

DPEP Phase-I

SL. NO.	ACTIVITY	TARGET	WORK STARTED	WORK COMPLETED	WORK IN PROGRESS	WORK NOT STARTED
1	BRC	25	25	19	6	0
2	CRC	353	341	304	37	12
3	EX. SCHOOL	527	517	414	103	10
4	ADDL. CLASSROOM	145	117	112	5	28
5	REPAIRING	290	235	229	6	55
6	TOILET	588	587	531	56	1
7	ECE CENTRE	106	106	106	0	0
8	CHAR SCHOOL	26	26	26	0	0
9	70 BEDDED HOSTEL	4	4	3	1	0
10	RESIDENTIAL SCHOOL	4	3	0	3	1
11	URC	2	2	2	0	0
12	ADDL. WORK FOR BRC AND SBH	5	5	5	0	0
	TOTAL	2075	1968	1751	217	107

DPEP Phase-II

SL. NO.	ACTIVITY	TARGET	WORK STARTED	WORK COMPLETED	WORK IN PROGRESS	WORK NOT STARTED
1	BRC	29	27	13	14	2
2	CRC/ADDL. CLASSROOM	729	722	362	360	7
3	EX. SCHOOL	345	337	81	256	8
4	REPAIRING	1489	1448	861	587	41
5	TOILET	844	820	484	336	24
6	70 BEDDED HOSTEL	5	4	2	2	1
7	DRINKING WATER FACILITIES	1006	924	736	188	82
	TOTAL	4447	4282	2539	1743	165

III. Proposed AWP & B 2002-2003

This being the last year of the project, the State has adopted the approach of block-level plans which have been then combined into district plans. This has helped in each block trying to take a

stock of the interventions already taken and suggest the most effective steps to be taken in the last year of the project. The household survey data collected last year has been taken as an important input in the planning process. Some of the interventions proposed are:

- 2002-03 being the ultimate year of the project, thrust has been upon the consolidation of interventions that have been undertaken and evaluation of interventions so that a clear acceptable model emerged in the field. The objectives of the plan exercise this year is as follows:
 - Coverage of unserved areas by providing schooling facilities
 - Bringing of children to formal schools by conducting short-term and long-term bridge courses in already served areas
 - Mainstreaming of moderately disabled children
 - Professional growth of teachers and upgradation of their efficiency
 - Systematization of academic monitoring and support
 - Thrust upon language development in Grade I
 - Activization of pupil evaluation
- Consolidation efforts involve gradation of schools, gradation of teachers and pupils continuous assessment.
- To upgrade the low-grade schools, emphasis would be on frequent visits by block level and district level coordinators, analysis of teacher's diary, holding of regular unit tests and their analysis and holding of teachers' self promotion test.
- To strengthen the pupil evaluation system, the State proposes to hold uniform unit test. Question Bank would be prepared centrally, while the CRCs would design and print unit test papers in their clusters. Analysis of performances would be an important input for further localized interventions. Parents' involvement would be brought in through printing and supply of children achievement card.
- An Early Language Development Programme would be undertaken on an experimental basis in selected schools.
- The unserved habitations would be covered by opening of Alternative schools under the EGS pattern. The EGS norms would be followed, with the community engaging village volunteers to run the school. These centres would have evaluation of learners' achievement by BACG members.
- In the served areas the State proposes to bring unenrolled and dropped out children through bridge courses. For the 5-7 age group children, short-term bridge courses are planned while for the 8-12 year age group a long-term bridge course has been proposed
- The head teacher of the nearest schools would give constant support to the academic coordinator.
- To strengthen the ECP component, the regular teachers would be given training on Ka-sreni intervention.
- For disabled children, the State would organize medical camps to identify the aids & appliances required and degree of disability. Readiness centres would be opened in habitations having more than 8 children, where the children will be trained for 5 months and then enrolled in formal schools
- Since the earlier VECs have been dissolved, and the new ones are being constituted with GP/Ward member as the president, the State proposes orientation of reconstituted VEC members and new local body members.
- Need based training of teachers would be done for quality improvement. Gradation of schools have been done and schools graded into three categories. Similarly, teachers, alternative schools and ECE centres have also been graded. The gradation would be reviewed every three months.

The total amount proposed by the State, district-wise, is as follows:

PROPOSED PLAN TILL JUNE 2003

(Rs lakhs)

State/District	AWP & B 2002-03	AWP & B April 2003 to June 2003	Total April 2002 to June 2003
DPEP-I			
Darrang	925.96	81.74	1007.70
Dhubri	948.80	93.40	1042.20
Morigaon	878.90	76.55	955.45
Karbi Anglong	1212.20	95.82	1308.02
State Component-I	101.99	0.00	101.99
Total	4067.86	347.51	4415.36
DPEP-II			
Barpeta	1122.04	89.39	1211.43
Bongaigaon	898.06	74.51	972.57
Goalpara	932.04	69.12	1001.17
Kokrajhar	924.05	76.40	1000.45
Sonitpur	1287.05	91.17	1378.21
State-II	383.24	26.72	409.96
Total	5546.47	427.31	5973.78
Grand Total	9614.33	774.82	10389.15

IV. Appraisal Process:

In keeping with the process of decentralisation in DPEP, the appraisal of AWP & B had been delegated to the state. Teams constituted by the state appraised the AWP & B for 2002-2003. EE Bureau and TSG conducted sample review of two districts - Darrang from DPEP-I and Bongaigaon from DPEP-II - and also appraised the state component plan of DPEP-I and II.

V. Changes recommended in the Plan on appraisal:

(i) Certain items in the Plan are found to be ineligible in the two districts appraised on a sample basis. These are as follows:

		(Rs lakhs)		
District	Item	Prop.	Recom.	Reasons
Darrang	Printing of teachers' diary	0.638	0	Not covered under the guidelines
	Printing of CRCC's diary	0.016	0	Not covered under the guidelines
	School development fund	3.43	0	Not covered under the guidelines
Bongaigaon	Printing of teachers' diary	0.44	0	Not covered under the guidelines
	Printing of CRCCs diary	0.15	0	Not covered under the guidelines
	School development fund	2.31	0	Not covered under the guidelines

(ii) Since the proposed Annual Plan was exceeding the EFC amount in most of the districts and also in some of the components like civil works or management, the State was asked to give its priority based on which decision could be taken to reduce the amount to EFC limits. The State accordingly, send a list of items which were of lesser priority and could be removed. After removing these non-priority and ineligible items, the total plan size is as follows:

MODIFIED PLAN TILL JUNE 2003

(Rs lakhs)

State/District	AWP & B 2002-03	AWP & B April 2003 to June 2003	Total April 2002 to June 2003
DPEP-I			
Darrang	821.53	81.74	903.27
Dhubri	862.00	93.40	955.40
Morigaon	789.71	76.55	866.26
Karbi Anglong	901.25	95.82	997.07
State Component-I	101.99	0.00	101.99
Total	3476.49	347.51	3824.00
DPEP-II			
Barpeta	999.50	89.39	1088.89
Bongaigaon	798.90	74.51	873.41
Goalpara	834.36	69.12	903.48
Kokrajhar	846.72	76.40	923.12
Sonitpur	1100.29	91.17	1191.46
State-II	383.24	26.72	409.96
Total	4963.00	427.31	5390.31
Grand Total	8439.49	774.82	9214.31

(iii) Even after deleting all the items which the State Government stated as non-priority, the plan size still takes both the overall cumulative expenditure and also expenditure under management in some cases over the limits prescribed by the EFC. This is visible from the following table:

State/Dist	EFC Cost	6% of EFC Cost	Cumulative total expenditure till June 2003	Cumulative Mangt expenditure till June 2003	Amount by which Total Exp exceeds EFC limit	Amount by which Mangt exp exceeds 6% of EFC limit
DPEP - I						
Darrang	4028.37	241.70	3978.66	211.49	In limits	In limits
Morigaon	3859.88	231.59	4031.27	141.53	254.86	In limits
Karbi Anglong	3519.47	211.17	3362.94	179.35	In limits	In limits
Dhubri	3776.41	226.58	3248.34	207.90	In limits	In limits
State Component I	1043.49	62.61	1067.31	302.68	23.82	
Total	16227.62	973.65	15688.53	1042.94	In limits	69.29
DPEP - II						
Barpeta	3272.80	162.32	3329.51	165.11	56.71	2.79
Bongaigaon	2711.03	153.09	2794.05	128.53	83.02	In limits
Goalpara	2528.84	142.91	2798.75	141.13	269.91	In limits
Kokrajhar	2687.98	145.33	3044.58	147.07	356.60	1.74
Sonitpur	3138.27	151.04	3151.97	137.82	13.70	In limits
State Component II	1294.51	176.73	1257.17	346.16	In limits	
Total	15633.43	931.42	16376.02	1065.81	742.59	134.39
Grand Total	31861.05	1905.07	32064.55	2108.75		

iv) Accordingly, where the State has exceeded the limits, the total amount has been reduced. The items under which the reduction should take place can be left to the State. The Plan size after reduction would be as follows:

RECOMMENDED PLAN SIZE TILL JUNE 2003

State/District	AWP & B 2002-03	AWP & B April 2003 to June 2003	Total April 2002 to June 2003
DPEP-I			
Darrang	821.53	81.74	903.27
Dhubri	662.00	38.54	700.54
Morigaon	789.71	76.55	866.26
Karbi Anglong	901.25	95.82	997.07
State Component-I	78.17	0.00	78.17
Total	3252.67	292.65	3545.31
DPEP II			
Barpeta	942.79	89.39	1032.18
Bongaigaon	715.88	74.51	790.39
Goalpara	594.36	39.21	633.57
Kokrajhar	516.72	49.80	566.52
Sonitpur	1086.59	91.17	1177.76
State-II	383.24	26.72	409.96
Total	4239.58	370.80	4610.38
Grand Total	7492.25	663.45	8155.69

v) Following comments may be added while approving the plan:

- a) The State should carry out similar reduction in the ineligible items mentioned in (i) above in other districts also, as done above in case of Darrang and Bongaigaon.
- b) The State may send revised plan after reducing the plan size to the figures indicated above.

VI. Additional Comments:

- The cumulative total expenditure for both the Phases is within the EFC cost after revision of the Plan size on appraisal as seen in Table II. However, the items of reduction as stated in Para V (iv) above, is left to the State which should ensure that plans are revised accordingly and no expenditure beyond the permissible limit occurs.
- The expenditure on civil engineering is within the 33.33% limit as seen from Table III. However, the expenditure is above the 24% limit and the State needs to satisfy two conditions to go to the 33.33% limit. The State satisfies one of the conditions of spending more than 50% on civil works-management allocations. But the second condition of having an infrastructure plan for each district is still being done and a detailed infrastructure survey is underway. So the increased civil works limit can be approved subject to the detailed infrastructure plan being ready.
- The management cost after revision is within the 6% limit as seen from Table IV. Under the originally proposed plan, management cost was exceeding this limit for both Phase I and II overall and also for Kokrajhar. So the amounts have been reduced from each district to bring the management cost within the limit. The exact items for reduction is left to the State.

VII. Approval of AWP & B

The Project Board may approve the revised Plan prepared as in Table I subject to the comments mentioned in Para V and VI above.

TABLE I

SUMMARY STATEMENT OF AWP & B 2002-03

(Rs lakhs)

State/ District	Approved AWP & B 2001-02	Reappro- priated	Revised plan size	Exp. during 2001-02	Saving 2001-02	Spill over to 2002-03	Fresh Proposal 2002-03	Total AWP & B 2002- 03	AWP & B 4/03- 6/03
EP-I									
Arrang	555.95	0.00	555.95	460.87	95.08	3.03	818.50	821.53	81.74
Bubri	413.44	0.00	413.44	389.89	23.55	14.67	647.33	662.00	93.40
Prigaom	583.93	0.00	583.93	307.45	276.48	145.55	644.16	789.71	76.55
Arbi Mong Mouza	1224.33	0.00	1224.33	643.57	580.76	381.48	519.78	901.25	95.82
Component-I	54.67	0.00	54.67	37.46	17.21	0.00	78.17	78.17	0.00
Total	2832.32	0.00	2832.32	1839.24	993.07	544.73	2707.94	3252.67	347.51
EP-II									
Patna	805.31	0.00	805.31	504.14	301.17	117.54	825.25	942.79	89.39
Baggaon	635.00	0.00	635.00	440.54	194.46	65.95	649.94	715.88	74.51
Alpara	539.49	0.00	539.49	394.16	145.33	54.79	539.57	594.36	69.12
Krajhar	627.60	0.00	627.60	527.14	100.46	54.32	462.40	516.72	76.40
Titpur	1006.48	0.00	1006.48	477.90	528.58	146.36	940.24	1086.59	91.17
Se-II	407.21	0.00	407.21	182.15	225.06	0.00	383.24	383.24	26.72
Total	4021.08	0.00	4021.08	2526.03	1495.06	438.96	3800.62	4239.58	427.31
Grand Total	6853.40	0.00	6853.40	4365.27	2488.13	983.69	6508.56	7492.25	774.82

TABLE II
ANALYSIS OF TOTAL EXPENDITURE

(Rs lakhs)

State/Dist	EFC Cost	Cumulative Expd. Till 31/3/2002	AWP & B 2002-03	AWP & B Apr to Jun 2003	Cum exp till 30th June 2003	Whether EFC limit exceeded
Darrang	4028.37	3075.39	821.53	81.74	3978.66	No
Morigaon	3776.41	3075.87	662.00	38.54	3776.41	No
Karbi Anglong	3859.88	2496.68	789.71	76.55	3362.94	No
Dhubri	3519.47	2251.27	901.25	95.82	3248.34	No
State Component I	1043.49	965.32	78.17	0.00	1043.49	No
Total	16227.62	11864.53	3252.67	292.65	15409.84	No
Barpeta	3272.80	2240.62	942.79	89.39	3272.80	No
Bongaigaon	2711.03	1920.64	715.88	74.51	2711.03	No
Goalpara	2528.84	1895.27	594.36	39.21	2528.84	No
Kokrajhar	2687.98	2121.46	516.72	49.80	2687.98	No
Sonitpur	3138.27	1960.51	1086.59	91.17	3138.27	No
State-II	1294.51	847.21	383.24	26.72	1257.17	No
Total	15633.43	10985.71	4239.58	370.80	15596.09	No
Grand Total	31861.05	22850.24	7492.25	663.45	31005.93	

TABLE III

ANALYSIS OF CIVIL WORKS BUDGET 2002-03

(Rs lakhs)

State District	EFC Cost	33.3% of EFC Cost on Original EFC Cost	Cumulative Expenditure till 31/3/2002	Spill Over of 2001- 02	Fresh Proposal for 2002- 03	Proposal for April to June,2003	Cumulative exp till June 2003	Whether 33% of EFC limit exceeded
DPEP-I								
State-I	1043.49	301.04	73.75	0.00	0.00	0.00	73.75	No
Darrang	4028.37	1046.18	779.72	6.42	260.04	0.00	1046.18	No
Dhubri	3776.41	1001.21	718.16	15.80	267.24	0.00	1001.21	No
Dorigaon	3859.88	973.28	681.38	12.84	279.06	0.00	973.28	No
Garbi	3519.47	991.10	481.56	349.01	160.47	0.00	991.03	No
Anglong								
Phase-I Total	16227.62	4312.80	2734.57	384.07	966.81	0.00	4085.45	No
PEP II								
State-II	1294.51	431.07	7.66	22.91	41.00	0.00	71.57	No
Arpela	3272.80	1089.84	656.19	113.57	320.08	0.00	1089.84	No
Bongaigaon	2711.03	902.77	585.36	62.43	254.97	0.00	902.76	No
Balpara	2528.84	842.10	532.01	37.20	247.66	0.00	816.87	No
Bokrajhar	2687.98	895.10	585.26	52.95	256.88	0.00	895.09	No
Chitpur	3138.27	1045.04	594.15	141.13	309.76	0.00	1045.04	No
Phase-II Total	15633.43	5205.93	2960.63	430.19	1430.35	0.00	4821.16	No
Grand total	31861.05	9518.73	5695.20	814.26	2397.15	0.00	8906.61	No

TABLE IV

STATEMENT OF MANAGEMENT COST

									(Rs lakhs)
State/Dist	EFC Cost	6% of EFC Cost	Cumulative Expd. Till 31/3/02	Fresh Proposal for 2002-03	Spill over from 2001-02	Cumulative total till 31/3/2003	Fresh Proposal for 2003(April to June)	Total Up to 30th June 2003	Whether 6% of EFC limit exceeded
DPEP-I									
Darrang	4028.370	241.70	176.73	17.59	0.00	194.33	3.31	197.63	No
Morigaon	3859.880	231.59	114.28	10.02	0.00	124.30	3.38	127.67	No
Karbi Anglong	3519.470	211.17	140.55	19.72	0.00	160.27	5.22	165.49	No
Dhubri	3776.410	226.58	172.50	18.46	0.00	190.95	3.09	194.04	No
State Component I	1043.490	62.61	269.22	10.00	9.60	288.82	0.00	288.82	
Total	16227.620	973.65	873.28	75.79	9.60	958.66	14.99	973.65	No
DPEP-II									
Barpeta	3272.800	162.32	121.15	16.91	0.00	138.06	4.65	142.71	No
Bongaigaon	2711.030	153.09	93.50	10.42	0.00	103.92	2.21	106.13	No
Goalpara	2528.840	142.91	102.84	13.26	0.00	116.10	2.63	118.73	No
Kokrajhar	2687.980	145.33	104.11	16.85	0.00	120.97	3.71	124.67	No
Sonitpur	3138.270	151.04	98.34	10.00	3.68	112.02	3.40	115.42	No
State II	1294.510	176.73	265.24	30.00	16.55	311.79	11.97	323.76	
Total	15633.430	931.42	785.18	97.44	20.23	902.86	28.57	931.42	No
Grand Total	31861.050	1905.07	1658.46	173.23	29.83	1861.52	43.55	1905.07	

DPEP- KERALA

ANNUAL WORK PLAN & BUDGET (AWP&B) for 2002-03

I. Introduction:

DPEP was launched in Kerala in three districts – Kasargod, Malappuram and Wayanad under Phase – I (1994-2003) and in another three districts – Palakkad, Idukki and Trivandrum – under Phase-II (1996-2003). The EFC approved project cost of DPEP-I is Rs. 9448.83 lakh and DPEP-II Rs. 9498.53 lakh. The closing date for both DPEP I&II is on 30.6.2003.

The cumulative expenditure of DPEP-I upto 31.3.2002 was Rs. 8453.86 lakh, which is 92% of the project cost. The approved AWP&B for 2001-02 was Rs. 1858.85 lakh of which Rs. 864.68 lakh was spent.

In case of DPEP-II, the total cumulative expenditure upto 31.3.2002 was Rs. 7194.95 lakh which is 76% of the project cost. The approved AWP&B for 2001-02 was Rs. 2980.78 lakh of which Rs. 1431.45 lakh was spent.

II. Progress during 2001-02:

i. Pedagogical interventions:

During 2001-02 the major pedagogic activities undertaken were:

- A visioning workshop was conducted for developing strategies for teacher training and preparation of module for Kinginikkottam
- Training to State Resource Group members on teacher training module
- State level inauguration of Kinginikkottam at Malappuram
- The children's material, teachers handbook and English teacher companion were refined and supplied to all children and teachers

ii. Access

A 5 day residential workshop was conducted for the preparation and standardisation of Self Learning Materials in Malayalam, Mathematics and EVS for Std. III & IV. 'Thudi' (reference book) for instructors was printed and distributed to MGLC/ AS Instructors.

iii. Girls' education:

Scripts for TV spots for creating public awareness were prepared and module for teacher training on gender aspects was prepared.

iv. Integrated Education for Disabled (IED):

- A novel programme, Sayantana Vedi Camps, were organised in the evening on weekends and holidays for children with special needs and their parents i) to improve the learning achievement of disabled children through remedial practices, ii) to address behavioural problems of learners and iii) to give guidance to parents in home-school convergence practices and help disabled children.
- 165 resource teachers – 3 each in all the 55 blocks – were trained and placed in BRCs.
- Teachers were given special training to identify disabled children with the help of revised checklists. In all 15793 disabled children were identified in the survey held in all the 55 blocks.
- Teacher Hand Books in 8 volumes, developed for classroom transactions with special focus on various categories of disabled children in regular school system, were printed and distributed to all teachers.
- Evolved computer assisted education for hearing impaired children in association with the National Institute of Speech and Hearing (NISH).

v. Early Childhood Care & Education (ECCE):

Two studies – one on the role of Anganwadi workers and another on status of pre-school education - were completed. Developed a module for training of Anganwadi helpers.

vi. Distance education:

The highlight of activities under the Distance Education Programme during the year was the operationalisation of interactive educational website – www.keralaprimaryeducation.org.

vii. Research and Evaluation:

In all, 14 studies initiated.

viii. Management Information System (MIS)

Developed a software that generates financial statements and registers.

ix. Educational Indicators:

Year	Schools	Classrooms	Teachers	Students	PTR
1999-2000	3555	30147	30019	8.15 lakh	27
2000-2001	3569	25106	27562	8.08 lakh	29
2001-2002	3569	25094	27571	8.08 lakh	29

Year	Class I Enrol.	% of girls	Repetition Rate	Av school size	Av class size
1999-2000	1.86 lakh	49%	4%	229	27
2000-2001	1.87 lakh	49%	4%	227	32
2001-2002	1.87 lakh	49%	4%	227	32

DISE:2000-01

III. Planning Processes:

The plans have been prepared through a participatory process with emphasis on consultative and decentralised planning. A large number of people - both official and non-official - at all levels have been involved with the planning process. A special feature of the planning process is that an attempt has been made to derive the vision at the school level.

The process of preparing AWP&B began with the formulation and review of the School Education Plan by the School Support Group (SSG), PTAs, MTAs, teachers, PRI members and members of grassroot level organisation in all schools. This led to preparation of village plan. Village plans were consolidated into the block plan after modification, prioritisation and finalisation. Plans were then reviewed and consolidated at the district level. The plans have taken into consideration findings of micro planning exercise, EMIS reports and research studies.

IV. Focus on AWP&B 2002-03:

As 2002-03 is the terminal year of the programme, the focus of initiatives and activities during 2002-03 will be on consolidating strategies, interventions and achievements and sustaining the gains.

- **Alternative Schooling:** To transform Alternative Schools into more child friendly, local specific and socially relevant centres of learning. The major proposed activities under alternative schooling includes survey and evaluation of Alternative Schools, finalisation of self-learning materials in

Tamil for Std. I to IV and publication of collection of folk songs and stories generated in the alternative schools.

- **Pedagogical interventions:** The focus in pedagogical interventions will be to consolidate all ongoing initiatives in the area – Kinginikkottam, Kalari, Ente Kuttikal, development of TLM, pedagogy park etc. Major activities proposed during the year are documentation of activities and interventions in pedagogical renovation and in developing teacher support material for teachers teaching Arabic.
- **Community Mobilization:** Orientation of people's representatives at Panchayat/ municipality for better dissemination of ideas at grassroots level. It is also proposed to develop material on good practices in PRI's, which will be printed and distributed among the stakeholders.
- **Civil works:** To complete all civil works.
- **ECCE:** Training for pre-primary teachers in joyful learning.
- **IED:** Learning Assessment Programme (LAP) for the disabled children will be one of the main activities this year.
- **Distance Education:** Training to teacher trainers and teachers in Computer/Internet education to enhance their capabilities in the optimum use of information technology tool.

V. Appraisal report:

In keeping with the process of decentralization in DPEP, the appraisal of AWP&B, had been delegated to Kerala. The DPEP Bureau and TSG carried out sample review of two districts – Wayanad from DPEP-I and Palakkad from DPEP-II. The state component plans of DPEP-I & II were also reviewed. The observations were conveyed to the state and their views were taken into consideration while preparing the appraisal note.

After reappraising the plans, DPEP-Kerala agreed to the following:

- The expenses on transportation and cooking mid-day meal for children in alternative schools will not be charged to the programme in Palakkad and other DPEP districts.
- The EFC cost of Malappuram and Palakkad will be restricted to Rs. 367.66 lakh and Rs. 471.37 lakh respectively, so that the outlays in these districts do not exceed the EFC outlay.
- Regarding the excess management cost in all the districts barring Trivandrum, the state assured that the discrepancies would be sorted out within 2-3 months.

VI. Comments and Observations:

a) General

- **Decline in enrolment:** The state should probe into the reported decline in number of classrooms and stagnation in enrolment.
- **Pedagogical Improvement:** While documenting pedagogical improvement processes in DPEP as proposed in the plan, efforts should also be made to review these activities. Linkages with SSA has not been explained in plan and the plan could have presented an overall futuristic vision in pedagogical improvement.
- **Media:** The emphasis in media appears to be only on production of films, public meeting and panel discussion and organizing exhibition and workshops, instead of multi media strategy to project activities and to improve visibility.
- **IED:** The total proposed outlay for IED in the state component plan I and II (Rs. 179.34 lakh) appears to be on high side and therefore it may be reduced.
- **Distance Education:** The optimum utilisation of the interactive website is to be ensured.
- **Girls' education:** A separate teacher training module on gender is proposed, instead of converging it with the regular teacher training. In the state plan, under the Intervention on girls' education, an outlay of Rs. 30,000/- has been proposed for training girls to ride cycles and Rs. 72,000/- for procurement of 60 cycles. This activity could be covered under the Innovation project.
- **EFC Cost:** The total anticipated expenditure for both DPEP-I & II is well within the approved EFC cost, after restricting the proposal for Malappuram and Palakkad.
- **Civil works:** The civil works budgets of districts could be enhanced to 33.3% of the EFC approved cost only if conditionalities for enhancement are met. The districts of Wayanad and Idukki propose to cross their original EFC approved ceiling, although they are well within 33.33% of the overall project costs. As this is the last year of programme implementation, districts should put in efforts to ensure that targets are met in the beginning of the current year itself.
- **Management cost:** Barring Trivandrum, the management cost has already crossed or will cross the 6% ceiling on project cost with the proposal for 2002-03 in all districts in Kerala. It should be limited to the ceiling of 6% of the EFC cost. If there were any misclassification in the booking of management expenditure, DPEP Kerala may rectify

it and rework the management expenditure. This point had been raised in the audit conducted by Director General of Audit Central Revenue, and the state had agreed to sort out the discrepancies within 2-3 months.

- **State share:** As on 31.3.2002, state share of Rs. 9.39 crore is pending for both DPEP I and II.
 - **Expenditure in non-DPEP districts:** No expenditure has been incurred so far, as against the outlay of Rs. 2840.71 lakh earmarked for 8 non-DPEP districts, to carry out DPEP activities, out of savings in DPEP-I. Rs. 10 crore had been released to the state for DPEP work in these non-DPEP districts.
- b) **Palakkad district:** A unit cost of Rs. 35/- per child has been proposed for supply of free textbooks to girls of standard 2 whereas the unit cost of Rs. 20/- per child has been proposed for the free supply of textbooks to SC/ST students of Class-II. Since, both the students are issued with the same textbooks the unit cost of Rs. 35/- proposed for girls students should be reduced to Rs. 20/- per child.

VI. Appraisal of AWP&B:

- The abstract of AWP&B for 2002-2003 and analysis of expenditure, civil works cost and management cost are given in Table I to IV.
- The AWP&B for 2002-03 for DPEP-I is Rs. 952 lakh, including spill over of Rs. 117.12 lakh and fresh proposals of Rs. 834.88 lakh.
- The AWP&B for 2002-03 for DPEP-II is Rs. 2069.45 lakh, including spill over of Rs. 468.51 lakh and fresh proposals of Rs. 1600.94 lakh.
- The AWP&B for 2002-03 for DPEP-I and DPEP-II of Kerala may be approved by the Project Board, subject to the comments and observations in para V and VI above.

Table-I

DPEP-Kerala
Abstract of AWP&B 2002-03

(Rs. in lakhs)

State/ Districts	AWP&B 2001-02	Expenditure 2001-02	Spill over to 2002-03	Fresh proposal	AWP&B 2002-03
1	2	3	4	5	4+5=6
DPEP-I					
Kasargod	542.59	255.33	14.36	251.04	265.40
Malapuram	689.82	322.09	8.79	358.87	367.66
Wayanad	407.78	245.78	46.54	113.32	159.86
State	218.66	41.48	47.43	111.65	159.08
Total	1858.85	864.68	117.12	834.88	952.00
DPEP – II					
Idukki	850.16	516.71	132.65	599.06	731.71
Palakkad	766.22	374.76	185.16	286.21	471.37
Trivandrum	901.68	379.78	112.50	474.62	587.12
State	462.72	160.20	38.20	241.05	279.25
Total	2980.78	1431.45	468.51	1600.94	2069.45

DPEP-Kerala
Analysis of Expenditure in DPEP I & II
AWP&B 2002-03

(Rs. in lakh)

State/District	EFC approved project cost	Cum. Expend. upto 31.03.02	AWP&B 2002-03	Total anticipated exp. upto 31.3.2003	Whether EFC limit crossed
1	2	3	4	5 (3+4)	6
DPEP-I					
Kasargod	2478.29	2191.03	265.40	2456.43	No
Malapuram	4435.70	4067.97	367.66	4435.63	No
Wayanad	1514.89	1352.39	159.86	1512.25	No
State	1019.95	842.47	159.08	1001.55	No
Total	9448.83	8453.86	952.00	9405.86	No
DPEP - II					
Idukki	2291.06	1556.48	731.71	2288.19	No
Palakkad	3058.46	2587.06	471.37	3058.43	No
Trivandrum	3132.61	2515.42	587.12	3102.54	No
State	1016.40	535.99	279.25	815.24	No
Total	9498.53	7194.95	2069.45	9264.40	No

Table-III

DPEP-Kerala: AWP&B 2002-03
Analysis of Civil Works Cost

(Rs. in lakhs)

State/ District	EFC approved cost	33.33% of EFC cost	Cum. Civil works expend upto 31.03.02	Civil Works for 2002-03	Total antcp. exp. upto 31.3.2003	Whether 33.33% ceiling crossed
1	2	3	4	5	6=4+5	7
DPEP-I						
Alappuzha	2478.29	826.01	552.29	14.12	566.41	No
Idukki	4435.70	1478.42	950.98	1.85	952.83	No
Kannur	1514.89	504.91	349.70	39.25	388.95	No
Kozhikode	1019.95	339.95	0.00	0.00	0.00	No
Total	9448.83	3149.30	1852.97	55.22	1908.19	No
DPEP - II						
Alappuzha	2291.06	763.61	462.53	203.31	665.84	No
Idukki	3058.46	1019.38	551.01	165.05	716.06	No
Kannur	3132.61	1044.10	486.68	98.32	585.00	No
Kozhikode	1016.40	338.77	0.00	0.00	0.00	No
Total	9498.53	3165.86	1500.22	466.68	1966.90	No

DPEP-Kerala: AWP&B 2002-03
Analysis of Management Cost

(Rs. in lak

State/District	EFC approved project cost	6% approved cost	Cum. expend till 31.03.02	Mgt. Cost for proposal 2002-03	Total Ant. exp. upto 31.3.2003	Whether 6% ceiling crossed
DPEP-I						
Kasargod	2478.29	148.70	143.28	32.55	175.83	Yes
Malapuram	4435.70	266.14	288.36	146.99	435.35	Yes
Wayanad	1514.89	90.89	116.29	24.04	140.33	Yes
State	1019.95	61.20	376.30	19.26	395.56	Yes
Total	9448.83	566.93	924.23	222.84	1147.07	Yes
DPEP - II						
Idukki	2291.06	137.46	171.39	41.70	213.09	Yes
Palakkad	3058.46	183.51	179.26	31.45	210.71	Yes
Trivandrum	3132.61	187.96	135.71	39.68	175.39	No
State	1016.40	60.98	173.82	79.48	253.30	Yes
Total	9498.53	569.91	660.18	192.31	852.49	Yes

AWP&B 2002-03 DPEP - KARNATAKA

INTRODUCTION :

Four districts under Phase-I (now comprising 5 districts) and 7 districts under phase-II (now comprising 11 districts) are covered under DPEP. The projects are closing on 30th June, 2003. The EFC approved project cost, actual expenditure upto 31.3.2002 and the proposed AWP&B for 2002-03 (upto 30.6.2003) is as follows:

(Rs. in Lakhs)

S. No.	State/District	EFC approved project cost	Expenditure upto 31.3.2002	Balance left out of Project Cost	AWP&B 2002-03
DPEP-I					
1	State Component	1137.60	925.23	212.37	178.19
2	Belgaum	5784.26	4692.87	1091.39	967.99
3	Kolar	5277.21	4560.12	717.09	841.86
4	Mandya	4206.63	3533.03	673.60	743.33
5	Raichur	5074.28	4461.12	613.16	601.93
6	Koppal				389.22
	Total DPEP-I	21479.98	18172.37	3307.61	3722.51
DPEP-II					
7	State Component	455.09	255.09	200.00	178.15
8	Bangalore (R)	3743.08	3143.08	600.00	934.11
9	Bellary	3523.15	3111.15	412.00	619.39
10	Bidar	2692.08	2357.08	335.01	637.15
11	Bijapur	4582.11	3717.10	865.01	725.87
12	Bagalkot				470.58
13	Dharwad	4827.01	4207.01	620.00	268.24
14	Gadag				308.35
15	Haveri				389.25
16	Gulbarga	4075.18	3570.18	505.01	964.97
17	Mysore	4118.53	3508.53	610.00	615.24
18	Chamarajanagar				275.54
	Total DPEP-II	28016.23	23869.20	4147.03	6386.83
	GRAND TOTAL	49496.21	42041.58	7454.64	9328.77

II. ACHIEVEMENTS OF DPEP :

2.1 Access and Enrolment: To provide universal access to the children of 6-11 years of age, 1250 schools were opened in school-less habitations with population 200+. Over 96% of the children have access to Primary schooling within 1 KM radius. There is a considerable increase in enrolment at the Primary level. Enrolment in DPEP-I districts in 2000-01 is 1160000 children, whereas it was 1100000 children in 1996-97. Enrolment in DPEP-II districts in 2000-01 is more than 2300000 children, whereas it was 2100000 children in 1997-98.

2.2 Out of School Children: In spite of increase in total enrolment, during the house-to-house survey conducted during February 2002, still 6.4 Lakhs of children of age group 6-14 are found to be out of school. Raichur and Gulbarga districts having 26.73% and 25.76% of children of age group 6-14 out of school, which is a cause of concern.

2.3 'Chinnara Angala' – A Summer Bridge Course Programme : The target for DPEP districts was to enrol 80,000 out of school children of which 71071 were on rolls and 67242 of them have been inducted to the formal schooling system. Their retention and achievement is being monitored continuously.

2.3.1 In its second phase, Chinnara Angala covered 611 centres in the seven districts of North-East Karnataka to bring 22,244 out of school children of age group 7-11 to the formal schooling system during this October-November 2001. There is a constant vigil over these children to see that all the enrolled attend the formal school regularly and thus 100% enrolment and 100% retention could be achieved.

2.3.2 Chinnara Angala Bridge course programme during 2002 was concluded on 8th June 2002. Out of 105050 targeted 97770 children were enrolled 3483 centres of DPEP Districts. Out of 97770 children enrolled 81267 children were mainstreamed to different classes from 1-6 in formal schools.

2.4 Equity : Equity thrusts on the emerging trends with respect to special groups - girls, children belonging to the socially disadvantaged groups in terms of access, retention, repetition and learning outcomes.

2.5 Gender and Social Equity Index: The Gender and Social Equity Index shows that there is an improvement in the equity Index level and the DPEP interventions has brought the equity ratio well within the set goals of DPEP.

2.6 Repetition: There is a considerable improvement in the transition to next higher classes thus reducing the repetition rate. Standard-wise repetition rates are given below :-

Repetition Rates (I-IV)

Standard	BOYS		GIRLS	
	1997-98	2000-01	1997-98	2000-01
I	11.15	4.70	11.61	4.80
II	8.73	3.80	8.75	3.90
III	10.15	4.80	10.38	4.90
IV	8.79	4.50	7.30	4.50
I-IV	9.79	4.45	7.30	4.53

2.7 Retention : Retention rates have considerably increased vis-à-vis decreasing the dropout rates. The increase in retention rate among girls is significant. The following table gives a bird's eye view of the retention rates.

YEAR	I – IV		I-VII	
	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls
1993-94	71.71	66.01	49.62	44.64
2000-01	85.72	87.68	61.32	56.73

2.8 Progress towards improving learning achievement : Terminal Assessment Survey (TAS) has been conducted for the DPEP Phase-I districts during 2001-02. The results show that an overall steadiness of achievement compared to BAS and MAS except in the district of Raichur. Eventhough, the expected level of achievement (80%) is not observable, the achievement is nearer the target.

2.9 PEDAGOGY :

i Teacher Training:

- 35700 teachers were provided training of 6-days duration in phase-I districts since 1998-99.
- 59246 teachers were provided training of 6-days duration in phase-II districts since 1998-99.

ii 'Nali-Kali'

- Multi level and Multigrade teaching approach on the basis of HD Kote experience has been extended to one Block each in 4 DPEP-1 districts. Accordingly, 4152 and 6616 teachers have been trained in the DPEP-1 and 2 districts respectively.
- UNICEF has evaluated 'Nali-Kali'; and the report is shared with districts and others for feed back.

iii Work books and Supplementary material :

- Activity based textbooks, workbooks and guidebooks introduced in class I-IV in Kannada, Urdu, Telugu, Tamil and Marathi media in language, Maths and Environment Studies.
- Development of similar material for Class V is complete and under trailing.
- Printing and supply of Activity cum work books for children of Standards 1 to IV in Kannada, Urdu, Telugu, Tamil and Marathi medium has been completed

2.10 Alternate Schooling:

- No NFE centres were initiated in DPEP-1 districts. However, 251 centres were functional. 28 NFE centres were initiated in DPEP-2 districts. However,

267 centres were functional. **All the NFE centres were closed down 31.3.2001 due to launching of Chinnara Angala in a massive way**

2.11 Community Mobilisation:

- VECs have been formed and training programmes conducted. 53492 and 51506 V members have been trained in Phase-1 and Phase-2 districts respectively.
- **As the School Development and Monitoring Committees (SDMCs) have been constituted in lieu of VECs, 7320 SDMC members have been provided training since the visit of last JRM**

2.12 Micro Planning

- **'Children Census' was conducted during 14-16 February 2002 to assess school age child population, out of school children, which include the new entrants and dropouts, and also children with disabilities**

2.13 Gender

- **1541 Chinnara Melas** conducted at cluster level with girl child and SC/ST children as focus.
- The gender perspective is integrated in all training modules and materials developed for community mobilisation and awareness creation.
- **A study on Class Room practices on gender perspective in 18 schools is in progress in 8 districts of Karnataka**

2.14 Early Childhood Education (ECE) :

- Since inception, 45 ECE Centres have been established.
- Under convergence with ICDS, 2455 Anganwadi Centres have been strengthened. Though there has been no further addition to these numbers after 1997-98, DPEP continues to support them as follows:
- Provision of monthly honorarium to AWW and Helper for extending the timing of AWW centres to match school timings (Rs. 300/- and Rs.250/- respectively).

2.15 Integrated Education for disabled children :

- Medical camps have been organised in Gadag district and preparatory work is in progress in other DPEP districts
- 144 teachers have been trained by the RCI recognised institutions till June 2001.
- **ALIMCO supplied aids and appliances to the identified children in Gadag district and in progress in other districts**

2.16 **Civil Works:** The progress is as follows :

DPEP-I

Sl.No.	Item	Total Target	Completed as on 31.12.2001	In progress	Not started
1	BRCs	40	38	2	0
2	CRCs	234	228	6	0
3	New School Buildings	459	446	12	1*
4	Addl. Class rooms	16	16	0	0
5	Toilets	796	754	40	2
6	Drinking Water	796	754	40	2
7	Repairs	212	206	1	5
8	MIS centres	5	4	0	1
9	SCERT / SIEMT	1	0	1	0
10	Hostels to DSERT	1	0	1	0
11	DPEP office, Mandya and Raichur	2	2	0	0
12	Addl Toilets to BRCs	12	10	0	2*
13	Kitchen blocks	12	10	1	1*
	Total	2586	2467	105	14

* works dropped

DPEP-II

Sl.No.	Item	Total Target	Completed as on 31.12.2001	In progress	Not Started
1	BRCs	67	22	31	14
2	CRCs	800	486	274	40
3	New School Building	600	380	186	34
4	Addl Class Rooms	162	140	20	2
5	Toilets	600	380	186	34
6	Drinking Water	600	380	186	34
7	Repairs	2	2	0	0
8	MIS centres	2	2	0	0
9	Repairs to Guru Bhavans	5	4	1	0
	Total	2838	1796	884	158

2.17 **Appointment of teachers :**

(a) Position of overall teachers' recruitment is given below :

	Total Planned		In position	
	DPEP-I	DPEP-II	DPEP-I	DPEP-II
Primary School teachers	2270	2867	2246	2245
Cluster Teachers	339	871	334	798

III. FOCUS AREAS for 2002-03 :

- Completion of remaining civil works during 2002-03.
- Salary for new school teachers and upgraded teachers.
- Implementation of 3rd phase of chinara Angla programme (Bridge Courses) for enrollment of out of school children.
- Teacher Training Activities.
- Disbursement of School grant and teacher grant.
- Awareness campaigns - 'Kalajathas, chinara melas, VEC melas and maa-beti melas.
- Interventions for Early Childhood Education (ECE).
- Student evaluation and its linkage to progress cards.
- School Improvement Plans
- Preparation of vision document and perspective plan of IED
- Cluster wise analysis of EMIS data through workshops and teleconference, through DIET & BRC
- Kelikali for Vth standard.
- Preparation of supplementary reading material cum activity book for children.

IV. APPRAISAL OF AWP&B 2002-03 :

DPEP-I :

4.1 The original EFC approved project cost was Rs.131.05 crores. The EFC in its meeting held on 17th August, 2001 approved the proposal for utilization of savings arising of exchange rate variations and other reasons under IDA credit and approved the revised project cost as Rs.214.80 crores. The cumulative expenditure upto 31.3.2002 is Rs.181.72 crores and the balance left is Rs.33.08 crores to be utilized for the remaining period upto 30.6.2003. The State Society has submitted the proposals for AWP&B 2002-03 amounting to Rs.29.42 crores and an additional plan of Rs.7.80 crores (**Rs.37.23 crores**) for the period April to June, 2003. However since an amount of Rs.33.08 crores is left out of the EFC approved project cost, the AWP&B upto 30.6.2003 may be restricted upto that amount.

DPEP-II :

4.2 The EFC approved project cost is Rs. 240.47 crores and an expenditure of Rs. 238.69 crores has already been incurred upto 31.3.2002. Since the remaining amount of Rs.1.08 crores would not be sufficient to meet the requirements upto the project closing date, the State Implementation Society had requested for an additional allocation of **Rs.66.46 crores** to continue the project without interruption and to implement the ongoing activities in the DPEP-II Districts.

The major reasons for increased requirements are as follows:-

(i) **Furniture / equipment** : The three districts of Bijapur, Dharwad and Mysore were bifurcated into seven districts resulting in the setting up of District Project Offices in the newly created districts. While the staff already provided in the original districts was re-allocated among the bifurcated districts, they had to be provided with essential furniture / equipment. The additional requirement is only Rs.151.27 lakhs. Out of this, an amount of Rs.49 lakhs is required to meet the requirements of providing aids and appliances to the disabled children under the programme of IED and as per DPEP parameters.

(ii) **Training** : The additional requirement of Rs.46.92 lakhs is due to the fact that while the perspective plans were prepared upto 31.3.2003, the project closing date is 30.6.2003. Besides, the plans were prepared for interventions upto class-IV whereas subsequently the state government decided to include class V in the primary level and as a result of upgradation, additional teachers are being trained.

The matter was discussed with the State project officials and it was decided that since an amount of Rs.276.92 lakhs was still available out of the approved project cost for this component, expenditure should be managed within the approved cost and no additionality need be provided.

(iii) **Salaries** : The major increase in the project cost has occurred due to the additional liability as a result of revision of pay scales of teachers and other staff w.e.f. 1.4.98. The original budget provision for salaries was Rs. 102.43 crores, against which an expenditure of Rs. 137.06 crores has already been incurred upto 31.3.2002. The estimated expenditure during remaining period of the project (1.4.2002 - 30.6.2003) is Rs.39.57 crores, resulting in total additional requirement of Rs.74.20 crores.

Under the approved parameters of DPEP, the salary of additional teachers appointed under DPEP and the project personnel is to be financed out of the project funds. Keeping in view the constraints of funds under DPEP-II, Govt. of Karnataka has agreed to bear the liability towards teacher salary from 1.4.2002 to 30.6.2003 amounting to Rs.17.40 crores for 2864 teachers.

The State Implementation Society has also been advised that since the project was now at the verge of completion, it may not be desirable to retain the entire staff strength at SPO / District and the same should be appropriately reduced minimum by 10%. The additional requirement for salary component was, therefore, restricted to Rs.50 crores only.

(iv) **Teacher Grant / School Grant** : The balance left out of approved project cost is Rs.2.13 crores and the anticipated expenditure during the next 15 months is indicated as Rs.4.53 crores, resulting in additional requirement of Rs.2.40 crores. The matter was discussed with the State Society officials and it was agreed that expenditure on this component should be managed within the available funds either by reducing the disbursement of grant or restricting the same to those schools where weaknesses in quality improvement were noticed.

6. It has been decided with the approval of the Ministry of Finance (Department of Expenditure) to allocate additional funds for DPEP-II in Karnataka works out as follows:-

<i>S. No.</i>	<i>Particulars</i>	<i>Amount (Rs. in Lakhs)</i> <i>(-) savings / (+) additionalities</i>
1.	Civil works	- 165.79
2.	Furniture / equipment & vehicles	151.27
3.	Consultants	- 199.50
4.	Awareness Campaign	- 84.95
5.	Salaries	5000.00
6.	O & M Expenses	- 761.26
	Total	3939.77

Recommended AWP&B 2002-03 :

The proposed and recommended AWP&B for 2002-03 are as follows :-

Project Phase	(Rs. in Lakhs)	
	Proposed AWP&B 2002-03 (including April - June, 2003)	Recommended AWP&B 2002-03 (including April - June, 2003)
DPEP-I	3722.51	3307.61
DPEP-II	6386.93	4147.00

Summary tables indicating the component-wise AWP&B for DPEP phase-I and phase II is given in Annex-I. Abstract of AWP&B indicating the spill over and fresh proposal provision is given at Annex-II. Statements regarding Management cost and Civil Works are given in Annex.-III and IV respectively.

COMPONENT-WISE AWP 2002-03 UNDER DPEP IN KARNATAKA

(Rs. in Lakhs)

S. No.	Activity	DPEP-I	DPEP-II	Total
1	Project Management	172.84	157.46	330.30
2	Planning & Management	17.68	103.33	121.01
3	Civil Works	72.74	1118.96	1191.69
4	Access & Alternative Schoolings	1768.31	1411.02	3179.33
5	Planning for Pedagogical Improvement	1078.74	1180.94	2259.68
6	Community Mobilisation & Participation	47.34	20.14	67.48
7	Research & Evaluation	23.06	8.67	31.73
8	Girl's Education	0.00	3.02	3.02
	Early Childhood Education	7.42	8.96	16.38
9	Integrated Education	48.59	55.55	104.14
10	Media	9.35	5.28	14.63
11	Distance Education Component	35.91	38.67	74.58
12	Management Information System	26.01	35.02	61.03
	TOTAL	3307.98	4147.00	7454.98

**ABSTRACT OF AWP & B PROPOSALS 2002-2003
STATE - KARNATAKA**

Annex.II

Phase - I

(Rs in Lakhs)

S. No.	STATE/ DISTRICT	Revised EFC Cost	Cumulative		Average Expenditure per year	Cumulative Expenditure till March,2002	Spill over to 2002-2003 (financial - outlay)	Fresh Proposals for 2002-03 for 15 Months	Total AWP&B for 2002-03 S.O.+F.P.
			Amount till March'2002	% of EFC					
A	B	C	D	F	G	H	I	J	L
	DPEP-I								
1	State Component	1137.60	925.23	81.33	132.18	925.23		77.31	246.71
2	Belgaum	5784.26	4692.87	81.13	670.41	4692.87	63.99	776.59	855.13
3	Kolar	5277.21	4560.12	86.41	651.45	4560.12	141.29	648.53	780.02
4	Mandya	4206.63	3533.03	83.99	504.72	3533.03	75.57	544.64	597.84
5	Raichur / Koppal	5074.28	4461.12	87.92	637.30	4461.12	457.01	50.07	828.26
	Total DPEP-I	21479.98	18172.37	84.60	2596.05	18172.37	737.86	2097.15	3307.95
	DPEP-II								
7	State Component	455.09	255.09	56.05	63.77	494.95	86.07	113.93	200.00
8	Bangalore (R)	3743.08	3143.08	83.97	785.77	3143.08	238.29	361.71	600.00
9	Bellary	3523.15	3111.15	88.31	777.79	3111.15	271.75	140.25	412.00
10	Bidar	2692.08	2357.08	87.56	589.27	2357.08	245.92	89.08	335.00
11	Bijapur / Bagalkot	4582.11	3717.10	81.12	929.28	3717.10	370.00	495.00	865.00
12	Dharwad / Gadag / Haveri	4827.01	4207.01	87.16	1051.75	4207.01	291.23	328.77	620.00
13	Gulbarga	4075.18	3570.18	87.61	892.54	3570.18	94.00	411.00	505.00
14	Mysore / Chamarajanagar	4118.53	3508.53	85.19	877.13	3508.53	223.00	387.00	610.00
	Total DPEP-II	28016.23	23869.20	85.20	5967.30	24109.06	1820.26	2326.74	4147.00
	GRAND TOTAL	49496.21	42041.58	84.94	4281.68	42281.44	2558.12	4423.89	7454.95

**STATEMENT ON CIVIL WORKS COST 2002-2003
STATE - KARNATAKA**

Annex.III

(Rs in Lakhs)

S.NO.	STATE/ DISTRICT	Revised EFC Cost	Ceiling for CIVIL WORKS (33%)	Cumulative Expenditure from 1994-2002 Till March' 2002.00	AWP&B 2002-03 including April-June, 2003.00	Expenditure till March'2002 + AWP&B 02-03	%age Utilisation
A	B	C	D	E	G	H	
	DPEP-I						
1	State Component	1137.60	375.41	130.68	18.00	148.68	13.07
2	Belgaum	5784.26	1908.81	644.50	0.67	645.17	11.15
3	Kolar	5277.21	1741.48	766.56	30.00	796.56	15.09
4	Mandya	4206.63	1388.19	664.62	1.00	665.62	15.82
5	Raichur / Koppal	5074.28	1674.51	709.10	23.07	732.17	14.43
	Total DPEP-I	21479.98	7088.39	2915.46	72.74	2988.20	13.91
	DPEP-II						
8	State Component	455.09	150.18	16.26	0.59	16.85	3.70
9	Bangalore (R)	3743.08	1235.22	486.86	324.59	811.45	21.68
10	Bellary	3523.15	1162.64	550.89	130.06	680.96	19.33
11	Bidar	2692.08	888.39	411.50	150.33	561.82	20.87
12	Bijapur / Bagalkot	4582.11	1512.10	503.95	427.77	931.71	20.33
14	Dharwad / Gadag / Haveri	4827.01	1592.91	601.98	234.91	836.89	17.34
17	Gulbarga	4075.18	1344.81	584.71	264.66	849.37	20.84
18	Mysore / Chamarajanagar	4118.53	1359.11	641.91	193.44	835.35	20.28
	Total DPEP-II	28016.23	9245.36	3798.05	1726.34	5524.39	19.72
	GRAND TOTAL	49496.21	16333.75	6713.51	1799.08	8512.59	17.20

STATEMENT ON MANAGEMENT COST 2002-2003
STATE - KARNATAKA

Annex.-IV

(Rs in Lakhs)

S. No.	STATE/ DISTRICT	Revised EFC Cost	EFC approved Cost for MANAGEMENT	Cumulative Expenditure till March 2002	AWP & B 2002-03 including expdr. 3-6/03	Expenditure till March'2002 + AWP&B 02-03	%age Utilisation
A	B	D	E	F	G	H	I
	DPEP-I						
1	State Component	1137.60	68.26	296.63	58.50	355.13	31.22
2	Belgaum	5784.26	347.06	105.59	18.70	124.29	2.15
3	Kolar	5277.21	316.63	118.55	16.87	135.42	2.57
4	Mandya	4206.63	252.40	127.52	33.65	161.17	3.83
5	Raichur / Koppal	5074.28	304.46	127.97	25.77	153.74	3.03
	Total DPEP-I	21479.98	1288.80	776.25	153.49	929.74	4.33
	DPEP-II						
6	State Component	455.09	27.31	95.86	57.95	153.81	33.80
7	Bangalore (R)	3743.08	224.58	70.55	17.13	87.68	2.34
8	Bellary	3523.15	211.39	54.78	25.45	80.23	2.28
9	Bidar	2692.08	161.52	61.52	15.43	76.95	2.86
10	Bijapur / Bagalkot	4582.11	274.93	158.14	37.50	195.64	4.27
11	Dharwad / Gadag / Haveri	4827.01	289.62	131.14	47.87	179.02	3.71
12	Gulbarga	4075.18	244.51	90.35	14.61	104.96	2.58
13	Mysore / Chamarajanagar	4118.53	247.11	79.56	26.57	106.13	2.58
	Total DPEP-II	28016.23	1680.97	741.91	242.51	984.42	3.51
	GRAND TOTAL	49496.21	2969.77	1518.16	396.00	1914.16	3.87

D P E P – Maharashtra Appraisal of AWP & B 2002-03

A. Introduction

- DPEP was launched in 5 districts of Maharashtra i.e. Aurangabad, Latur, Nanded, Osmanabad and Parbhani (including bifurcated district of Hingoli), during phase-I in 1994-95 and was expanded to Beed, Dhule (including bifurcated district of Nandurbar) Gadchiroli and Jalna in 1997-98 under phase-II.
- 5 phase-I DPEP districts in Maharashtra have completed eight years of implementation whereas the expansion districts have completed five years.
- EFC approved project cost for DPEP-I in Maharashtra was originally Rs.18592.37 lakhs. This has been revised to Rs.23592.13 lakhs on account of availability of additional funds. These additional funds are also to be spent in 5 non-DPEP districts on a limited number of activities. EFC approved project cost is Rs.15771.79 lakhs for four expansion districts.

B. Process of Appraisal

- Annual Work Plan of 9 DPEP districts and the state component were prepared by district and state teams for the year 2002-03. It is not clear whether these plans were appraised at the state level, because the state appraisal report was not made available in spite of repeated reminders. In the last few years, Maharashtra has been sending comprehensive appraisal reports.
- Two district plans i.e. Aurangabad (phase-I) and Nandurbar (phase-II) and the state level plans for phase-I and II were appraised at the national level on a sample basis. **The comments of the appraisal would apply to all district plans.**

C. Financial Issues

- Financial details are indicated in tables A, B and C attached to the note.

- The expenditure in phase-I upto March 2002 is Rs.18841.90 lakhs, 79.86% of the approved revised project cost and in phase-II Rs.9640.53 lakhs, 61.12% of the project cost. **Phase-II districts would need to speed up their interventions considerably to ensure that all project funds are utilized by June 2003.**
- The expenditure in the non-DPEP districts from extra finances available in phase-I districts is Rs.247.25 lakhs, which is 7% of the approved cost. Extra effort will be needed to complete activities in these districts.
- The overall plan of Rs.3003.211 lakhs for Osmanabad slightly exceeds EFC approved amount of Rs.3003.20 lakhs. This may be kept within EFC cost.
- In 5 phase-I DPEP and non DPEP districts i.e. Osmanabad, Ahmednagar, Buldana, Jalgaon and Sangli, the amounts proposed for civil works exceed the EFC amounts but are within the 33% limit.
- **The proposed expenditure on management exceeds 6% of the total revised cost in phase I districts + non-DPEP districts and also the revised amount approved by EFC as indicated in Table C. This may be kept within the 6% limit.**
- In phase-II, expenditure on management exceeds the actual approved amount, but is within 6 % limit.

D. Functional area wise comments:

(i) Alternative Schooling Unit

State Component

The state has not shown any activity under Alternative Schooling. Possibly activities under "workshops" etc. will be taken up, but thrust from state level is not clear. **The state many ensure that this is clarified before implementation.**

District Aurangabad

- Micro-planning survey conducted in 1998-99 revealed 13908 out of school children in the 9-14 age group. In 2000, the estimated no. of children out of

school in 6-14 age group was 11780. **The district may consider establishing a system of updating records about out of school children 95 as suggested by GoI.**

- The district AWP&B has shown that the following categories of alternative strategies will be in operation during the current financial year.
 1. Sugar school – in the area of 5 existing sugar factories in the district
 2. Remedial Vocational ALs – for low achievers
 3. Prerna centres – in rural areas
 4. A category MPHEGS-303
 5. B category MPHEGS-126
 6. Vasti Shala
- Provision for Sugar school is shown twice separately in table 'C' (Fresh Proposals for the year 2002-2003) in the district plan. Activities shown to be undertaken for both are also not same. **These may be corrected.**
- In some AS strategies, no amounts have been kept for activities like training for instructors/volunteers, supply of books and educational materials, evaluation etc. Reason for not keeping budget for such activities for all the strategies is not know. No provision for TLM grants or school improvement grants has been kept. These may be ensured as per need.

District Nanduar

- The district has been running Prerna Centres and Contract Schools to provide education to out of school children. Out of the total 20,598 out of school children, 14,244 children have been covered by Prerna centres. The remaining children would be covered under Mahatma Fule Shikshan Hami Yojna and Vasti Shala.
- During the current financial year the district has proposed to run short term course "Summer / Bridger Course' on pilot basis for the out of school children. One of the tribal blocks "Navapur" with the lowest female literacy has been selected for this. The bridge course and condensed course are to address the out of school

children of 9-14 age group who are scattered and not covered by any of other schemes of education.

- Reason for not keeping activities like supervision and training for instructors / volunteers, for all the strategies is not know. No provision for TLM grants school improvement grants has been kept. It may be ensured that these are available.

(ii) Pedagogical Improvement

- The state plan touches upon the issue of pedagogical renewal in two parts: one of the MIEPA, Aurangabad and the other of SCERT, Pune. The MIEPA section has highlighted the following activities:
 - Training on Multilevel teaching to district functionaries.
 - Workshops on Multi-grade teaching.
 - Workshop on Sustainability of DPEP.
 - Workshops on good reading habits.

The SCERT, Pune aims to conduct some workshop. Some themes are to be decided.

- **As the state aims to emphasize on trainings for multi-grade and multilevel teaching, student evaluation and school libraries, the following activities might prove fruitful at the present stage of the project:**
 - 1. Initiate small pilot MGT/MLT projects in different districts by selecting near by schools with lower PTR and interested teachers.**
 - 2. Document the positive practices of Phase-I districts in the different areas of pedagogical renewal and share them with others as lessons from the project.**
 - 3. Share the experience of successful experiments like 'active schools' of Latur district through exposure trips for other districts. Expand the impact of 'active schools' of Latur district at a steady pace to nearby schools. Experience shows that being motivated by the success of the**

active schools, many other nearby schools are also eager to try out such practices.

- 4. SCERT, Pune can concentrate on quality improvement in the Pupils' Assessment in schools of different districts on the lines of pilot evaluation project of active schools.**
- 5. The state can initiate school improvement programme in small number of selected schools.**

Aurangabad District

The major activities planned by the district include training for teaching of English, training of cluster coordinators, workshop to inculcate reading habits among students, TLM exhibition etc.

- Under the intervention of school improvement grant, the number of schools has been shown as 1533 which does not appear to be correct as per the number of schools given in the district profile at pg.6-7. According to this, the number of schools (Class I to IV and Class V works out to 1508 including the aided private schools). School grant should not exceed this limit of 1508 schools.
- The number of schools for provision of special racks under the interventions pedagogy also shown as 1533 which should be reduced to the actual number of Government schools, Zilla Parishad schools and NC schools numbering 1457. Government aided private schools should not be given any furniture.
- Under the intervention of school improvement grant, an outlay of Rs.7.84 lakhs has been provided in the current year's plan towards 4% contingency for DPEP school teachers. **DPEP does not provide for this. DPEP allows for a TLM grant of Rs.500 per teacher. However, since the state already provides a 4% contingency for this purpose, the same was not accessed in DPEP. This amount was accessed for new schools only. This condition would continue to apply.**

Nandurbar District

- Under the intervention of school improvement grant, an outlay of Rs.6.27 lakhs has been provided in the current year's plan towards 4% contingency for DPEP school teachers. Remarks above apply.

(iii) Community Mobilisation & Participation

The State Plan

There is no component head under *community mobilisation / participation*. It is quite understandable that there may be barely any need for community *mobilisation* activities at this stage (terminal year) and even if there is any need, the activities under Media component could very well cater to it. However, only mobilisation activities might not suffice to ensure community *participation*. Being the final year of the Programme intervention, there could have been concrete strategy for ensuring spontaneous sense of belonging among the people and also ensuring space for the people to get involved in the education process. There is no reflection of such kind of thinking in the AWP & B. **The state should spell out its strategies to inculcate community ownership for sustainability before implementation.**

Aurangabad

Two activities have been proposed under community mobilisation in the AWP& B under the major head namely *Mobilisation of panchayat functionaries, MLAs, NGOs* etc. One of the activities is a composite of activities like meetings with PRI functionaries at various levels, MLAs, NGOs etc. to gather opinion in regard to implementation of the Programme. Lack of clear vision is discernible from the fact that a lump-sum amount has been estimated without indicating any unit cost. **This may be indicated clearly and state norms be observed.** Moreover, it is pointless to gather opinion on programme implementation at the stage of terminal year. Rather, ensuring

sustainability could be a more sensible issue. This may be ensured before implementation.

Nadurbar

The AWP&B proposes to held *melas* to mobilize panchayat functionaries, VECs, NGOs etc, with a lump-sum budget estimate. No clarity on modalities and issues to be addressed is reflected.

(iv) Civil works

State component Plan, Phase I

Original and revised budgets are shown as under:

Budget Head	Budget Original (Rs. in lakhs)	Revised Budget (Rs. in lakhs)
Total	919.67	1597.32
Civil Works	220.72(24%)	326.72 (20.42% of revised total budget)

The revised proposal of MIEPA is as follows:

Budget Head	Budget Original (Rs. in lakhs)	Revised Budget (Rs. in lakhs)
Total	309.00	588.05
Civil Works	220.72	320.72

The main increase in Civil Works proposed is for additional construction (provision of sanitary and electrical facilities) at MIEPA, where otherwise the renovation is complete, but these basic facilities are lacking. The state proposes to increase the budget for MIEPA beyond the allowed Rs.300 lakhs, up to Rs.588 lakhs, with an increase of Rs.100 lakhs under Civil Works. **Under DPEP, expenditure on MIEPA may be restricted to Rs.300 lakhs as approved by EFC and as per DPEP guidelines. The state many ensure that these limits are followed.**

State Component Plan, Phase II

The construction of the Womens' Hostel building at the SCERT in Pune, worth Rs.100 lakhs, did not begin last year. The state did not incur any expenditure at all under this head. The entire amount has been spilled over to this year. It does not seem likely that this work can be completed within the time frame. **The state may evolve a clear strategy for the same.**

District Aurangabad

The Civil Works details of the plan are as follows:

- Original approved Civil Works budget:Rs.970.60 lakhs
- Revised Civil Works budget: Rs.1536.60 lakhs
- Cumulative expenditure thus far: Rs.980.36 lakhs
- Expenditure last year: Rs.242.48 (out of Rs.548.63) lakhs
- Amount to be spent this year: Rs.538.96 lakhs

Although not clearly mentioned in the plan, it seems that three local consultants have been hired to help out in Civil Woks activities. However, more staff needs to be appointed to be able to effectively spend the amount required by June 2003-especially because a major component is repairs. **The state may ensure that this is monitored well and a high quality is maintained.**

District Nandurbar

There are large spillovers in the civil works component. The state may ensure that works are undertaken speedily.

E. General

Subject to the above observations, AWP& B proposals as indicated in Tables A, B and C enclosed are submitted for approval of the Project Board.

ABSTRACT OF AWP & B PROPOSALS 2002-03
STATE - MAHARASHTRA

(Rs. in lakhs)

Phase/Districts	EFC approved Project cost	Cumulative Ant. Expenditure		Average exp. per year	Approved AWP & B 2001-02 (incl. S.O.)	Expenditure 2001-02	Spillover 2002-03	Fresh Proposal 2002-03	Total AWP&B 2002-03 (S.O.+F.P.)	Total AWPB 2002-03 as % of av. yearly exp. (Col. I as % of Col. D)	Total AWPB 2002-03 as % of EFC cost (Col. I as % of Col. A)	Cum. exp.+ AWP & B 2002-03 (Col. B + Col. I)
		Amount till March 2002	As % of Col. A									
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L
Phase - I	(Revised)											
Aurangabad	5067.25	3677.190	72.56	459.648	1708.74	578.830	698.49	680.21	1378.70	299.94	27.20	5055.89
Latur	3815.86	3163.526	82.90	395.440	1280.50	628.220	417.30	235.02	652.32	164.96	17.09	3815.846
Nanded	5384.84	4399.416	81.70	549.927	1290.48	750.180	80.25	905.17	985.42	179.19	18.29	5384.836
Osmanabad	3003.20	2343.973	78.04	292.996	1006.76	374.061	407.038	252.20	659.238	224.93	21.94	3003.211
Parbhani	4723.67	4002.314	84.72	500.289	1439.59	718.265	409.315	312.012	721.327	144.18	15.27	4723.641
SPO	1597.32	1255.485	78.59	156.935	398.29	177.456	68.827	163.97	232.797	148.33	14.57	1488.282
Total Phase-I	23592.13	18841.904	79.86	2355.235	7124.37	3227.012	2081.22	2548.582	4629.802	196.57	19.62	23471.706
Non-DPEP districts under Phase - I												
Ahmednagar	700.16	47.36	6.76	47.36	700.16	47.36	417.59	235.21	652.80	1378.37	93.23	700.16
Buldana	700.39	51.54	7.36	51.54	700.39	51.54	325.471	323.38	648.851	1258.92	92.64	700.391
Jalgaon	731.02	34.04	4.66	34.04	731.02	34.04	474.72	217.02	691.74	2032.13	94.62	725.78
Sangli	691.18	55.93	8.09	55.93	691.18	55.93	283.78	351.47	635.25	1135.79	93.36	691.18
Solapur	703.70	58.38	8.30	58.38	703.70	58.38	520.02	125.30	645.32	1105.37	91.70	703.70
Total	3526.45	247.25	7.01	247.25	3526.45	247.25	2021.581	1252.38	3273.961	1324.15	92.84	3521.211
Phase - II												
Beed	3618.968	2598.356	71.79	519.67	1556.82	787.90	348.21	672.40	1020.61	196.39	28.20	3618.966
Dhule	3998.523	2292.626	57.33	458.52	1646.63	658.10	549.45	1138.50	1687.95	368.13	42.21	3980.576
Gadchiroli	3395.004	1940.934	57.17	388.18	1311.05	553.834	415.592	640.719	1056.311	272.11	31.11	2997.245
Jalna	3847.270	2584.08	67.16	516.81	1367.34	719.42	354.64	822.82	1177.46	227.83	30.60	3761.54
SPO	912.031	224.532	24.61	44.90	295.46	47.02	164.561	75.36	239.921	534.34	26.30	464.453
Total Phase-II	15771.796	9640.528	61.12	1928.10	6177.32	2766.274	1832.453	3349.799	5182.252	268.77	32.85	14822.78

STATEMENT OF CIVIL WORKS COST 2002-03
STATE - MAHARASHTRA

Phase/District	EFC appd. Cost	33.33% of EFC appd. cost	Actual approved civil work cost	Cumulative exp. till March 2002	Allocation made for 2002-03			Exp. till March 2002 + S.O. + F.P. 2002-03
					Fresh Plan	Anticipated spillover	Total	
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Phase - I	(Revised)							
Aurangabad	5067.25	1689.08	1536.60	980.36	0.00	538.96	538.96	1519.32
Latur	3815.86	1271.95	1137.04	737.28	0.00	399.71	399.71	1136.99
Nanded	5384.84	1794.94	1593.404	1022.11	294.84	73.03	367.87	1389.98
Osmanabad	3003.20	1001.07	902.36	561.33	65.80	339.23	405.03	966.36
Parbhani	4723.67	1574.55	1428.47	855.225	0.00	408.915	408.915	1264.14
SPO	1597.32	532.38	326.72	103.84	0.00	20.00	20.00	123.84
Total Phase-I	23592.13	7863.99	6924.594	4260.145	360.64	1779.845	2140.845	6400.99
Non-DPEP districts under Phase - I								
Ahmednagar	700.16	233.38	189.28	0.00	41.75	189.28	231.03	231.03
Buldana	700.39	233.46	187.435	15.69	121.51	93.94	215.45	231.14
Jalgaon	731.02	243.67	188.00	0.00	53.25	187.99	241.24	241.24
Sangli	691.18	230.39	189.13	21.20	39.45	167.43	206.88	228.08
Solapur	703.70	234.56	189.30	0.00	0.00	189.30	189.30	189.30
Total	3526.45	1175.48	943.145	36.89	255.96	827.94	1083.90	1120.79
Phase-II								
Beed	3618.97	1206.32	N.A.	632.66	0.00	188.44	188.44	821.10
Dhule	3998.52	1332.84	N.A.	519.15	0.00	320.10	320.10	839.25
Gadchiroli	3395.00	1131.66	N.A.	462.126	0.00	336.96	336.96	799.086
Jalna	3847.27	1282.42	N.A.	584.32	0.00	304.68	304.68	889.00
SPO	912.03	304.01	N.A.	8.13	0.00	100.10	100.10	108.23
Total Phase-II	15771.79	5257.26	N.A.	2206.386	0.00	1250.28	1250.28	3456.666

Table - C

**STATEMENT OF MANAGEMENT COST 2002-03
STATE - MAHARASHTRA**

(Rs. in lakhs)

Phase/District	EFC appd. cost	6% of EFC approved cost	Actual approved Management cost	Cumulative exp. Anticipated till March 2002	Allocation made for 2002-03			Exp. till March, 2002 + S.O. + F.P. 2002-03
					Fresh Plan	Anticipated spillover	Total	
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Phase - I	(Revised)							
Aurangabad	5067.25	304.03	245.93	191.37	47.95	3.34	51.29	242.66
Latur	3815.86	228.95	222.42	202.80	18.34	1.27	19.61	222.41
Nanded	5384.84	323.08	169.71	151.29	18.42	0.00	18.42	169.71
Osmanabad	3003.20	180.19	181.235	169.675	10.517	0.00	10.517	189.225
Parbhani	4723.67	283.42	167.766	135.127	19.55	0.00	19.55	145.644
SPO	1597.32	95.82	530.372	509.500	74.84	0.50	75.34	584.84
Total Phase-I	23592.13	1415.51	1517.433	1359.762	189.617	5.11	194.727	1554.489
Non-DPEP districts under Phase - I								
Ahmednagar	700.16	42.00	22.33	0.00	42.00	0.00	42.00	42.00
Buldana	700.39	42.02	49.01	2.74	39.29	0.00	39.29	42.03
Jalgaon	731.02	43.86	26.87	0.00	38.62	0.00	38.62	38.62
Sangli	691.18	41.47	35.38	0.38	21.69	7.13	28.82	29.20
Solapur	703.70	42.22	36.96	0.63	36.33	0.00	36.33	36.96
Total	3526.45	211.58	170.55	3.75	177.93	7.13	185.06	188.81
Phase-II								
Beed	3618.97	217.14	133.22	105.32	46.04	6.80	52.84	158.16
Dhule	3998.52	239.91	135.27	129.24	68.62	5.05	73.67	202.91
Gadchiroli	3395.00	203.70	178.09	127.086	53.83	4.192	58.022	185.108
Jalna	3847.27	230.84	132.82	115.63	62.73	5.46	68.19	183.82
SPO	912.03	54.72	112.98	81.847	31.46	1.22	32.68	114.527
Total Phase-II	15771.79	946.31	692.32	559.123	262.68	22.722	285.402	844.525

DPEP- TAMIL NADU

ANNUAL WORK PLAN & BUDGET (AWP&B) for 2002-03

I. Introduction:

DPEP was launched in Tamil Nadu in three districts – Dharmapuri, Thiruvannamalai and South Arcot (bifurcated into Cuddalore & Villupuram) under Phase-I (1994-2003) and in another three districts – Ramanathapuram, Pudukkottai and Perambalur under Phase-II (1996-2003). The revised EFC approved project cost of DPEP-I was Rs. 16897.22 lakh, which was further revised to Rs. 18224.24 lakh. The EFC approved project cost of DPEP-II is Rs. 9244.29 lakh.

The cumulative expenditure of DPEP-I upto 31.3.2002 was Rs. 15901.40 lakh, which is 94% of the project cost. The approved AWP&B for 2001-02 was Rs. 5538.13 lakh of which Rs. 3970.55 lakh was spent.

In case of DPEP-II, the total cumulative expenditure upto 31.3.2002 was Rs. 5724.87 lakh. This was only 62% of the total project cost. The approved AWP&B for 2001-02 was Rs. 2873.47 lakh of which Rs. 1434.17 lakh was spent.

II. Progress during 2000-01:

- i. **Access:** Provision of schooling facilities under DPEP has considerably enhanced in both Phase I and II districts in Tamil Nadu. The GAR of Phase I districts which ranged from 84% to 95% during 1994-95 has increased to 96% - 99% during 2000-01. The GAR of Phase II districts has also increased from 96% in 1997-98 to 99% in 2000-01.
- ii. **Pedagogical intervention:** Activity based cards for grade I children were prepared and field tested. The revised textbooks for std. II & III were introduced in all the schools.
- iii. **Alternative schooling:** In all, 737 centres with a total enrolment of 13,300 pupils in Phase I and 199 centres with an enrolment of 4925 pupils in Phase-II districts are functioning. Textbooks prepared by Govt. of Tamil Nadu for grade I, II & III and textbooks and notebooks were distributed to all learners in AS centres.
- iv. **IED:** The programme was upscaled to two more blocks in each district, bringing IED coverage to 22 blocks (13 in phase-I and 9 in phase-II). Three special teachers were appointed in each block. One module in IED

for teachers and parents to identify and address the various issues of children with special needs was developed.

- v. **ECE:** One module on 'Thematic Approach' for providing training to the ECE workers was developed and training was imparted to ECE workers to update their skills and knowledge in pre-school education.
- vi. **Cohort study:** Cohort study was conducted in all the schools in DPEP districts for three consecutive years i.e. from 94-95 to 98-99, 95-96 to 99-2000 and 96-97 to 2000-2001 to assess the internal efficiency of the schools.
- vii. **Completion rate:** The completion rate has increased from 51% to 55%, 60.44% to 66.25%, 57.64% to 64.96% and 56% to 65% in Phase I districts of Dharmapuri, Thiruvannamalai, Cuddalore and Villupuram respectively. The completion rate in the Phase II districts of Perambalur, Pudukkottai and Ramananthapuram has increased from 51.6% to 58.69%, 53% to 56% and 52.26% to 56% during 1997-98 to 2000-01 respectively.
- viii. **Dropout rate:** In Phase I districts, as per the Cohort Study for the quinquennium 1996-97 to 2000-01, Thiruvannamalai and Cuddalore districts have dropout rates less than 10%. The dropout rate for Villupuram district is 12% whereas it is 16% for Dharmapuri district. The dropout rate in the Phase II districts of Perambalur, Pudukkottai and Ramananthapuram has declined from 18.4% to 13.3%, 18% to 10% and 17.8% to 10% during 1996-97 to 2000-01 respectively.
- ix. **Repetition rate:** The Repetition Rate (RR) during 1996-97 to 2000-01 ranges from 23% in Villupuram district to 34% in Pudukkottai and Ramananthapuram districts. The RR of boys is higher (33.50%) as compared to girls (25.50%). The repetition rate of Perambalur district shows a marginal decline from 29.5% to 28% whereas in Pudukkottai and Ramananthapuram an increasing trend is noticed viz. from 29% to 34% and 30% to 34% respectively during 1996-97 to 2000-01. Continued efforts including regular academic support visits of low performing schools, child-centred approach in classroom practices, increased use of teaching-learning materials in classrooms, special trainings on multi-grade teaching, orientation to teachers with activity-based teaching have been initiated to remedy the untoward trend in Repetition Rates.
- x. **Equity:** The DPEP goal of equity in enrolment between boys and girls and social groups have been attained in all the DPEP districts in Tamil Nadu. The GER of boys is 96.01% as against 97.69% for girls during 2000-01. Similarly, the GER of all students is 96.85% whereas it is 92.41% in respect of Schedule Caste students. The NER of boys is 75.09% compared to 78.00% for girls during 2000-01. The NER of all students is 76.56% as against 75.12% percentage of Scheduled Caste students. The disparity between Gender and Social group of All and SC is

less than 5% in enrolment. The completion rate of boys and girls is 59.81% and 60.67% respectively during 2000-01.

- xi. Civil works:** In phase-I all the construction works have been completed or nearing completion. All the additional works like additional classrooms, drinking water facilities, toilets etc. proposed due to enhancement of civil works ceiling from 24 to 33.33% have been undertaken, major part of which is almost completed. Similar status has been observed in DPEP-II.
- xii. Special coaching:** Special coaching classes for SC/ST girls after school hours for 1½ hours per day conducted in 1872 centres covering over 46497 girls in phase-I and in 494 centres covering 13095 girls in phase-II.
- xiii. Educational indicators:**

Educational Indicators

Year	NER	GER	% of girls	Class I enrol.	PTR	Schools	Classrooms	Teachers	Students
1999-2000	70%	85%	49%	3.23 lakh	39	10677	35289	38273	14.88 lakh
2000-2001	69%	85%	49%	3.18 lakh	39	10670	37227	38202	14.87 lakh
2001-2002	86%	99%	49%	2.96 lakh	38	10677	37227	37882	14.55 lakh

III. Planning process:

The preparation of plan is highly decentralized and participatory. Plans have incorporated the suggestions from various quarters including JRM recommendations and key indicators like GAR, NER, GER etc. and levels of achievements by pupils. There is evidence of use of MIS data and Cohort Study Report. The starting point of planning process in the state was the School Development Plan (SDP), which was updated with the involvement of VLCs, PTAs and the community. The action plans prepared at school level were consolidated into cluster plan and block plans and finally district plans.

IV. Appraisal report:

In keeping with the process of decentralization in DPEP, the appraisal of AWP&B 2002-03 had been delegated to Tamil Nadu. The State Appraisal Team based on the guidelines outlined in the 'AWP&B preparation and appraisal manual' appraised the plan to ensure conformity with DPEP guidelines. The Bureau and TSG carried out sample re-appraisal of two districts – Cuddalore from DPEP-I and Pudukkotal from DPEP - II. The state component plans of DPEP I and II were also reviewed. After review and re-appraisal of the plans, the observations of the Bureau were communicated to Tamil Nadu DPEP.

V. Thrust areas for 2001-02:

- Quality improvement – through activity based teaching and joyful learning process. Strengthen school based academic support to enhance the achievement levels of children and augment teacher specific and student specific interventions in low performance schools. Conduct diagnostics studies in the area of learner achievement, subject content and classroom transactions.
- Provide in-service teacher training on multi-grade and activity based teaching and impart comprehensive training to teachers on continuous and comprehensive evaluation.
- Re-orientation of BRC and CRC personnel
- Improve completion rate by reducing dropout and repetition rate.
- Open schools/ alternative schools in all unserved habitations.
- To activate the monitoring system for the effective implementation of the project at all the stages
- To act as a catalyst to SSA programme when DPEP subsumes with the SSA.

VI. Comments and observations on AWP&B 2001-02:

1. Cuddalore:

The original DPEP-I district of South Arcot was bifurcated into two districts of Cuddalore and Villupuram. The original EFC project cost for South Arcot was Rs. 4037.56 lakhs, which was revised to 6754.42 lakhs and further revised to Rs. 7237.36 lakh. However, consequent on the bifurcation of the district, separate EFC cost for each district has not been given.

2. Pudukkottai:

To achieve the full utilisation of the EFC approved project cost, the district has to take efforts to maximize the expenditure during the current financial year. Since, the ceiling on civil works has been revised to 33%, the district can incur more expenditure on civil works subject to the fulfilment of the conditions.

VII. General:

• Pedagogy:

- a) The progress overview in the plans does provide an account of various interventions made under DPEP, however it is not clear how this review has been used to plan for pedagogical renewal for 2002-03. For example, an account of the number of textbooks introduced and training programmes conducted is provided but a critical analysis of the strengths

and weaknesses of these initiatives appears to be missing. Such a review would have helped in identifying the next steps in each activity.

- b) The state may like to undertake a detailed field level review of the new textbooks involving desk analysis of textbooks, classroom observation and feedback from teachers and stakeholders. Similar review could also be initiated on teacher training programme.
 - c) Cluster level on-site support to teachers in the state is weak as there are no full time coordinators. The state should explore strategies to fill this missing link by identifying active teachers and planning a series of activities with them.
 - d) The state should evolve strategies to address the causes of low performance, and low performing schools, by analysing data on achievement tests.
 - e) The scope of training programmes on multi-grade teaching, evaluation and CRC coordinators should be widened in terms of objectives to make them more meaningful.
 - f) The role of DIET in the pedagogical renewal process for this year is not clear.
- **IED:** The state should consider further upscaling of the IED interventions to more blocks. All children with special needs requiring aids and appliances should be provided with assistive devices.
 - **Community mobilisation:** The state component plans for both phases I and II have not proposed any activity under community mobilisation and participation, although the progress overview portion mentions about community involvement, specially in construction activities.
 - **Research and evaluation:** The state is one of the 9 states in which a study on "Causes of Grade Repetition" is to be conducted in 2002-03, funded by the state budget for R&E. But there is no mention of this study and funds for conducting it. As suggested by MHRD the state may like to undertake studies on a) Social acceptability of primary schools in comparison with other types of schools functioning in the same area and b) relationship between enrolment and completion rate of primary schooling.
 - **Media:** Traditional and inter-personnel media may be used more widely for community mobilisation.
 - **Enrolment:** The state should probe into the reported decline in overall enrolment, especially grade I enrolment.
 - **Other facilities:** Steps should be initiated for providing girls toilet and drinking water facilities in schools without these facilities.
 - **Pace of DPEP-II:** Pace of DPEP-II has to be accelerated as only 62% of the project outlay has been utilised as on 31.3.2002, when the project has only 15 more months.

- **Small Plan Size of DPEP-II:** The proposed AWP&B for 2002-03 for DPEP-II is only Rs. 14.31 crore compared to the AWP&B of 28.73 crore and expenditure of Rs. 14.34 crore in 2001-02. It is not clear why the state has prepared only a limited annual plan when the state will be left with unutilised outlay of Rs. 20.88 crore on 1.4.2003, even if entire AWP&B for 2002-03 is fully utilised.
- **Revision of EFC Cost in DPEP-I:** The EFC cost of DPEP-I has been further revised from Rs. 168.97 crore to Rs. 182.24 crore, utilising the amount earmarked for non-DPEP districts out of savings in DPEP-I.
- **EFC Cost:** The cumulative expenditure on state intervention in Phase I has already crossed the EFC outlay, although the overall expenditure in DPEP-I will not exceed the revised EFC cost with the proposal of this year.
- **Civil works cost:** No fresh civil works proposed in 2002-03 in both Phase-I and II. The civil works cost in Thiruvannamalai and Perambalur has already crossed the 33.33% ceiling of EFC cost.
- **Management cost:** The overall management cost as well as the management cost in respect of state component is crossing the 6% limit in case of DPEP-I districts. In case of DPEP-II, districts the expenditure in state component plan has already exceeded the 6% limit, though the overall management cost is within the limit. State should look into this and if it is due to wrong booking of expenditure, this should be reworked and correct expenditure may be arrived at.

VIII. Appraisal of AWP&B:

- The abstract of AWP&B for 2002-2003 and analysis of expenditure, civil works cost and management cost are given in Table I to IV.
- The AWP&B for 2002-03 for DPEP-I is Rs. 2322.85 lakh, including spill over of Rs. 915.89 lakh and fresh proposals of Rs. 1406.96 lakh.
- The AWP&B for 2002-03 for DPEP-II is Rs. 1431.77 lakh, including spill over of Rs. 374.07 lakh and fresh proposals of Rs. 1057.70 lakh.
- The AWP&B for 2002-03 for DPEP-I and DPEP-II of Tamil Nadu may be approved by the Project Board, subject to the comments and observations in para VI above.

Table – I

DPEP – Tamil Nadu
Abstract of AWP&B 2002-03

(Rs. in lakhs)

State/District	AWP&B 2001-02	Expenditure 2001-02	Spill over to 2002-03	Fresh proposal	AWP&B 2002-03
1	2	3	4	5	6=4+5
DPEP-I					
Dharmapuri	1798.91	1325.18	400.93	468.47	869.40
Thiruvannamalai	1187.16	829.69	116.07	358.50	474.57
*Cuddalore	995.79	763.20	233.65	74.75	308.40
*Villupuram	1433.90	935.82	159.54	431.04	590.58
State	122.37	116.67	5.70	74.20	79.90
Total	5538.13	3970.56	915.89	1406.96	2322.85
DPEP – II					
Perambalur	473.19	466.28	44.09	264.34	308.43
Pudukkottai	794.35	423.93	59.06	396.79	455.85
Ramanathapuram	690.25	444.18	171.92	281.57	453.49
State	915.68	99.78	99.00	115.00	214.00
Total	2873.47	1434.17	374.07	1057.70	1431.77

DPEP – Tamil Nadu
AWP&B 2002-03
Analysis of Expenditure in DPEP-I & II

(Rs. in lakhs)

State/District	EFC Cost	Cum. Expenditure upto 31/03/02	AWP&B 2002-03	Total anticipated expend. Upto 2002-03	Whether EFC limit crossed
1	2	3	4	5(3+4)	6
DPEP-I					
Dharmapuri	6104.41	5235.01	869.40	6104.41	No
Thiruvannamalai	4038.95	3564.38	474.57	4038.95	No
*Villupuram	7237.36	6338.39	898.98	7237.37	No
*Cuddalore					
State	843.52	763.62	79.90	843.52	Yes
Total	18224.24	15901.40	2322.85	18224.25	No
DPEP – II					
Perambalur	2610.73	1624.45	308.43	1932.88	No
Pudukkottai	2854.19	1927.96	455.85	2383.81	No
Ramanathapuram	2862.09	1569.16	453.49	2022.65	No
State	917.28	603.30	214.00	817.30	No
Total	9244.29	5724.87	1431.77	7156.64	No

* The South Arcot district was bifurcated into two districts viz. Cuddalore and Villupuram.

DPEP – Tamil Nadu
AWP&B 2002-03
Analysis of Civil Works cost in DPEP-I & II

(Rs. in lakhs)

State/District	EFC Cost	33.33% of EFC approved cost	Cum. expend upto 31.03.02	AWP&B 2002-03 (Fresh +spill over)	Total anticipated exp. upto 31.3.2003	Whether 33.33 ceiling crossed
1	3	3	4	5	6=4+5	7
DPEP-I						
Dharmapuri	6104.41	2034.60	1409.30	131.27	1540.57	No
Thiruvannamalai	4038.95	1346.18	1374.32	109.07	1483.39	Yes
*Villupuram	7237.36	2412.21	1884.52	316.02	2200.54	No
*Cuddalore						
State	843.52	281.15	154.04	2.63	156.67	No
Total	18224.24	6074.14	4822.18	558.99	5381.17	No
DPEP – II						
Perambalur	2610.73	870.16	877.84	0.00	877.84	Yes
Pudukkottai	2854.19	951.30	936.42	8.38	944.80	No
Ramanathapuram	2862.09	953.93	830.94	123.58	954.52	No
State	917.28	305.73	3.17	101.83	105.00	No
Total	9244.29	3081.12	2648.37	233.79	2882.16	No

DPEP – Tamil Nadu
AWP&B 2002-03
Analysis of Management cost in DPEP-I & II

(Rs. in lakhs)

State/District	EFC Cost	6% of EFC approved cost	Cum. expend upto 31.03.02	AWP&B 2002-03 (Fresh +spill over)	Total anticipated exp. upto 31.3.2003	Whether 6% ceiling crossed
1	3	4	5	6	7=5+6	7
DPEP-I						
Dharmapuri	6104.41	366.26	86.87	42.85	129.72	No
Thiruvannamalai	4038.95	242.34	96.32	17.84	114.16	No
*Villupuram	7237.36	434.24	114.07	21.11	135.18	No
*Cuddalore				13.73	13.73	No
State	843.52	50.61	355.36	66.90	422.26	Yes
Total	18224.24	1093.45	652.62	162.43	815.05	No
DPEP – II						
Perambalur	2610.73	156.64	67.50	27.85	95.35	No
Pudukkottai	2854.19	171.25	67.40	26.82	94.22	No
Ramanathapuram	2862.09	171.73	45.07	23.63	68.70	No
State	917.28	55.04	287.78	90.00	377.78	Yes
Total	9244.29	554.66	467.75	168.30	636.05	No

ANNUAL WORK PLAN & BUDGET (AWP&B) FOR 2002-2003

DPEP-MADHYA PRADESH

I Introduction : In Madhya Pradesh, District Primary Education Programme is being implemented for Universalisation of Primary Education. In first phase, 19 districts were selected under District Primary Education Programme in the year 1994 while in the year 1997, 15 districts were taken in second phase.

In the year 1999 after the division of the state & bifurcation of the districts, DPEP activities are going on in 33 districts which are as follows:

Phase -I (1994-2002)	Phase -II (1997-2002)
Betul, Raisen, Rajgarh, Sehore, Guna, Dhar, Rewa, Satna, Shahdol, *Umaria, Sidhi, Chhatarpur, Panna, Tikamgarh, Mandsaur, *Neemuch, Ratlam.	Bhind, Dewas, Damoh, Datia, Jhabua, Khandwa, Khargone, *Barwani, Mandla, *Dindori, Morena, *Sheopur kalan, Seoni, Shajapur, Shivpuri, Vidisha.

*Newly bifurcated districts

II. Physical and Financial Achievements of DPEP :

The district wise total project outlay, cumulative expenditure upto March 2002, spill over amount and fresh plan of 9 months (till Dec'02) are as follows:

DPEP - I

S. no.	Name of Districts	Total Project Outlay (Revised EFC)	Cumulative expenditure upto Mar'2002	Spill over amount	Fresh Plan for 9 Months (till dec'02)
1.	Betul	3168.05000	2920.88544	13328128	497.28392
2.	Raisen	2654.21000	2331.72476	162.85725	447.41425
3.	Rajgarh	2773.10000	2550.30430	179.24666	434.66931
4.	Sehore	2340.40000	2061.77052	185.81250	373.14169
5.	Guna	3200.77000	2982.70338	157.36000	536.12574
6.	Dhar	4018.77000	3633.72291	188.83227	520.26867
7.	Rewa	3500.61000	3037.57105	317.83335	506.12308
8.	Satna	3410.28000	3011.91092	131.39420	504.18980
9.	Shahdol	4197.64000	3648.14292	256.77723	640.05117
10.	Umaria				
11.	Sidhi	3624.80000	3090.65514	349.08867	559.95540
12.	Chhatarpur	3209.95000	2833.95388	180.95618	463.63735
13.	Panna	2118.42000	1853.99732	126.51062	361.45000
14.	Tikamgarh,	2790.59000	2524.67618	175.86175	461.72219

S. no.	Name of Districts	Total Project Outlay (Revised EFC)	Cumulative expenditure upto Mar'2002	Spill over amount	Fresh Plan for 9 Months (till dec'02)
15.	Mandsaur	3171.91000	2791.41882	288.66492	546.50490
16.	Neemuch				
17.	Ratlam	2820.09000	2346.47535	271.11051	395.80418
	SPO	3220.79000	2447.58389	305.25012	242.95226
	Total	50220.38000	44067.49678	3410.83751	7491.29391
	G. Total *	57023.28000			

* including 6802.9 lakh of 12 non DPEP districts sanctioned from additional plan.

DPEP - II

S. no.	Name of Districts	Total Project Outlay (Revised)	Cumulative expenditure upto Mar'2002	Spill over amount	Fresh Plan for 9 Months (till dec'02)
1.	Bhind	2460.49500	2009.03056	104.39955	285.18684
2.	Damoh	2038.97000	1810.21951	61.82754	309.57536
3.	Datia	1198.23500	1088.72407	50.11382	203.39169
4.	Dewas	2348.59700	1775.50465	74.08749	284.71745
5.	Jhabua	3999.69000	3586.30206	7.67248	374.91132
6.	Khandwa	3010.89000	2185.86328	69.99371	295.49518
7.	Khargone	3999.83000	3819.38294	64.47652	507.75498
8.	Barwani				
9.	Mandla	3999.38000	3195.01017	402.02315	548.11353
10.	Dindori				
11.	Morena	3847.39500	2859.16400	288.75886	409.17835
12.	Sheopur Kalan				
13.	Seoni	2917.50500	2639.27190	53.73565	362.96375
14.	Shajapur	1777.29500	1632.19985	69.67948	297.53715
15.	Shivpuri	2757.25500	2593.75936	189.46867	368.00392
16.	Vidisha	2789.25900	2032.15334	70.99445	283.30914
	SPO	966.14000	461.41519	308.63552	77.02750
	Total	38110.93600	31688.00088	1815.86689	4607.16616

III. Achievements of DPEP :

- **Access :** Madhya Pradesh has achieved the target of 100% (which was declared on 20th August 1998). This was made possible by providing 4261 New Primary Schools, 26160 EGS Schools and 70 Ashram Schools.
- **Appointment of teachers :** All the 8522 posts of Shiksha Karmis III against 4261 New Primary Schools (two posts in each NPS), 14871 posts of Additional Teachers and 4325 posts of Senior teachers (UDI) as CACs in CRCs have been filled.
- **Enrolment and Retention :** Growth in GER of Phase I and II may be seen in the table below :

Phase	Position of GER						Growth in GER
	LSA - I			LSA - II			
	Boys	Girls	Total	Boys	Girls	Total	
Phase - I	81.94	70.44	76.56	98.78	94.00	96.54	19.98
Phase - II	81.80	70.19	76.40	98.88	93.68	95.94	19.54

There is remarkable decrease in the number of dropout children during the project period. The detail is given below :

Phase	Number of dropout children						Decline in no. of dropout children
	LSA - I			LSA - II			
	Boys	Girls	Total	Boys	Girls	Total	
Phase- I	93318	100738	194056	66132	77278	143410	50646
Phase- II	77929	82773	160702	59594	61530	121124	39578
Total	171247	183511	354758	125726	138808	264534	90224

A number of activities have been undertaken to improve the GER and RR of the the state which may be summarised as follows :

1. **Mobilisation** : Series of activities have been organised by all the district. The major ones are – Back to School drive, Padna Badna Andolan, Shiksha Panchayat and orientation of VEC/SMC/PTA.
2. **Improving Infrastructure** : Providing buildings and additional rooms in the schools is one of the important strategies in improving the enrolment and retention of children. The status of civil works is as follows :

DPEP – I

S.no.	Category	Target	Achievement	Spill over
1.	BRC Buildings	120	120	Nil
2.	Primary School Buildings	6000	4357	1643
3.	Additional Rooms	2877	2870	7

DPEP – II

S.no.	Category	Target	Achievement	Spill over
1.	BRC Buildings	116	116	Nil
2.	Primary School Buildings	6823	4220	2603
3.	Additional Rooms	1665	1617	48

3. **School Contingency** : Teaching aids and school improvement fund play a vital role in the teaching learning process and improving school environment. School contingency has been distributed to 43180 schools in phase I and II districts.
4. **Shishu Shiksha Kendras/Jhoolaghars** : Pre-primary education has been introduced in rural areas through 3090 Shishu Shiksha Kendras in phase I districts and 236 Jhoolaghars in one block each of phase II districts to give attention to 3-5 age group children to inculcate in them the appropriate habits of learning and socialisation.

5. **Library Movement** : To improve the basic teaching learning material, which not just text books but also the use of a range of books outside the prescribed syllabus to supplement the teaching learning processes, the Mission has established libraries in 982 Jan Shiksha Kendras and 8582 EGS Schools.
6. **Special Focus Group** :
 - i. **Tribal Education** : Special interventions have been given for tribal children like 70 residential Ashram Schools for tribal girls, Bridge language Inventory (BLI) in Gondi, Kudukh, Baigani and Bhili languages have been developed. New Primary Schools and EGS Schools have also been opened in tribal areas. In EGS Schools, 44% children are tribal. Buildings and Additional Rooms have been constructed in tribal areas. Enrolment drives have been conducted in tribal dominated areas.
 - ii. **Integrated Education for Disabled Children** : The IED project has been implemented in all 236 blocks of DPEP districts. Disabled children of 5-14 years have been identified through LSA. Medical Assessment camps were organised in 98 blocks in which children were assessed & equipments were distributed to 10861 children according to the extent of their disability. 780 teachers were trained on IED. 206 teachers of 9 DPEP districts were trained for 45 days. Ramps & railing have been provided in 1400 school buildings.
 - iii. **Girls Education** : Several steps have been taken to improve enrolment and retention of girls like reservation for women in Panchayats, 30% reservation of teachers post for women, special drives such as LSA & Mahila Shiksha Abhiyan, gender sensitization of teachers and VEC members, Sahyogini project in one block of all DPEP districts on pilot basis was launched & special emphasis was given on removing gender bias in academic inputs. Mahila Samakhya is also working in 5 DPEP districts towards empowering women and girls.
 - iv. **Education of minority children** : In the year 2001-02, 523 Madarasas were taken to bring the children of minority children in the main stream of education. 12 days training has been given to all 523 Madarsa teachers of 14 DPEP districts & free textbooks were also distributed to the children of these Madarasas.
7. **Achievement** : Activities that have been taken to improve achievement level of children are teachers training on newly implemented ILM with the help of supplementary learning material in order to improve classroom teaching. In the year 2001-02, training has been given to 5791 MTs, 22309 Gurujis, 41080 Shiksha Karmis and 57091 primary school teachers.
8. **English Training** : 4 days training on English has been given to all the teachers, Shiksha Karmis and Gurujis in the year 2001-02.

9. **Head Start Programme** : 594 Head Start centers have been established in DPEP district (18 JSKs per district) in which 3 computers, 1 UPS & 1 Printer have been provided. Through these computers children solve there hard sport easily and at faster speed. 12 CDs on Maths, Language and EVS have also been developed. Head start is specially oriented to rural learners. It is an effort to bridge the digital divide and also provide a knowledge based to learners.

IV. Focus areas of AWP&B 2002-03 :

The AWP&B 2002-03 is prepared for 9 months only, it is to be completed by Dec'02. Most of the proposed activities in the AWP&B 2002-03 are ongoing activities and the recurring liabilities have been proposed like payment of salary of existing functionaries, O&M, completion of spill over civil works (i.e. School Buildings and Additional Rooms), teachers training etc.

1. **Civil Works** : There is spill over of 4246 school buildings and 55 Additional Rooms which will be completed in the year 2002-03 on priority.
2. **Salary to staff/teachers** : Salary of staff and teachers has been booked in the AWP&B 2002-03.
3. **Mobilisation** : Training will be organised for the members of Parent Teacher Association (PTA) explaining their responsibilities and functions so that they can be made aware of their rights and help in improving the enrolment and retention of the children by regular monitoring.
4. **Teacher Training** : Induction training will be conducted for newly recruited teachers and refresher training will be organised for primary school teachers and FGS gurujis.
5. **Head Start Programme** : There is proposal to start 20 more Head Start centers in all the 17 DPEP – I districts The budget for the same has been booked in AWP&B 2002-03 and amounts to Rs. 560.65 Lakh.

V. Appraisal of AWP&B 2002-03 :

The plans have been appraised by the EE Bureau and it is observed that the proposals are mostly based on the on-going / spill over activities and recurring expenditure like salaries of teachers / project staff, school improvement / teacher grant, teacher training, civil works, etc. The proposals were discussed with the officials of the State Society and the same have been restricted at the funds available out of the EFC approved project cost. However, the proposal to start 20 more Head Start Centres in each of the 17 DPEP-I district does not appear to be reasonable and justified in the remaining period of the project, which is closing on 31.12.2002. Moreover, in the EFC meeting held on 3rd August, 2001 regarding plans for utilisation of savings, the number of Head Start Centres was approved at the rate of 18 centres per district, which cannot be increased at this stage.

VI. Non-DPEP Districts :

Total amount approved for 12 Non-DPEP districts from additional Plan sanctioned for DPEP-I was Rs.68.03 crores. Due to the recurring liabilities of DPEP districts till December 2002, an amount of Rs. 47.50 crores is proposed to be diverted to DPEP-I districts and remaining amount of Rs. 20.54 crores will be used for different approved activities like - civil works (preferably school buildings, additional rooms, toilets, drinking water facility in primary schools), teachers training, school improvement grant, teachers grant, training-cum-orientation of newly formed PTAs in every school, mobilisation campaigns for girls and disadvantaged groups and 18 Head Start Centers in each non-DPEP district as approved in additional plan. In view of the deletion of the provision for additional 20 Head Start Centres in DPEP-I districts, saving of Rs.560.65 lakhs should be used in the non-DPEP district.

The recommended AWP&B for 2002-03 is as follows :

Project	Rs in Lakh		
	Spill Over	Fresh Plan	Total
DPEP-I	3410.84	6930.64	10341.48
Non-DPEP districts	2614.30	0.00	2614.30
DPEP-II	1815.87	4607.17	6423.04
	7841.01	11537.81	19378.82

Summary tables indicating the component-wise AWP&B for DPEP phase-I and phase II is given in Annex.I. Component-wise utilisation of funds in 12 non-DPEP districts are given in Annex.II. Abstract of AWP&B indicating the spill over and fresh proposal provision is given at Annex-III. Statements regarding Management cost and Civil Works are given in Annex.-IV and V respectively.

**DPEP-I MADHYA PRADESH
ABSTRACT OF AWP & B PROPOSALS 2002-2003**

Annex.I

PHASE-I DISTRICTS

(Rs. in lakhs)

SNO	Heads	Approved AWP & B 1994 to 2001-02	Anticipated expenditure upto 31st March'2002	Spill Over Amount for 2002-03	Fresh Proposals 2002-2003 for 9 Months	Total AWP & B 2002-2003 (Spillover+ Fresh Proposals)
1	New Primary School + Addl.Teach.	7648.63783	7041.75112		2992.72500	2992.72500
2	Alternative Schools	4097.74793	4075.39568			
3	Shishu Shiksha Kendra	1642.25615	1577.44381		178.44750	178.44750
4	Education Gaurantee Scheme	3880.06506	3800.62769	19.97064	40.00000	59.97064
5	District Project Office	934.11144	903.64144		139.70250	139.70250
6	District MIS	331.86734	324.87510		28.64250	28.64250
7	DIET	280.08469	273.06471		9.00000	9.00000
8	Block Resource Centre	1159.07817	1061.79092		208.03500	208.03500
9	Cluster Resource Centre	3554.23813	3188.54441		1012.32000	1012.32000
10	School Contingency	3739.88543	3227.10610		679.95000	679.95000
11	P.S.Building	12590.98259	9727.45360	2863.52899		2863.52899
12	Additional Room	2040.97334	1989.28410	51.68924		51.68924
13	Repairs	306.72269	277.85960	28.86309		28.86309
14	BRC Building	581.73519	571.03743	10.69776		10.69776
15	Gender	426.74868	45.05225		10.12500	10.12500
16	Mahila Samakhya	235.01972	192.46868	16.69290	24.94149	41.63439
17	Tribal	44.21840	24.11136			
18	Ashram School	125.36292	111.68587		19.89000	19.89000
19	Disabled Children	80.67529	26.76873	36.88991		36.88991
20	VEC Training	247.83882	131.77272		692.00346	692.00346
21	Innovation	11.20115	11.20115			
22	Distance Education	153.12500	0.79500	98.50000		98.50000
23	SCERT	416.32111	303.59599	33.79844	63.88750	97.68594
24	SIEMT	37.57137	27.08586	9.16000	5.85000	15.01000
25	Text Book Corporation	58.95000	58.95000			
26	SPO	1751.57108	1620.44645	91.87877	98.57200	190.45077
27	State MIS	153.42836	143.85065	2.34542	16.91396	19.25938
28	SSP Training + Cluster Trg.	124.22756	124.22756			
29	Quality Watch Training	381.48472	381.48472			
30	In Service Teacher Training	1651.61194	1564.73371		649.41000	649.41000
31	IEC/Mobilisation	681.56705	681.23384		9.00000	9.00000
32	Madarsa	1.80350				
33	Janpad Shiksha Kendra	74.38269	22.82559	32.75710	18.00000	50.75710
34	Jan Shiksha Kendra	692.35188	555.33094	114.06525	33.21800	147.28325
	Total	50137.84722	44067.49678	3410.83751	6930.63391	10341.47142

**DPEP-II MADHYA PRADESH
ABSTRACT OF AWP & B PROPOSALS 2002-2003**

Annex.I (Contd...)

PHASE- II DISTRICTS

(Rs. In lakhs)

SNO	Heads	Approved AWP & B 1997 to 2001-02	Anticipated expenditure upto 31st March'2002	Spill Over Amount for 2002-03	Fresh Proposals 2002-2003 for 9 Months	Total AWP &B 2002-2003 (Spillover+ Fresh Proposals)
1	New Primary School+Addl. Teach.	6183.88521	4182.69733		2270.70000	2270.70000
2	Alternative Schools	937.06069	814.10500			
3	Jhoola Ghar	100.07296	72.55500		12.60300	12.60300
4	Education Gaurantee Scheme	4260.83201	3634.02400			
5	District Project Office	852.85833	823.07000	7.87741	129.73800	137.61541
6	District MIS	196.23533	177.29900	12.58533	24.82350	37.40883
7	DIET	154.56939	142.95000		7.80000	7.80000
8	Block Resource Centre	1038.41470	926.01100		209.56000	209.56000
9	Cluster Resource Centre	3287.06686	3058.15100		1063.68000	1063.68000
10	School Contingency	2750.88088	2708.21200			
11	In service teacher training	1478.27052	1211.23800		373.48420	373.48420
12	P.S. Building	10418.28989	9085.23200	1333.05808		1333.05808
13	Additional Room	1287.13638	1234.46100	52.67577		52.67577
14	BRC Building	663.37373	647.04200	16.33157		16.33157
15	Gender	256.37480	65.75300		10.62750	10.62750
16	Mahila Samakhya	51.76206	30.21100	8.35999	10.80846	19.16845
17	Tribal	4.67030	4.67000			
18	Ashram School	270.89211	228.02900		72.93000	72.93000
19	Disabled Children	127.38473	4.06500	60.71000		60.71000
20	VEC Training	287.04088	157.10400		279.00000	279.00000
21	BRC Dev. in New Districts	70.00000	46.61700			
22	Innovation	65.00000	7.37900	55.12066		55.12066
23	Distance Education	182.61500	13.93200	68.19582		68.19582
24	SCERT	102.41127	89.91300	11.50000	25.69500	37.19500
25	SPO	354.62547	271.26700	79.06945	38.32250	117.39195
26	State MIS	81.35907	37.38400	34.03959	13.01000	47.04959
27	SSP Training + Cluster Trg.	114.04219	113.05100			
28	Quality Watch Training	317.74688	316.30400			
29	Shiksha Panchayat	83.34148	59.26100			
30	Madarsa	35.57876	6.55000			
31	Urban School for working children					
32	Janpad Shiksha Kendra	132.26265	107.64500	15.80569	23.20000	39.00569
33	Jan Shiksha Kendra	610.06476	535.57467	60.53753	41.18400	101.72153
34	IEC/Mobilisation	876.24449	876.24400			
	Total	37632.36379	31688.00100	1815.86689	4607.16616	6423.03305
	Grand Total (I+II)	87770.21101	75755.49778	5226.70440	11537.80007	16764.50447

Districtwise Budget details of 12 Non-DPEP district for AWP 2002-03

Approved from Additional Plan of DPEP-I

Rs. In Lakhs				
Sno	Districts	Spillover Amount for 2002-03	Civilwork Cost	Civilwork %
	INDORE	146.37	48.25	33.0%
	BHOPAL	112.98	37.30	33.0%
	JABALPUR	205.55	67.75	33.0%
	KATNI	151.56	50.00	33.0%
	GWALIOR	145.07	47.90	33.0%
	NARSINGH PUR	163.44	54.00	33.0%
	BALAGHAT	219.78	72.50	33.0%
	CHHINDWADA	238.31	78.60	33.0%
	SAGAR	227.31	75.00	33.0%
	HOSHANGABAD	172.62	56.80	32.9%
	HARDA	99.87	32.85	32.9%
	LUJAIN	170.84	56.35	33.0%
	Total	2053.70	677.30	33.0%

Component & Districtwise Budget details proposed as Spillover activities for the AWP 2002-03 as approved in Additional Plan of DPEP-I for 12 Non-DPEP Districts

Sno	Components	UnR Cost	INDORE	BHOPAL	JABALPUR	KATNI	GWALIOR	NARSINGHPUR	BALAGHAT	CHHINDWADA	SAGAR	HOSANGABAD	HARDA	LUJAIN	TOTAL
1	School Contingency(Primary Schools)	0.03000	26.22	17.58	42.00	25.26	29.97	28.74	50.58	57.51	46.11	28.62	11.82	36.39	400.80
2	Strengthening of Zila Shiksha Kendra	9.00000	9.00	9.00	9.00	9.00	9.00	9.00	9.00	9.00	9.00	9.00	9.00	9.00	108.00
3	Strengthening of DIET	3.00000	3.00	3.00	3.00		3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00		3.00	30.00
4	Strengthening of Jan Shiksha Kendras	0.20000	24.20	13.40	43.60	26.60	18.00	30.00	40.00	44.00	48.00	35.00	12.00	27.40	364.20
5	Strengthening of Janpad Shiksha Kendra	1.50000	6.00	3.00	10.50	9.00	7.50	9.00	15.00	16.50	16.50	10.50	4.50	9.00	117.00
6	Headstart at JSKs	1.65000	29.70	29.70	29.70	29.70	29.70	29.70	29.70	29.70	29.70	29.70	29.70	29.70	356.40
7	Additional Rooms	0.75000	27.75	15.00	42.75	25.50	22.50	30.00	43.50	52.50	48.00	30.00	11.25	35.25	384.00
8	Toilets	0.10000	5.50	5.80	7.00	6.50	6.50	6.00	6.50	7.20	7.50	7.00	6.00	5.50	77.00
9	Drinking Waters	0.30000	15.00	16.50	18.00	18.00	18.90	18.00	22.50	18.90	19.50	19.80	15.80	15.60	216.30
	Total Budget		146.37	112.98	205.55	151.56	145.07	163.44	219.78	238.31	227.31	172.62	99.87	170.84	2053.70

ABSTRACT OF AWP & B PROPOSALS 2002-2003
STATE - MADHYA PRADESH

Annex.III

Phase - I

(Rs in Lakhs)

S.NO.	STATE/DISTRICT	EFC Cost including \$ exchange rate amount	Cumulative Amt. Expenditure (1994-2002)		Average Expenditure per year	Approved AWP&B 2001-02 (Incl. SO)	Expend. during 2001-02 till March,2002	Anticipated amount saved	Reappropriation amount	Spill over to 2002-2003 (financial - outlay)	Fresh Proposals for 2002-03 for 9 Months	Total AWP&B for 2002-03 S.O.+F.P.
			Amount till March'2002	% of EFC								
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K
1	STATE	3220.79000	2447.58389	78.0%	349.65484	1072.71667	332.81705	739.89962	434.64951	305.25012	242.95226	548.20238
2	BETUL	3168.05000	2920.88544	92.2%	417.26935	823.40998	578.90521	244.50477	111.22349	133.28128	484.30392	597.58520
3	RAISEN	2654.21000	2331.72476	87.9%	333.10354	698.52495	376.03848	322.48847	159.62922	162.85725	414.43425	577.29150
4	RAJGARH	2773.10000	2550.30430	92.0%	364.32919	723.90013	501.21211	222.68802	43.44138	179.24668	401.68931	580.93597
5	SEHORE	2340.40000	2061.77052	86.1%	294.53885	632.38372	355.68491	276.69881	90.88831	185.81250	340.16169	525.97419
6	GUNA	3200.77000	2982.70338	93.2%	426.10048	844.88454	626.95542	217.92912	80.56912	157.36000	503.14574	660.50574
7	DHAR	4018.77000	3633.72291	90.4%	519.10327	963.72657	578.67749	385.04908	196.21681	188.83227	487.28867	676.12094
8	REWA	3500.81000	3037.57105	88.8%	433.93872	954.50489	491.48216	463.04273	145.20938	317.83335	473.14308	790.97643
9	SATNA	3410.28000	3011.91092	88.3%	430.27299	934.91408	540.87542	394.03868	262.64446	131.39420	471.20980	602.60400
10	SHAHDOL	4197.84000	3848.14292	86.9%	521.16327	1059.32526	549.89827	509.42899	252.64976	256.77723	574.09117	830.88840
11	SIDHI	3624.80000	3090.85514	85.3%	441.52216	945.84180	411.69948	534.14234	185.05367	349.08867	526.97540	676.08407
12	CHHATARPUR	3209.95000	2833.95388	88.3%	404.85055	858.57235	482.58999	376.00238	195.04618	180.95618	430.85735	611.81353
13	PANNA	2118.42000	1853.99732	87.5%	264.85676	563.36484	298.83990	264.42494	137.91432	126.51062	328.47000	454.98062
14	TIKAMGARH	2790.59000	2524.67618	90.5%	360.66803	685.01521	419.09783	285.91738	90.05563	175.86175	428.74219	604.60394
15	MANDSAUR	3171.91000	2791.41882	88.0%	398.77412	862.86120	482.36537	380.49583	91.83091	288.66492	480.54490	769.20982
16	RATLAM	2820.09000	2348.47535	83.2%	335.21076	746.30882	272.70550	473.60332	202.49281	271.11051	362.82418	633.93469
	Total	50220.38000	44067.49678	87.7%	6295.35668	13370.25501	7299.90457	6070.35044	2659.51294	3410.83751	6930.63391	10341.47142
	Non DPEP Plan	6802.90000										
	Grand Total DPEP-I	57023.28000										

Note : * For DPEP-I an amount of Rs.47.4924 Crores required for 9 Months AWP 2002-03 will be adjusted from Additional plan amount of Rs. 68.02 Crores approved last year for 12 Non-DPEP Districts of M.P. remaining Rs.20.53 Crores will be utilised in 12 Non-DPEP Districts

ABSTRACT OF AWP & B PROPOSALS 2002-2003
STATE - MADHYA PRADESH

Annex.III (Contd.)

Phase - II

(Rs in Lakhs)

S.NO.	STATE/DISTRICT	EFC COST	Cumulative Amt. Expenditure (1997-2002)		Average Expenditure per year	Approved AWP&B 2001-02 (Incl. SO)	Expend. during 2001-02 till March,2002	Anticipated amount saved	Reappropriation amount	Spill over to 2002-2003 (financial - outlay)	Fresh Proposals for 2002-03 for 9 Months	Total AWP&B for 2002-03 S.O.+F.P.
			Amount till March'2002	% of EFC								
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K
1	STATE	966.14000	461.41519	47.8%	115.35380	580.10437	143.70375	436.40062	127.78510	308.63552	77.02750	385.66302
3	BHIND	2460.49500	2009.03056	81.7%	502.25764	964.80854	524.42800	440.38054	335.98067	104.39955	285.18684	389.58639
4	DAMOH	2038.97000	1810.21951	88.8%	452.55488	734.02091	418.26200	315.75891	253.93172	81.82754	309.57536	371.40290
5	DATTA	1188.23500	1088.72407	90.9%	272.18102	481.65712	356.32613	125.33099	75.21717	50.11382	203.39169	253.50551
6	DEWAS	2348.58700	1775.50465	75.6%	443.87816	970.37025	474.21490	496.15535	422.06786	74.08749	284.71745	358.80494
7	JHABUA	3999.69000	3588.30206	89.7%	896.57552	1195.82348	782.57681	413.24667	405.57419	7.67248	374.91132	382.58380
8	KHANDWA	3010.89000	2185.86328	72.6%	546.46582	997.52081	542.88914	454.63167	384.63796	68.99371	295.49518	365.48889
9	KHARGONE	3999.83000	3919.39294	95.5%	954.84574	992.01658	811.79808	180.21850	115.74198	64.47652	507.75498	572.23150
10	MANDLA	3999.39000	3195.01017	79.9%	798.75254	1748.48632	944.09994	804.36638	402.34324	402.02315	548.11353	950.13668
11	MORENA	3847.39500	2859.16400	74.3%	714.79100	1529.57600	782.13580	737.44020	448.68131	298.75886	409.17835	697.93721
13	SEONI	2917.50500	2639.27190	90.5%	659.81798	843.16734	554.89571	288.27163	234.53598	53.73565	362.96375	416.69940
14	SHAJAPUR	1777.29500	1632.19985	91.8%	408.04996	632.45473	374.29572	258.15901	188.47953	69.67948	297.53715	367.21663
15	SHIVPURI	2757.25500	2593.75938	94.1%	648.43984	1013.16476	577.55431	435.61047	246.14180	189.46867	368.00392	557.47259
16	VIDISHA	2789.25900	2032.15334	72.9%	508.03834	982.11771	433.72571	558.39200	487.39755	70.99445	283.30914	354.30359
	Total	38110.93600	31688.90088	83.1%	7922.00022	13675.26893	7730.90600	5944.36293	4128.49606	1815.86689	4607.16616	6423.03305
	Grand Total	95134.21600	75755.49766	79.6%	14217.35690	27045.62394	15030.81057	12014.71337	6788.00900	5226.70440	11537.80007	16764.50447

STATEMENT ON CIVIL WORKS COST 2002-2003
STATE - MADHYA PRADESH

Annex.IV

Phase - I

(Rs in Lakhs)

S.NO.	STATE/DISTRICT	EFC Cost including \$ exchange rate amount	EFC approved Cost for CIVIL WORKS	24% of EFC approved cost	33.33% of EFC approved cost	Cumulative Expenditure from 1994-2002 Till March' 2002	Allocation made for the Year 2002-2003		TOTAL	Expenditure till March'2002 + S.O.+F.P.
							fresh plan 2002-03 for 9 Months	Anticipated spill over		
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
1	STATE	3220.79000	301.6000	772.8896	1073.4893					
2	BETUL	3168.05000	580.5000	760.3320	1055.9111	896.9085		121.59151	121.59151	1018.50000
3	RAISEN	2854.21000	511.7500	637.0104	884.8482	739.6227		151.91515	151.91515	891.53780
4	RAJGARH	2773.10000	550.0000	665.5440	924.2742	785.2378		167.76224	167.76224	953.00000
5	SEHORE	2340.40000	485.0000	561.6960	780.0553	857.0739		182.81250	182.81250	839.68637
6	GUNA	3200.77000	590.2500	758.1848	1066.8168	873.6100		146.64000	146.64000	1020.25000
7	DHAR	4018.77000	743.2500	964.5048	1339.4560	1111.9520		180.29800	180.29800	1292.25000
8	REWA	3500.61000	673.2500	840.1464	1166.7533	848.0167		314.23335	314.23335	1162.25000
9	SATNA	3410.28000	606.5000	818.4672	1136.6463	1005.8574		115.63711	115.63711	1121.49450
10	SHAHDOL	4197.84000	809.5000	1007.4336	1399.0734	1076.8700		256.63000	256.63000	1333.50000
11	SIDHI	3824.80000	655.0000	869.9520	1208.1458	799.0789		345.58867	345.58867	1144.66752
12	CHHATARPUR	3209.95000	587.5000	770.3880	1068.8763	853.2774		165.22261	165.22261	1016.50000
13	PANNA	2116.42000	405.0000	508.4208	706.0694	582.3767		123.62326	123.62326	706.00000
14	TIKAMGARH	2790.59000	521.5000	688.7416	930.1036	747.3659		159.13413	159.13413	906.50000
15	MANDSAUR	3171.91000	644.2500	761.2684	1057.1976	845.7150		269.52004	269.52004	1115.23500
16	RATLAM	2820.09000	541.5000	676.8216	939.9360	748.0495		254.37051	254.37051	1003.42000
	Total	50220.3800	9246.3500	12052.8912	16738.4527	12572.01211		2954.77908	2954.77908	15526.79119
	Non DPEP Plan	6802.90000								
	Grand Total DPEP-I	57023.28000								

STATEMENT ON CIVIL WORKS COST 2002-2003
STATE - MADHYA PRADESH

Annex.IV (Contd.)

Phase - II

(Rs in Lakhs)

S.NO.	STATE/DISTRICT	EFC COST	EFC approved Cost for CIVIL WORKS	24% of EFC approved cost	33.33% of EFC approved cost	Cumulative Expenditure from 1997-2002 Till March' 2002	Allocation made for the Year 2002-2003		TOTAL	Expenditure till March'2002 + S.O.+F.P.
							fresh plan 2002-03 for 9 Months	Anticipated spill over		
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
1	STATE	966.14000		231.87360	322.01446					
2	BHIND	2480.49500	588.45000	590.51880	820.08298	725.77589		94.87382	94.87382	820.44971
3	DAMOH	2038.97000	487.90000	489.35280	679.58870	624.20188		54.19812	54.19812	678.40000
4	DATIA	1198.23500	285.95000	287.57640	399.37173	355.70518		43.88682	43.88682	399.59200
5	DEWAS	2348.59700	561.80000	563.66328	782.78738	717.72442		64.70229	64.70229	782.42671
6	JHABUA	3999.69000	952.35000	959.92560	1333.09668	1329.31669		3.77622	3.77622	1333.09291
7	KHANDWA	3010.89000	717.80000	722.61360	1003.52964	939.99630		63.60370	63.60370	1003.60000
8	KHARGONE	3999.83000	960.10000	959.96920	1333.14334	1273.43901		59.49601	59.49601	1332.93502
9	MANDLA	3999.38000	959.85000	959.85120	1332.99335	943.57597		388.87403	388.87403	1332.45000
10	MORENA	3847.39500	920.85000	923.37480	1282.33675	1005.74570		276.18875	276.18875	1281.93545
11	SEONI	2917.50500	698.00000	700.20120	972.40442	924.58355		47.08575	47.08575	971.64930
12	SHAJAPUR	1777.29500	424.25000	426.50080	592.37242	529.16468		62.65827	62.65827	591.82293
13	SHIVPURI	2757.25500	657.95000	661.74120	918.89309	740.08703		178.51297	178.51297	918.60000
14	VIDISHA	2789.25900	667.80000	689.42216	929.86002	865.69808		64.40767	64.40767	930.10575
	Total	38110.93600	8882.05000	9146.62464	12702.37487	10974.99436		1402.06542	1402.06542	12377.95978
	Grand Total	95134.21600	18128.40000	21189.51584	29440.82762	23547.00647		4356.84450	4356.84450	27903.85097

Annual Work Plan & Budget (AWP&B) for 2002-2003

CHHATTISGARH

Introduction:

After the creation of the new State of Chattisgarh w.e.f. 1.11.2000, six DPEP districts (now comprising 15 districts) were transferred from Madhya Pradesh. Four districts (now comprising 9 districts) are covered under EC assisted DPEP-I and two districts (now comprising 6 districts) are covered under IDA assisted DPEP-II. As a part of the Plan approved by the EFC for utilisation of savings under EC grant, funds were also sanctioned for certain limited interventions for the only non-DPEP district in the State, namely, Durg.

Physical and Financial Achievements of DPEP:

The position of EFC approved project cost, expenditure upto March, 2002 and the anticipated requirements up to the end of the project period are as follows:-

DPEP-I

(Rs. in Lacs)

District	Revised project Cost	Expen 2001-02	Total Expen till march 2002	Amount left for the dist	Requirement for next nine months(till Dec. 2002)
Bilaspur	4541.58	490.06	3866.94	674.64	609.529
Raigarh	3830.87	487.59	3385.56	445.31	500.285
Rajnandgaon	2906.4	422.94	2748.66	157.74	509.316
Surguja	4221.35	469.61	3839.86	381.49	634.039
Non DPEP Durg	664	62.98	62.98	601.02	7.04
Total	16164.2	1933.18	13904	2260.2	2260.209
SPO	100	17.33	17.33	82.67	140.89
Grand Total	16264.2	1950.51	13921.33	2342.87	2401.099

DPEP-II

(Rs. in Lacs)

District	Project Cost	Expenditure till 31.3.2002	Funds Available for the Remaining Project Period	Requirement for fin. Year 02-03	Req. (Upto June 2003)	Additional fund required (till June 03)
Bastar	3999.80	3273.54	726.26	746.989	182.345	929.334
Raipur	3999.02	3084.03	914.99	894.422	127.582	1022.004
Total	7998.82	6357.57	1641.25	1641.411	309.927	1951.338

Access:

The State had achieved 100% access in the year 1998-99. However, due to the growth of several new habitations in size and closure of NFE centres in July, 2000 the access is now 99.03% in phase-I districts and 99.36% in phase-II districts. 1152 new primary schools, 5720 EGS centres and 24 Ashram Shalas have been opened under DPEP.

Enrolment & Retention:

There has been constant increase in the Enrollment and Retention at Primary level. At present the GER in DPEP I is 101.25% and in DPEP - II it is 103.5%. Retention in DPEP - I is 84.29% and 89% in DPEP - II.

Civil Works:

Almost all the civil works originally planned have been completed. However, in view of the additional allocations made in the DPEP - I under the plan for utilisation of savings and increase in the ceiling for Civil Works upto 33.3%, a large number of additional Civil Works have been planned. Against the revised target of 1928 primary school buildings and 560 additional classrooms under DPEP I, 1033 primary school buildings and 558 additional classrooms have been completed. Similarly under DPEP-II out of 1276 primary school buildings and 136 additional classrooms, 338 primary school buildings and 131 additional classrooms have been completed. Besides this, out of 1386 shelters for EGS schools under DPEP-I, 1241 have been completed. Under DPEP-II, the planned 278 EGS shelters have been completed.

Shishu Shiksha Kendras :

A total of 680 SSKs are opened in DPEP - I districts to take care the first generation learners for primary schooling. Under DPEP - II SSK are converged with the Mahila Bal Vikas Vibhag.

School Contingency:

Teacher grant and school grant are major project components with DPEP through which funding is provided for creating material and environmental support facilitating effective school processes. A grant of Rs. 2000/- per annum per school and 500/- per teacher per school (maximum 1000/-) is provided to each school for improving school facilities. The central idea behind the grant is to make the schools an attractive place for the child and change the environment/ambience of the school.

Teachers Training:

Most of the teachers are trained in Seekhna -Sikhana package in a phased manner and EGS Gurujis are given training in both the Seekhna-Sikhana Package and alternative school based Pathan-Paathan Package. Teachers are also provided on the job as well as training during monthly meetings. On the basis of hard areas, Self - Learning Materials (SLM) are also developed and EGS gurujis are provided 21 days training.

Equity/Coverage of Special Focus Group :

DPEP has provided special inputs for meeting the challenges of providing quality education to all children of all social groups without any gender discrimination. Through LSA it was made very clear that girls, children belonging to SC/ST/differently able need prime focus to achieve the goal of UPE. The measures taken in this regard are opening of new schools, residential schools for girls (Ashram Shalas), providing local teachers, special enrolment drives, avoiding the gender bias in text books and ensuring participation of ladies, members of deprived communities in the village level committees.

Quality Watch Programme :

Through this programme it has been possible to achieve 100% enrolment, Attendance of all children for an average of 200 teaching days, attainment of stipulated learning levels by all children, improved learning environment, better integration of educational content with contextual needs, greater local ownership of the school, more self-reliant schools.

Head Start Programme :

With a view to impart computer training to teachers and computer education to children, Head Start Programme was started in 1999-2000 @ 18 clusters per district. As such, for 15 bifurcated districts, 270 Headstart centres have been started. They are to be provided 3 Computers each with one UPS and One Printer the recurring cost is on account of O&M expences @ Rs 9000/- per year.

Dropout/ Retention :

During the implementation phase of DPEP in the state the over all Retention in all terms – be they of SC, ST or of Boys, Girls- the state has registered a remarkable increase. The present Retention Rate of the state in terms of DPEP I districts is 84.29% and the same in terms of DPEP II districts is 89% against the DPEP supergoal (in this regard) of 90%.

IED :

Survey of Disabled children has been conducted in the districts and in joint collaboration of DRC (District Rehabilitation Centers) the districts are implementing various programmes for Disabled. Scholarships are provided through the Social Welfare Department of the state.

FOCUS AREAS OF AWP&B 2002-3

Since DPEP I is closing on 31.12.2002 and DPEP II is to be completed by 30 June, 2003, most of the activities planned under the AWP & B for 2002-03 are the on going activities like payment of salary for the project staff/teachers, completion of pending Civil Works, Teacher Training, Disbursement of school improvement/ teacher grant etc. the new initiatives are as follows :

(1) Opening of new EGS centres

The number of out of school children in the state is estimated to be 2.08 lakhs. Due to the closer of NFE centres, there is a proposal to open 1453 new EGS centres. This is now

proposed to be covered under the new scheme of EGS and AIE within the framework of SSA.

(2) Need based Teachers Training.

With a view to improve the content and refinement in teaching skills it is proposed to provide need based teacher training by identifying the training needs of the teachers by utilising the guidance and expertise of NCERT and DIETs. Each DIET will prepare a detailed report on the training needs of their districts which will include development of a questionnaire, classroom observation by DIET staff and focus group discussions.

(3) In Service Teacher Training

At present the in service training of teachers through distance mode is organized on a very limited scale. Before last year all the cluster Academic Coordinators (CACs) were given 3 days training through distance mode. This year the use of distance education mode will be used frequently during different training programmes.

(4) English Training

10 days training will be given to all EGS teachers and EGS Gurujis on English teaching in primary classes. The budget for this purpose will be used from the savings.

(5) School Chalo Abhiyan

Through School Chalo Abhiyan every person of the village take oath to enrol the girls and sent the school every day. Balika Shiksha Shivir which will be organized at the block level. The state this year is going to organise "SCHOOL JABO – PADHKE AABO" programme in the month of July. The programme will be mass enrollment drive and the community will be organising the programme. All especially Newcomers, dropped out and still unrelod will be welcome in the programme. The community will organise a get together for these and will keep an eye of their progress all through the year. This programme in a nutshell is extension of the last years enrollment drive "Padhbo Padhobo School Jabo" abhiyaan.

Appraisal of AWP & B for 2002-03

DPEP - I

Under DPEP – I, no additional requirement has been proposed over the EFC approved project cost. Since the project cost was recently revised with the approval of EFC regarding utilization of savings in EC grant and no additional funds are available, it is not possible to make any additional allocation and the project has to be managed within the already approved project cost. However, as regards inter district reallocation of funds, the state has made proposal to use the funds of Non DPEP – district Durg. Chhattisgarh being a newly constituted State and since full compliment of staff at the SPO is not yet available, appraisal of all the district plans have been conducted in the Bureau in association with the concerned officials of the State Society and the following deductions are proposed :-

1. Bilaspur:

In Bilaspur district, the provision of grant for educational material for AS centres budgeted @ Rs. 5000/- per centre may be reduced to 50% i.e. from Rs. 12.00 lakhs to Rs. 6.00 lakhs. For AS Centres, improvement Grant @ Rs. 2000/- per year amounting to Rs.4.8 lakhs may be reduced to Rs 2.4 lacs (@ Rs 1000/- per school) as the last year's grant has been released only in March, 2002. The proposal for opening new 65 EGS Centres may be dropped and accordingly the provisions for pre-service training of new Gurujis and appointment of new Gurujis would be proportionately reduced. The O & M expenses for the District Project Office may be restricted at the last year's level. For EGS centres also, the TLM grant may be reduced to 50% i.e., from Rs. 48.25 lakhs to Rs. 24.25 lakhs. A total deduction of Rs. 66.60 lakhs is therefore recommended for Bilaspur district.

2. Raigarh :

The provision for Improvement Grant of Rs. 14.02 lakhs for EGS centres is reduced to Rs 7.57 lacs this will be @ Rs 1000/- per EGS school., The school/teacher grant amounting to Rs.53.14 lakhs and Rs. 26.57 lakhs may not be released during this year as the same has been released in March, 2002. This O & M expenses for DPO may be restricted at the last year level. A total deduction of Rs. 90.08 lakhs is therefore recommended for Raigarh district.

3. Rajnandgaon:

The provision of Rs. . 3.045 lakhs towards AS Improvement Grant and Rs3.66 lakhs for EGS grant may be reduced to Rs 2.1 lacs and Rs 1.83 lacs respectively making a reduction of Rs .945 lacs and Rs 1.83 lacs i.e. @ Rs 1000/ per AS & EGS as the same has been released in March, 2002. O & M expenses for DPO may be restricted at the last year's level and provision for quality watch training amounting to Rs. 5.16 lakhs may be deleted. Similarly, the provision for VEC/SMC training amounting to Rs. 8.72 lakhs need not be made. Construction of 103 primary school buildings which have not yet been started may be reduced. The total deduction in this district would be Rs. 120.71 lacs.

4. Surguja:

The AS Improvement Grant of Rs. 4.40 lakhs @ Rs 2000/- per school may be reduced to Rs 2.2 lacs (@ Rs 1000/- per school), opening of new EGS Centres amounting to Rs. 2.70 lakhs can be deleted and the Improvement Grant for EGS centres amounting to Rs. 21.28 lakhs may be reduced to Rs 10.64 (@Rs 1000/- per school). This would bring a total deduction of Rs. 15.54 lakhs in the district plan.

DPEP-II:

5. Bastar:

The provision for opening of 69 new EGS centres amounting to Rs.10.70 lakhs may be deleted. The expenditure of the DPO may be restricted at the last year's level. The provisions for innovation and action research activities may also be dropped. Due to the constraint of funds and ceiling on civil works, out of 281 new school buildings (EGS shelters) the provision for 166 school buildings which are not yet started may not be agreed

to. A total deduction of Rs.188.645 lakhs is proposed for this district. The district will need additional amount of Rs 20.69 lacs will be needed to pull the project till March. This amount will be pooled to the district from the other DPEP II district Raipur.

6. Raipur:

The provision for 150 new school buildings (EGS shelters) which are not yet started may not be agreed to. Similarly, the provision for purchase of computers for Head-Start project may be reduced from Rs. 27.00 lakhs to 18.00 lakhs. Improvement grant for the EGS, keeping the availability of funds in mind may be reduced from Rs 2000/- per school to Rs 1000/ per school. A reduction of Rs 4.28 lacs is needed. A total saving of Rs. 143lakhs is affected in respect of this district. Total deduction of Rs 163.78 is proposed.

III. The recommended provisions are as follows:-

DPEP-I

District	Revised project Cost	Total Expen till March 2002	Recommended AWP & B for 2002-03
Bilaspur	4541.58	3866.94	606.23
Raigarh	3830.87	3385.56	497.94
Rajnandgaon	2906.40	2748.66	507.51
Surguja	4221.35	3839.86	630.98
Non DPEP Durg	664.00	62.98	7.00
Total	16164.20	13904.00	2249.66
SPO	100.00	17.33	130.00 *
Grand total	16264.2	13921.33	2379.66

* Expenditure of SPO upto 31.12.2002 would be booked under DPEP-I and from 1.1.2003 to 30.6.2003 it will be booked under DPEP-II.

DPEP-II

District	Project Cost	Total Expen till 31.03.2002	Recommended AWP & B for 2002-03
Bastar	3999.80	3273.54	744.65
Raipur	3999.02	3084.03	891.64
Total	7998.82	6357.57	1636.29

Summary tables indicating the component-wise AWP & B is given in Annex-I. Abstract of AWP&B indicating the spill over & fresh proposal provision is given at Annex-II. Statements regarding Management cost and civil works are given in Annex-III & IV respectively.

RAJIV GANDHI PRATHMIK SHIKSHA MISSION
DISTRICT PRIMARY EDUCATION PROGRAMME
 Componentwise break up of AWP&B 2002-03

Annex - I

State Chhattisgarh Phase I Districts

Rs in lacs

S.No	Component	SPO	Non DPEP Durg	Bilaspur	Raigarh	R'gaon	Surguja	Total DPEP I	Bastar	Raipur	Total DPEP II	Total DPEP
1	2			3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1	NPS			45.78	57.55	63.45	62.10	228.88	138.00	193.20	331.20	560.08
2	AS Centres			55.11	31.99	51.98	51.85	190.92	0.00	0.00	0.00	190.92
3	Jhoolaghar/SSK			2.36	8.32	12.86	15.16	38.70	0.00	0.00	0.00	38.70
4	EGS Centre			145.65	87.07	22.88	130.30	385.89	239.17	69.34	308.51	694.40
5	Addl. Teachers			29.55	36.02	30.90	19.67	116.13	0.00	0.00	0.00	116.13
6	District Project Office			12.33	8.65	9.50	11.31	41.78	5.60	12.57	19.17	60.95
7	District MIS			2.27	2.24	2.69	2.38	9.67	1.50	1.98	3.48	13.04
8	Strengthening of DIET			0.60	0.73	0.73	0.73	2.78	0.80	0.80	1.60	4.38
9	Block Resource Centres			28.75	22.95	18.38	32.40	102.48	52.60	64.33	117.13	219.59
10	Cluster Resource Centres			92.90	51.53	44.38	79.41	268.23	149.96	154.90	304.86	573.08
11	School Contingency			44.80	0.00	0.00	0.00	44.80	0.00	0.00	0.00	44.80
12	Ashram Schools			1.24	2.72	1.36	5.08	10.40	16.48	13.18	29.66	40.06
13	Gender			0.75	0.58	1.63	0.58	3.53	0.00	1.00	1.00	4.53
14	Tribal			1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	328.00	328.00	329.00
15	Disabled Children			0.50	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.50	0.00	1.00	1.00	2.50
17	Need Based Training			20.00	9.00	11.00	13.00	53.00	19.00	15.00	34.00	87.00
18	Head-Start			30.15	4.81	4.81	4.94	44.70	4.86	26.21	31.67	75.77
19	Civil Works			72.50	164.00	223.50	190.00	650.00	115.00	0.00	115.00	765.00
20	English Training (EGS)			15.00	5.50	4.00	8.00	32.50	0.00	5.00	5.00	37.50
21	Motivational Training (BROC&CAC)			3.20	1.32	1.50	2.09	8.10	0.00	3.13	3.13	11.23
22	Innovation			1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	4.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	5.00
23	Action Research			1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	4.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	5.00
24	Quality Watch			0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.49	0.00	0.49	0.49
25	SPO	130.00						130.00			0.00	130.00
26	Non DPEP Durg (MIS & DPO)		7.00					7.00			0.00	7.00
TOTAL		130.00	7.00	606.23	497.94	507.51	630.98	2379.66	744.65	891.64	1636.29	4015.95

STATE PROJECT OFFICE
CHHATTISGARH, RAIPUR

Annexure - II

ABSTRACT OF AWP & B PROPOSALS 2002-03

STATE - CHHATTISGARH

Phase - I

(Rs. In lakhs)

Sl.No.	State/District	EFC Revised approved Cost (Baseline)	EFC approved Cost (with % contg.)	Cumulative Expenditure from 1994-02		Average expenditure per year	Approved AWP & B 2001-02 (incl.S.O.)	Expenditure during 2001-02 till March 2002	Spill Over to 2002-03 (Financial outlay)	Fresh proposal for 2002-03	Total AWP & B for 2002-03 S.O. + F.P.	Total AWP & B as % of av. Yearly expenditure	Total AWP & B as % of EFC Cost
				Amount till March'02	% of EFC								
		A	B	C	D	E	F	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Bilaspur	4541.580	3184.300	3866.940	85.15%	552.420	793.710	490.060	72.500	533.730	606.230	109.74%	13.35%
2	Raigarh	3830.870	3150.540	3385.560	88.38%	483.651	980.983	487.590	164.000	333.940	497.940	102.95%	13.00%
3	Rajnandgaon	2990.400	2595.140	2748.660	94.57%	392.666	861.276	422.940	223.500	284.010	507.510	129.25%	17.46%
4	Surguja	4221.350	3163.520	3839.860	90.96%	548.551	837.930	469.810	190.000	440.980	630.980	115.03%	14.95%
TOTAL		15500.200	12093.500	13841.020	89.30%	1977.289	3473.899	1870.200	650.000	1786.604	2242.660	114.24%	14.69%

ABSTRACT OF AWP & B PROPOSALS 2002-03

Phase - II

STATE - CHHATTISGARH

(Rs. In lakh)

Sl.No.	State/District	EFC approved Cost (Baseline)	Cumulative expenditure from 1997-02	% of EFC	Average expenditure per year	Approved AWP & B 2001-02 (incl.S.O.)	Expenditure 2001-02 till March 2002	Spill Over 2002-03 (financial outlay)	Fresh proposal for 2002-03	Total AWP & B for 2002-03 S.O. + F.P.	Expected Exp. for 01.04.03 to 30.06.03 (3 months)	Expected Exp. for 01.04.02 to 30.06.03 (15 months)	Total AWP & B as % of av. Yearly expenditure for 2002-03	Total AWP & B as % of EFC Cost
1	Bastar	3999.800	3273.540	81.843	654.708	1329.570	695.440	115.000	629.650	744.650	182.345	926.995	113.74%	18.62%
2	Raipur	3999.020	3084.030	77.120	616.806	1448.955	810.030	328.000	563.640	891.640	127.5814	1019.2214	144.56%	22.30%
TOTAL		7998.820	6357.570	79.481	1271.514	2778.525	1505.47	443.00	1193.290	1641.411	309.9264	1951.3376	129.15%	20.46%

STATE PROJECT OFFICE

CHHATTISGARH, RAIPUR

STATEMENT OF MANAGEMENT COST 2002-03 (Upto Dec. 02)

Annexure - III

STATE - CHHATTISGARH

Phase - I

(Rs. In lakhs)

Sl.No.	State/District	EFC approved Project Cost	Proposed Revised Project Cost	6% of proposed revised cost	Management cost proposed as per EFC	Cumulative Expenditure till March 2002	Allocation made for the year 2002-03 (Upto Dec. 02)			Exp. Till March 2002 S.O. + F.P. 2002-03
							Fresh Plan	Anticipated spillover	Total	
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
1	Bilaspur	3091.550	4541.580	272.4948	95.58	188.465	12.600	0.000	12.600	201.065
2	Raigarh	3058.780	3830.870	229.8522	95.58	136.900	13.340	0.000	13.340	150.240
3	Rajnandgaon	2519.550	2906.400	174.384	95.58	113.612	12.440	0.000	12.440	126.052
4	Surguja	3071.380	4221.350	253.281	95.58	207.630	13.204	0.000	13.204	220.834
TOTAL (Phase I)		11741.260	15500.200	930.012	382.32	646.607	51.584	0.000	51.584	698.191

STATEMENT OF MANAGEMENT COST 2002-03

Phase II

(Rs. In lakhs)

Sl.No.	State/District	EFC approved Project	Proposed Revised Project	6% of proposed revised	Management cost proposed as per EFC	Cumulative Expenditure till March 2002	Allocation made for the year 2002-03			Exp. Till March 2002 S.O. + F.P.
							Fresh Plan	Anticipated spillover	Total	
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
1	Bastar	3999.800	3999.800	239.988	82.67	2.849	18.045	0.000	18.045	20.894
2	Raipur	3999.020	3999.020	239.9412	82.67	93.000	14.550	0.000	14.550	107.550
TOTAL (Phase II)		7998.820	7998.820	479.9292	165.34	95.849	32.595	0.000	32.595	128.444

STATE PROJECT OFFICE

CHHATTISGARH, RAIPUR

STATEMENT OF CIVIL WORKS COST 2002-03 (Upto Dec. 02)

STATE - CHHATTISGARH

Annexure - IV

Phase - I

(Rs. In lakhs)

Sl.No.	State/District	FC Approved Project Cost	Proposed Revised Project Cost	33.33% of proposed revised cost	Civil work cost as per EFC	Cumulative Expenditure till March 2002	Allocation made for the year 2002-03 (Upto Dec. 02)			Exp. Till March 2002 S.O. + F.P. 2002-03
							Fresh Plan	Anticipated spillover	Total	
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
1	Bilaspur	4541.550	4541.580	1513.709	694.250	699.666	0.000	72.500	72.500	772.166
2	Raigarh	3830.870	3830.870	1276.829	816.000	955.066	0.000	164.000	164.000	1119.066
3	Rajnandgaon	2906.400	2906.400	968.7031	673.500	668.723	0.000	223.500	223.500	892.223
4	Surguja	4221.350	4221.350	1406.976	820.000	833.090	0.000	190.000	190.000	1023.090
TOTAL (Phase I)		11111.260	115500.200	5166.217	3003.750	1001.150	0.000	650.000	650.000	1651.150

STATEMENT OF MANAGEMENT COST 2002-03

Phase - II

(Rs. In lakhs)

Sl.No.	State/District	FC Approved Project Cost	Proposed Revised Project Cost	33.33% of proposed revised cost	Civil work cost as per EFC	Cumulative Expenditure till March 2002	Allocation made for the year 2002-03			Exp. Till March 2002 S.O. + F.P.
							Fresh Plan	Anticipated spillover	Total	
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
1	Bastar	3999.800	3999.800	1333.133	620.750	812.763	0.000	115.000	115.000	927.763
2	Raipur	3999.020	3999.020	1332.873	132.750	558.683	0.000	328.000	328.000	886.683
TOTAL (Phase II)		7998.820	7998.820	2666.007	753.500	1371.447	0.000	443.000	443.000	1814.447

STATE PROJECT OFFICE

CHHATTISGARH, RAIPUR

STATEMENT OF CIVIL WORKS COST 2002-03 (Upto Dec. 02)

STATE - CHHATTISGARH

Annexure - IV

(Rs. In lakhs)

C owed ect st	Proposed Revised Project Cost	33.33% of proposed revised cost	Civil work cost as per EFC	Cumulative Expenditure till March 2002	Allocation made for the year 2002-03 (Upto Dec 02)			Exp. Till March 2002 S.O + F.P. 2002-03
					Fresh Plan	Anticipated spillover	Total	
	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
1.550	4541.580	1513.709	694.250	699.666	0.000	72.500	72.500	772.166
3.780	3830.870	1276.829	816.000	955.066	0.000	164.000	164.000	1119.066
9.550	2906.400	968.7031	673.500	668.723	0.000	223.500	223.500	892.223
1.380	4221.350	1406.976	820.000	833.090	0.000	190.000	190.000	1023.090
1.260	15500.200	5166.217	3003.750	1001.150	0.000	650.000	650.000	1651.150

STATEMENT OF MANAGEMENT COST 2002-03

(Rs. In lakhs)

ved ect	Proposed Revised Project	33.33% of proposed revised	Civil work cost as per EFC	Cumulative Expenditure till March 2002	Allocation made for the year 2002-03			Exp. Till March 2002 S.O. + F.P.
					Fresh Plan	Anticipated spillover	Total	
	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
800	3999.800	1333.133	620.750	812.763	0.000	115.000	115.000	927.763
020	3999.020	1332.873	132.750	558.683	0.000	328.000	328.000	886.683
820	7998.820	2666.007	753.500	1371.447	0.000	443.000	443.000	1814.447

10

Abstract of AWP & B indicating the spill over & fresh proposal provision is given at Annex-II
Statements regarding Management cost and civil works are given in Annex-III & IV respectively.

ANNUAL WORK PLAN & BUDGET (AWP&B) FOR 2002-2003

DPEP-HIMACHAL PRADESH

1. INTRODUCTION :

1.1 Six districts of Himachal Pradesh are covered under DPEP at a total project cost of Rs. 129.28 crores. Expenditure incurred upto 31.3.2002 is Rs. 92.93 crores. The State Implementation Society has made detailed assessment of district-wise anticipated expenditure from 1.4.2002 to 30.6.2003 (project completion date) based on which savings are anticipated in the expenditure at State level and Lahaul-Spiti district and there are additional requirements in respect of Chamba, Kullu and Sirmour districts.

II. PROGRESS OVERVIEW

2.1 Planning and Management

- Microplanning has been initiated in all DPEP districts of H.P. and trainings have been provided to all functionaries of DPEP.
- School Mapping exercise was conducted with the help of teachers and community to identify suitable location for opening new schools under DPEP in all the four districts.
- Cohort studies have been conducted in few blocks to assess the internal efficiency of educational system.

2.2 Civil works :

Under Innovation Fund, the consultancy for designing and supervision of prototypes by INTACH is in progress. The consultancy for designing and supervision of school buildings with solar passive features was assigned to State Council for Science, Technology and Environment, HP. The Council has submitted the designs for the buildings selected for solar passive construction and are being implemented in the districts. The consolidated and district wise targets and progress of different civil works as on 31.3.2002 is reflected in the tables below and State is hopeful of completing the entire civil works within the stipulated time frame.

Name of Work	Project Target	Taken up so far	Completed	In Progress
New School Buildings	808	787	564	223
CRC's	342	274	194	80
Repair	802	337	320	297
Toilet	612	486	446	40
Water Supply	505	403	365	38
Electrification	375	299	287	12
BRCs	33	15	6	9

Name of Work	Project Target	Taken up so far	Completed	In Progress
Add. Class room	51	21	19	2
Mini DIET	1	1	0	1
Society office	1	1	1	0
SCERT building	1	1	1	0
SIEMAT	1	0	0	0
Total	3532	2625	2180	445

2.3 Integrated education for Disabled (IED) :

In all the DPEP districts of Himachal Pradesh, the children of Special Focus Groups are being imparted primary education and have been enrolled. For the students of IED, comprehensive survey of disabled children was conducted in the 33 Education Blocks in all the DPEP districts in 1999-2000 with the help of teachers. The survey revealed that there were total of 1977 disabled children in the age group of 5-11 years. Out of which 1849 were in schools, while 128 were out of schools.

2.4 Access :

District	No. of Pre DPEP Prry schools	New schools Opened under DPEP	New schools opened under State Plan	Total Prry. schools
Chamba	810	235	27	1072
Kullu	420	250	23	693
Sirmour	638	300	29	967
Lahaul-Spiti	181	23	8	212
Total	2049	808	87	2944

2.5 Appointment of Teachers :

The state Govt. has formulated a Gram Vidya Upasak Yojna to appoint 10+2 qualified local para teachers through Gram Panchayats to cater to the vacancy in the formal school with concerned Gram Panchayats. 7422 teachers, comprising 5743 regular teachers, 1340 contract teachers and 339 para-teachers have been appointed in the 4 DPEP districts.

2.6 Alternative Schooling

With the opening of 808 formal schools under DPEP in the four educationally backward districts of the State the Net Enrolment Rate (NER) for all students has reached above 97 % and there is no unserved population of school age children in these districts. 75 ALS have already been notified to be opened in the districts of Kullu, Sirmour and Chamba. It has now been decided by the State Govt. to activate 25 ALS centres each in Chamba, Kullu and Sirmour districts in the academic session 2001-02.

2.7 **Girls education is free in Himachal Pradesh upto graduation level. Free Text Books are being supplied to SC,ST,OBC,IRDP girls under the State Schemes. To build up the capacity of CRCCs, BRCCs, DIET faculties and Project Personnel, three district level**

workshops were held which targeted at proper functioning of MTAs, involving community in girl child issues, and involving more and more female resource persons in different orientation/trainings & workshops. 30% member of the VEC are females. VEC members have been given second round of training and inputs included gender specific issues also. The GER for girls in 1999 –2000 has reached 114 % and NER 97%.

2.8 Social Equity :

In Himachal Pradesh all the SC, ST and girls students have been enrolled in primary schools in DPEP districts.

2.9 Early Childhood Care and Education

It has been decided to establish 175 ECCE centres out of which microplanning for 158 centres has been completed and notification for opening of centres has been issued by State Govt. in March,2002.

2.10 Community mobilisation and participation.

Community based organisations of school specific village based structure were constituted in the district as follows:-.

Distt	Schools	VEC	PTA	MTA
Sirmour	967	967	967	967
Kullu	693	693	693	693
Chamba	1072	1072	1072	1072
L & S	212	212	212	212
Total	2944	2944	2944	2944

2.11 Pedagogical Renewal

- SCERT is functional at Solan and it has constituted a DPEP cell to take up DPEP interventions. It has also started participating to certain extent in curriculum development and development of teachers training modules. Text books and teachers guides for class V will be developed by SCERT during current year. SCERT has taken up the study on decline in class-I enrolment in respect of Chamba and Sirmour district.
- DIETs are functional in all the four DPEP districts and are duly staffed. DIETs have taken up the pre-service and in-service training in the districts. They also provide resource support for teachers training at the block and cluster level.
- About 7500 teachers in the DPEP districts covered for minimum of 15 days in-service training.
- Curriculum development in the field of EVS, Hindi, Mathematics for class III and second phase training module for Vidya Upasaks (para teachers) of 30 days duration has been developed.
- A teacher guide book for class I,II,III developed and shared with teachers by Chamba districts.

III. FOCUS AREAS FOR AWP&B 2002-03

3.1 Project Management:-

- 169 vacancies of CRCCs should be filled up and preference given to women for addressing gender equity issues in the context, process and management of education. CHT's may also be asked to work as academic support institutions in addition to their administrative functions.
- Strengthening of DIET's, SCERT and SIEMAT.

3.2 Planning and Management:-

- Community based micro-planning to ensure effective mechanism to address quality issues at the school level, especially achievement of students and transition from one class to the other.
- Capacity building of BRCC/ CRCC and lecturer DIET in planning.
- Preparation of Block specific, school specific and village specific plans and sharing with other blocks and districts.

3.3 Civil Works:-

- All outstanding civil works in State and districts may be completed immediately.

3.4 Access & Alternative Schooling :-

- Strategies to ensure smooth transition of children from ALS to main stream.
- Comprehensive strategies which includes identification of all children in all districts with special educational needs, working children, migrating children and an audit of the technical support available to district in particular need.
- Already approved and notified ALS are to be made functional.

3.5 Pedagogical Renewal:-

- Text books and teacher guide for class V will be developed through SCERT.
- Good practices to be video documented for sharing with other states.
- State to take-up work in the area of multi-grade teaching more urgently to solve the problem of shortage of teachers.
- DIETs to be strengthened and fully integrated into support and training structure of DPEP.
- Capacities building of BRCCs/ CRCCs and teachers in school in use of TLM and its link with pedagogical renewal process.
- Teacher Training activities.

3.6 Research & Evaluation :-

- Studies on enrolment, Access retention and quality improvement to be conducted to find out the barriers of fulfilling the objectives of DPEP.
- VECs to be trained and case studies may be undertaken on how effective the training of VECs has been till date from the community perspective.

3.7 Media:-

- Video/print documentation of best practices in micro planning in different states to be encouraged for large scale dissemination.
- Documentation and sharing of good practices to be initiated at the earliest.

3.8 Integrated Education for Disabled :-

- A more comprehensive strategy, based on convergence and community participation , to be evolved for participation of disabled children in school. The focus on sensitization of teachers and community for integration of children with special needs to continue
- Annual medical checkup for all children is yet to be initiated.

IV. APPRAISAL OF AWP&B 2002-03 :

(a) Management Cost:

4.1 Due to less expenditure on deployment of project staff, consultancies, furniture & equipment, O&M expenses etc., a saving of Rs. 30.13 lakhs is expected to be achieved as follows:-

(Rs. in Lakhs)

DPEP district	EFC approved project cost	Approved management cost	Total expd. Upto 31-3-02	Anticipated Expr. from 1.4.2002 to 30.6.2003	Excess (+) saving(-)
State level	1502.50	293.84	178.56	120.88	(+)5.60
Chamba	3889.40	189.52	144.31	40.18	(-)5.02
Kullu	2965.70	112.62	87.67	24.93	(-)0.02
Sirmour	3423.60	127.45	112.24	29.60	(+)14.39
Lahaul-Spiti	1146.90	141.00	65.97	29.97	(-)45.07
Total	12928.10	864.43	588.75	245.56	(-)30.13

(b) Civil Works:

4.2 Out of the total project cost of Rs. 12928.10 lakhs, an outlay of Rs. 2953.36 was earmarked for civil works, against which an expenditure of Rs. 2239.54 Lakhs has already been incurred upto 31st March, 2002. Consequent upon the increase in the ceiling on civil works from 24% to 33.33% as approved by the Cabinet, additional civil works have been planned by diverting savings from other components. The anticipated expenditure during 1.4.2002 to 30.6.2003 is Rs. 1379.56 lakhs, as follows:-

(Rs. in lakhs)

DPEP districts	Total approved project cost	Approved outlay for civil works	Total exp. upto 31.3.02	Anticipated expenditure from 14.2.2002 to 30.6.2003	Saving (-) Excess (+)
State Level	1502.50	254.00	107.95	126.06	(-) 19.99
Chamba	3889.40	913.66	745.66	317.95	(+) 149.95
Kullu	2965.70	704.20	547.12	430.83	(+) 274.25
Sirmour	3423.60	813.30	651.21	423.62	(+) 261.53
Lahaul-Spiti	1146.90	268.20	187.10	81.10	-
Total	12928.10	2953.36	2239.54	1379.56	(+) 665.74

4.3 With the additional allocation of Rs. 665.74 lakhs, the percentage of civil works will be 28% against the permissible ceiling of 33.33%. The position is briefly as follows:-

- (1) **District Chamba:** In Chamba district, additional requirement of Rs. 149.95 lakhs has arisen partly due to increase in the cost of construction over a period of five years and introduction of Child Friendly elements in 150 school buildings (Rs. 53.36 lakhs) and repairs to 40 school buildings over and above the originally planned target (Rs. 26.00 lakhs)
- (2) **District Kullu:** Additional allocation of Rs. 274.25 lakhs is on account of additional civil works i.e., electrification of 325 school buildings, provision of toilets in 192 schools, introduction of child friendly elements in 60 schools and construction of boundary walls in 250 schools.
- (3) **District Sirmour:** The additional allocation of Rs. 261.53 lakhs is on account of cost escalation in the on-going civil works (Rs. 191.53 lakhs), besides taking up new works i.e., repair and maintenance of 100 more existing schools (Rs. 70.00 lakhs).

(c) **Other Educational/Quality Improvement Interventions:**

4.4 A saving of Rs. 635.61 lakhs is anticipated in respect of expenditure on this component. A major saving of Rs. 454.97 lakhs is anticipated in the State-level expenditure. At the district level, the saving of Rs. 311.59 lakhs is in respect of Lahaul Spiti district as the State Government had provided large funds under the tribal sub-plan for this district, as a result of which, less funds from DPEP could be utilized in the district. The additional requirement of Rs. 275.09 lakhs in Sirmour district is on account of less provisioning under the Head Salaries at the time of preparation of perspective plans. A provision of Rs. 1194.70 lakhs was made but an expenditure of Rs. 1618.637 lakhs has already been incurred. About 2543 teachers have been appointed under DPEP in this district. The district-wise position is as follows:-

(Rs. in lakhs)

DPEP district	FFC approved project cost	Approved outlays under other educational programme	Total expr. Upto 31-3-02	Anticipated expenditure from 1.4.2002 to 30.6.2003	Saving (-) Excess(+)
State level	1502.50	954.66	257.39	242.30	(-)454.97
Chamba	3889.40	2786.22	2256.08	461.46	(-)68.68
Kullu	2965.70	2148.88	1536.52	536.88	(-)75.48
Sirmour	3423.60	2482.85	2147.34	610.60	(+)275.09
Lahaul-Spiti	1146.90	737.70	267.05	159.08	(-)311.59
Total	12928.10	9110.31	6464.38	2010.32	(-)635.61

4.5 From the appraisal of State/District Plans, it is observed that actual expenditure during 2001-02 on the above component was Rs.13.15 crore and therefore, it is felt that it may not be possible to incur an expenditure of Rs.20.10 crores during the remaining period of the project. Comments on the various provision as follows:-

- (1) **State Project Office :** A provision of Rs.27 lakhs has been proposed for procurement of books and educational material against the expenditure of Rs.50,000/- only in the previous year. Provision should be restricted to Rs.1.00 lakh only. Similarly, Provision of rs.26.19 lakhs for IED, Rs.81.80 lakhs on pedagogical renewal activities, Rs.30.00 lakhs on research and evaluation and Rs.72.00 lakhs on planning and management appear to be very much on the high side and may be reduce to Rs.10.00 lakhs for IED, Rs.40.00 lakhs on pedagogical renewal, Rs.20.00 lakhs for research and evaluation and Rs.50 lakhs for planning and management.
- (2) **District Project Offices :** Provision at the rate of Rs.3.00 lakhs per BRC for procurement of library books may be reduced to Rs. 1.00 lakh per BRC. For pedagogical renewal activities which include teacher training, school grant, teacher grant and salary, etc., the provision may be kept at the rate of last years' level. The recommended provisions are

(Rs. in Lakh)

Activities/ Works	State Component	DPEP districts				Total
		Chamba	Kullu	Sirmour	Lahaul-Spiti	
Integrated Education for Disabled	10.00	10.00	5.00	2.50	2.80	30.30
Access & Alternative schooling	0.50	7.50	3.37	3.00	0.85	15.22
Gender interventions	3.40	10.96	15.00	13.00	0.40	42.76
ECCE	1.00	-	4.48	-	-	5.48
Community mobilisation and participation	1.20	1.00	23.13	5.00	4.45	34.78
MIS	4.20	-	5.16	1.94	0.98	12.28
Media	8.65	0.20	3.50	5.00	6.13	23.48
Pedagogy/School Improvement	50.00	175.00	400.00	265.00	54.21	944.21
Distance Education	13.50	-	1.64	7.89	2.00	25.03
Research & Evaluation	20.00	2.00	5.75	7.50	0.90	36.15
Planning Management	50.00	200.00	20.00	180.00	75.00	525.00
Total	162.45	406.66	487.03	490.83	147.72	1694.69

4.6 The total recommended AWP&B for 2002-03 (1.4.2002 to 30.6.2003) is as follows :-

(Rs. in Lakhs)

Sl. No.	SPO/District	Management	Civil works	Qty. Imp.	Total
1	State Level	94.88	126.06	162.45	383.39
2	Chamba	40.18	317.95	406.66	764.79
3	Kullu	24.93	430.83	487.03	942.79
4	Sirmour	29.6	423.62	490.83	944.05
5	Lahaul-Spiti	29.97	81.1	147.72	258.79
	Total	219.56	1379.56	1694.69	3293.81

4.7 Summary tables indicating the component-wise AWP & B is given in Annex-I. Abstract of AWP&B indicating the spill over & fresh proposal provision is given at Annex-II Statements regarding Management cost and civil works are given in Annex-III & IV respectively.

Summary Annual Work Plan Budget 2002-03 under DPEP in Himachal Pradesh

Annex.I

(Rs. in Lakhs)

Sl. No.	District	EFC approved Project Cost	Expenditure upto 31.3.2002	AWP&B for 1.4.2002 to 30.6.2003			Cummulative Anticipated Expenditure as on 30.6.2003
				Spill Over	Fresh Proposal	Total	
	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	
1	State level	1502.50	543.90	71.75	311.64	383.39	927.29
2	Chamba	3889.40	3146.05	232.31	532.48	764.79	3910.84
3	Kullu	2965.70	2171.81	169.31	773.48	942.79	3114.60
4	Sirmour	3423.60	2910.80	139.76	804.29	944.05	3854.85
5	Lahaul - Spiti	1146.90	520.12	155.66	103.13	258.79	778.91
	Total	12928.10	9292.68	768.79	2525.02	3293.81	12586.49

Annual Work Plan Budget 2002-03 - CIVIL WORKS under DPEP in Himachal Pradesh

Annex.II

(Rs. in Lakhs)

Sl. No.	Activities/ Works	State Component	DPEP districts				
			Chamba	Kullu	Sirmour	Lahaul-Spiti	Total
1	Civil works	126.06	317.95	430.83	423.62	81.10	1379.56
2	Management cost	94.88	40.18	24.93	29.60	29.97	219.56
3	Integrated Education for Disabled	10.00	10.00	5.00	2.50	2.80	30.30
4	Access & Alternative schooling	0.50	7.50	3.37	3.00	0.85	15.22
5	Gender interventions	3.40	10.96	15.00	13.00	0.40	42.76
6	ECCE	1.00	-	4.48	-	-	5.48
7	Community mobilisation and participation	1.20	1.00	23.13	5.00	4.45	34.78
8	MIS	4.20	-	5.16	1.94	0.98	12.28
9	Media	8.65	0.20	3.50	5.00	6.13	23.48
10	Pedagogy/School Improvement	50.00	175.00	400.00	265.00	54.21	944.21
11	Distance Education	13.50	-	1.64	7.89	2.00	25.03
12	Research & Evaluation	20.00	2.00	5.75	7.50	0.90	36.15
13	Planning Management	50.00	200.00	20.00	180.00	75.00	525.00
	Total	383.39	764.79	942.79	944.05	258.79	3293.81

(Rs. in Lakhs)

Sl. No.	District	EFC approved Project Cost	EFC approved cost for Management	Expenditure till 31.3.2002	AWP&B for 1.4.2002 to 30.6.2003			Cumulative Anticipated Expenditure as on 30.6.2003	%age utilisation
					Spill Over	Fresh Proposal	Total		
	(2)	(3)		(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)		
1	State level	1502.50	293.84	178.56	41.30	53.58	94.88	273.44	18.20
2	Chamba	3889.40	189.52	144.31	3.75	36.43	40.18	184.49	4.74
3	Kullu	2965.70	112.62	87.67	1.68	23.25	24.93	112.60	3.80
4	Simour	3423.60	127.45	112.24	2.60	27.00	29.60	141.84	4.14
5	Lahaul - Spiti	1146.90	141.00	65.97	8.79	21.18	29.97	95.94	8.37
	Total	12928.10	864.43	588.75	58.12	161.44	219.56	808.31	6.25

(Rs. in Lakhs)

Sl. No.	District	EFC approved Project Cost	EFC approved cost for Civil Works	Expenditure upto 31.3.2002	AWP&B for 1.4.2002 to 30.6.2003			Cummulative Anticipated Expenditure as on 30.6.2003	%age utilisation
					Spill Over	Fresh Proposal	Total		
	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)		
1	State level	1502.50	254.00	107.95	84.76	41.30	126.06	234.01	15.57
2	Chamba	3889.40	913.66	745.66	168.00	149.95	317.95	1063.61	27.35
3	Kullu	2965.70	704.20	547.12	53.20	377.63	430.83	977.95	32.98
4	Sirmour	3423.60	813.30	651.21	92.22	331.40	423.62	1074.83	31.39
5	Lahaul - Spiti	1146.90	268.20	187.10	76.90	4.20	81.10	268.20	23.38
	Total	12928.10	2953.36	2239.04	475.08	904.48	1379.56	3618.60	27.99

D. P. E. P – GUJARAT

ANNUAL WORK PLAN & BUDGET (AWP & B) FOR 2002-03

I. Introduction

DPEP was launched in 3 districts of Gujarat – Banaskantha, Dangs and Panchmahal in October 1996 (referred to as Phase II). The EFC approved project cost for Gujarat is Rs. 9567.45 lakhs (US \$ 27.3 m), against which the total cumulative expenditure till 31.03.2002 was Rs. 9266 lakhs.

Again, six more districts (referred to as Phase IV) were approved under DPEP by the EFC in its meeting in June 2001, in the following manner:

- i) Three districts of Kutch, Sabarkantha and Surendranagar to be funded by Government of India through Dutch assistance on the DPEP fund sharing pattern of 85:15.
- ii) Three districts of Bhavnagar, Jamnagar and Junagadh to be fully funded by the State Government through its own resources

For the three districts under the Netherlands assistance, the total approved EFC cost was Rs 12497.54 lakhs, the expenditure till 31/3/2002 being Rs 348.89 lakhs. For the three districts under State funding the total outlay as per the perspective plan is Rs 11231 lakhs, with the total expenditure being Rs 317.28 lakhs till March 2002.

II Progress During 2001-2002:

Phase II districts

Expenditure: Against the provision of Rs. 2661.53 lakhs in 2001-2002, Rs. 1711.08 lakhs have been spent, which works out to 64% of the approved annual plan.

Alternative Schooling. Two schemes - back to school camps and bridge courses - have been the main instruments in Gujarat for providing education to the disadvantaged children. Against the target of 2800 centres for Back to School Programme, 2282 centres have been opened enrolling 49422 out of school children. Of these 49422 children, 17799 children were mainstreamed and enrolled in formal schools. Similarly 2816 Bridge course centres have been opened registering 58403 children, of whom 47421 appeared in the examination and 35274 passed out.

Gender Education: DPEP Gujarat has focused on gender disparities in enrolment, retention and learning achievements prevalent in Banaskantha, Panchmahal and Dangs. Gender perspective has been incorporated in all aspects of planning and implementation. A variety of interventions have been tried to enhance enrolment and retention of girls. Some of them include preparation of special material for community mobilisation, cross visits of MTA members to expose them to best practices, awareness campaigns in low girls literacy clusters, gender sensitization training of PRI members, Gender awareness training of teachers, development of teacher support material on gender awareness, etc. Campaigns like Mahila Jagruti Sammelans, Maa-Beti Mela, activating local women groups, etc., have improved the awareness of the communities in favour of girls' education. 231 girl specific AS centres and 15 ECCE centres were opened in this period. A gender sensitive curricula, gender sensitization training of both male and female teachers and community members have helped in improving the participation of girls in classroom transaction.

Pedagogy: The new textbooks for Std. I and II have been developed by the DPEP and introduced all over the state after trial. The new textbooks for Std.III have been introduced in all schools of the three DPEP districts after field trial in 400 schools. The final version of English workbook (Part I & II) for Std V has been developed which focus on improving listening, reading and writing skills, and have been distributed in all districts. A total of 10684 Vidyasahayaks have been recruited in these three districts and given induction training. Suitable Distance learning interventions have been undertaken to support the ongoing teacher training activities.

IED: Parents of disabled children have been nominated as members of VEC in 2511 villages. VEC, MTA and PTA members have been pledged to motivate the parents to send the disabled children to school. A comprehensive strategy has been developed to identify the various categories of disabilities based on a questionnaire prepared by Ed Cil.

SC/ST Education: To mainstream the never enrolled and dropout children, as many as 1210 tribal-specific AS centres have been opened under Back to School programme enrolling 25623 children, of which 13824 were girls. Content-based supplementary material in local dialects have been developed and distributed in all schools of the tribal areas in the three districts. Newly recruited teachers in tribal areas were trained on pronunciation of local words.

Civil Works: The progress of civil works in the three districts in 2001-02 is as follows:

	Targeted	Completed	In progress
Construction of new school	253	251	2
Additional classrooms	346	343	3
Toilets and urinals	859	858	1

BRC	19	18	1
Repair	933	933	0

Media: Advocacy of primary education is the area of focus for media. An in-house magazine of DPEP is being published quarterly and has a circulation of 20500 copies per month. Films on earthquake related works were produced in English and Hindi.

Community Mobilisation: Campaign mode has been used at the local level to generate community awareness and environment building. Print and audiovisual media were used in local and culturally appropriate context. During the year a total of 20650 VEC members and 80687 MTA and PTA members were given training. Training materials were developed for orientation of VECs, MTAs and PTAs. The details of VEC, MTA and PTA formed in the three districts are as follows:

	VEC		MTA/PTA	
	No. formed	No. of memb. trained	No. formed	No. of memb. trained
Banaskantha	858	6097	2039	29288
Panchmahal	1876	12376	3264	45729
Dangs	309	2177	396	5670
Total	3043	20650	5699	80687

The community also contributed a sum of Rs 12,83,127/- towards the enrolment drive

Phase IV Districts

Expenditure: Against the provision of Rs. 1497.71 lakhs in the 2001-2002 Plan in the Centrally sponsored districts, Rs. 348.89 lakhs have been spent, which works out to 23%. The reason for low expenditure is the late approval of the staffing of the new districts. In the three districts being funded by the State Government the total expenditure last year was Rs 317.28 lakhs.

Formation of VEC, VCWC, MTA & PTA: Village based grass root structures have been already formed across the six Phase IV DPEP districts. Training of VEC members have been organized in Sabarkantha and Surendranagar and is underway in the remaining four districts.

Setting up of Office: All district level offices have been set up. All BRC coordinators have been recruited and CRC coordinators are being recruited.

MIS: Intensive training of personnel on DISE organised at all levels through cascade model. Data collection has been completed and data entry is in progress.

Capacity Building: Induction training has been organised at State level for BRC and CRC coordinators. BRC sites have been identified and offices established. School grant and teachers grant has been released for improvement of school infrastructure and preparation of TLM. Training on microplanning and preparation of School Improvement Plan through cascade mode is under progress at the district level in all the six districts. A number of workshops have been held for various functionaries such as BRCs, DPEOs, DIET principals, etc.

III Proposed AWP&B 2002-2003:

Phase II

In the last year of the plan the State proposes to pay special attention towards enrolment drive for children still out of school, initiatives for increasing retention, coverage of special focus groups, empowering of BRCs and CRCs, opening of new alternative centres and capacity building. Some of the steps, which have been proposed, are:

- ◆ 4150 bridge courses would be conducted to retain those children who are dropouts or those who have failed in the annual exam. Further 2426 educational camps would be conducted for migrant children. Training would be given to all BRC and CRC coordinators for bridge courses and educational camps. Use of teleconference has been also envisaged by Dangs district for this purpose.
- ◆ Training to BRC and CRC personnel would be given in various areas so as to equip them to take the work forward after closure of the programme. The BRC personnel would be involved in the development of TLM at the block level.
- ◆ The centres opened under ECE would continue to be operational this year.
- ◆ Three experts in the three areas of IED each would be appointed in each taluka. Books and educational material would be provided to all blocks. Medical camps would be organised in each block. Other initiatives in this area include teacher training sensitization workshop and IED awareness programme at CRC level focussing on increasing retention.
- ◆ To elicit the support and involvement of community, awareness campaign will be made more vigorous in three districts. Enrollment drives would be conducted which would involve multiple modes of mobilisation. A special mobilization would be conducted for VEC and PTA. Balmelas, 'Knocking the door' programme, educational exhibition, etc., would be organised in selected schools in all CRCs to improve retention.

- ◆ With new constructions almost coming to completion, thrust in this year would be on completion of pending works and repairs.
- ◆ Science kit would be developed and supplied to all schools for conducting experiments related to science. Educational magazines would be provided to schools, which would be useful to teachers in classroom transaction. Training in multigrade teaching, English grammar, Hindi grammar, training of Std 5 science hardspots and training on preparation of TLMs would be some of the trainings to be conducted in these districts. An additional 1000 Vidyasahayaks would be appointed and trained this year.
- ◆ For the tribal areas, special campaigns would be organized in each CRC and Adivasi sammelan in each block to improve enrolment and retention. Reference books and dictionary in the tribal dialects also would be prepared and supplied. District and Block Action Group on gender would be activated to mobilize the community towards increasing enrolment and retention of girls. Exposure visits for MTA members would be extended further.
- ◆ Apart from district level studies, the State has proposed 7 studies, of which two - repetition rate study and terminal assessment survey - are being coordinated at the National level.
- ◆ The total amount proposed by the State in Phase II this year is as follows:

(Rs lakhs)

Name of District/SPO	Spill Over	Fresh Proposal 2002-03	Total 2002-03	April 2003 to June 2003
State Pr. Office	90.36	79.70	170.06	15.35
Banaskantha	148.70	744.15	892.85	357.18
Panchmahal	62.33	981.08	1043.41	519.08
Dangs	16.03	140.45	156.47	58.34
Total	317.42	1945.37	2262.79	949.95

Phase IV:

The Plans have been prepared through a participative process with the VECs being actively involved in the planning process. Attempt has been made to divide the districts into homogenous zones and identify the problems of these zones. Other problems affecting the primary education sector has also been identified and interventions suggested. This being effectively the first year of DPEP for the new districts, they have not yet become fully operational and so the emphasis this year is on setting up the infrastructure and capacity building. The GER in these districts is below the State average of 124% and so community mobilization is another important item of work proposed to be taken up. The Plans have also given year-wise targets for some indicators like

enrolment, GER and NER. Some of the important initiatives, which are proposed to be taken up, are:

- ◆ Special campaign for alternative schooling would be organized to sensitize the parents of never-enrolled and dropped out children. The AS school personnel would be selected by the VEC and sent for training. Project staff would also be trained on alternative schooling.
- ◆ The BRCs and CRCs would be made operational and necessary infrastructure provided to them.
- ◆ A small start would be made in as far as opening of ECE centres in low female literacy clusters. However, training of master trainers, training of ICDS workers, development of kit-box for ICDS workers would be taken up at a larger scale.
- ◆ Under IED, the emphasis would be on training of master trainers, orientation of project staff, development of awareness material for teachers, supplementary teaching material for teachers and printing of TLM module. Medical camps would be organized and aid would be provided for children so identified.
- ◆ The project management office at the State and district would be made functional with provision of essential office equipment. The management information system would be made fully operational with detailed training to staff on data collection, data entry, DISE form, etc.
- ◆ Community mobilization drive would be taken up in all clusters. There will be a multi-media approach towards this with all tools such as folk dance, pamphlet, posters, wall writing, hoardings, matrix mela, audio and videocassettes, padyatras, awareness campaigns being utilized for the purpose. Master trainers for VEC, MTA, and PTA members training would be trained followed by training of the members of these committees. The village civil works committee would be also given training this year to ensure that they are enabled to carry out community based construction activities.
- ◆ Master trainers would be trained on various aspects of teacher training such as multigrade teaching, development of TLM material, Grade V grammar training, Grade-wise subject training, etc. The newly recruited Vidayasahayaks would also be trained this year.
- ◆ Every village would be trained in microplanning this year.
- ◆ For gender awareness, emphasis would be on setting up and activating the DRGs, MTA meeting at village levels, organisation of Mahila Shibirs, master trainers training for MTA & Mahila Sarpanch, printing training modules, etc.
- ◆ For tribal education, the emphasis is on development of awareness material, supplementary TLM, development of Teaching Learning aids, organisation of special campaigns and training of master trainers.

- ◆ Under civil works programme, emphasis would be on construction of BRCs, provision of water facilities, toilets, additional classrooms, new school buildings and repair of school buildings. Setting up of Building Centre in each Block has also been envisaged.

- ◆ The total amount proposed by the State Government for the Phase IV districts is as follows:

i) Centrally Sponsored Scheme

(Rs lakhs)

Name of District/SPO	Spill Over	Fresh Proposal 2002-03	Total 2002-03
State Project Off.	0	226.76	226.76
Surendranagar	129.55	874.28	1003.83
Kutch	236.65	666.27	902.92
Sabarkantha	281.97	902.40	1184.37
Total	648.17	2669.71	3317.87

ii) State funded

(Rs lakhs)

Name of District	Total perspective plan	Exp till March 2002	AWPB 2002-03
Bhavnagar	3789	107.19	949.66
Junagadh	3947	113.37	1268.23
Jamnagar	3495	96.72	1036.06
Total	11231	317.28	3253.95

IV Appraisal Process:

Since Gujarat is an old DPEP State, the primary appraisal of the AWP&B was done at the state level by the state appraisal team. In addition, appraisal has been done at the Govt of India level for one district, viz. Panchmahal for Phase II and all three districts of Surendranagar, Sabarkantha & Kutch for Phase IV, along with the State Components of both the phases.

V. Changes recommended in the Plans on Appraisal

a) Certain items were found to be ineligible as per the DPEP norms. Accordingly, these need to be deleted. These are as follows:

(Rs lakhs)

District/SPO	Activity	Propos.	Recom.	Reason
SPO, Ph II	Salary for Staff (PFE - A3)	12	8	Previous year also Rs 12 lakhs was proposed but only Rs 5.917 lakhs were spent. Taking escalation also in mind, it may be restricted to 8.

	Furniture for Training Institute (SCE - F3)	20	10	Furniture cost has been put exorbitantly high (25% of cost of building)
	Construction of training institute (SCE - C7)	100	80	Only Rs 80 lakhs were sanctioned last year for this item, and only Rs 10 lakhs were spent. No revision is necessary this year.
Panchmahal	Hiring of vehicle for AS (ALS-O8)	1.53	0.5	Intervention wise hiring of vehicle is not desirable. No such provision in previous years. A small amount may be given for emergency situations
	Books & educational Material to each CRC (CRC-L2)	11.25	4.5	The allocation 2 Rs 5000/- per CRC is very high So reduced to Rs 2000/-. Last year total exp was only Rs 1.58 lakhs.
	IED Resource room (IED - B9)	2	0	The exact use and need for this has not been mentioned in the plan. So may be deleted. Not provided for in the EFC approval also.
	Mobilization drive for VEC, PTA, MTA (MED-Q5)	10.5	5	Seeing that it is the last year of the programme and separately Rs 10.8 lakhs has been budgeted for enrolment drives, this may be reduced for only more difficult areas.
Banaskantha	IED Resource room (IED - B9)	2	0	The exact use and need for this has not been mentioned in the plan. So may be deleted. Not provided for in the EFC approval also

Surendranagar	Block Resource Centres (BRC)	49.95	45.205	In the introduction of the plan only 9 blocks have been mentioned, but costing of a number of items has been done for 10. So this amount has been reduced
	Grant for school libraries (PFE - L2)	19.40 lakhs	0	This item is not covered under DPEP guidelines and CAG had also disapproved of this item last year
Kutch	Salary for ALS staff (ALS-A4)	6	0	No details of staff provided. Other ALS staff like Bahmitra, supervisor budgeted separately
SPO, Ph IV	Supply of coordinator diary (PFE - IA)	0.85	0	Not permitted under guidelines

Thus, the total reduction in plan size district would be, district wise, as follows:

Phase II

(Rs lakhs)

District	Original Plan-size	Reduction	Recommended Plan size
State Pr. Office	170.06	34.00	136.06
Banaskantha	892.85	2.00	890.85
Panchmahal	1043.41	15.28	1028.13
Dangs	156.47	0	156.47
Total	2262.79	51.28	2211.51

Phase IV

(Rs lakhs)

District	Original Plan-size	Reduction	Recommended Plan size
State Project Off.	226.76	0.85	225.91
Surendranagar	1003.83	24.15	979.69
Kutch	902.92	6.00	896.92
Sabarkantha	1184.37	0	1184.37
Total	3317.87	31.00	3286.88

b) The cumulative expenditure for Dangs district till June 2003 goes beyond the revised EFC limit if the Plan for April to June 2003 is also taken into account. Accordingly, the Plan size for April to June 2003 has been reduced from Rs 58.337 lakhs to Rs 36.163 lakhs. Accordingly, the Plan size for April to June 2003 for Phase II districts would be as follows:

(Rs lakhs)

Name of District/SPO	Original April 2003 to June 2003	Reduced	Revised April 2003 to June 2003
State Pr. Office	15.35	0	15.35
Banaskantha	357.18	0	357.18
Panchmahal	519.08	0	519.08
Dangs	58.34	22.17	36.16
Total	949.95	22.17	927.77

Following comments may be added while approving the above plan sizes:

- i) There is a small discrepancy between the figures of number of schools and number of teachers given in the introductory write-up and in the costing table in case of school grants and teacher grants for the new districts. The discrepancy is minor and so the figures in the costing table have been allowed. However, the State should use the correct figure while passing on the funds to the districts, and report the same at the time of next year's planning.
- ii) In Kutch and Sabarkantha, money has been provided for books and education material. It may be ensured that books are not issued to schools for library, since the same is not covered under the DPEP guidelines.
- iii) It must be ensured that the unit costing for the civil works is as per the State norms in the new districts and not on the higher side.

VI. Additional Comments

- The revised AWP&B for 2002-2003 for Phase II is Rs. 2211.507 lakhs which is 17% less than the AWP&B of the previous year. The plan is realistic and achievable, considering the performance of DPEP Gujarat in the previous year (in which only 64% of the AWP&B approved amount was spent).
- The total anticipated Project Cost for Phase II at the end of 31.3.2003 is Rs 1147751 lakhs, which is more than the EFC approved cost. Similar excess is seen in State component, Panchmahal and Dangs district. Gujarat has requested for revision of the EFC approved cost to Rs 13455.91 lakhs. This is within the amount available through exchange rate variation and file on this has gone to Finance Department through IID. The cumulative expenditure with the present plan size will be within the revised limits proposed by the State. The detailed analysis is given in Table II.

The increase in the expenditure is said to be mainly due to the following reasons:

- 1) The provision for the civil works was only 18% originally against the DPEP norm of 24%. The state has gone upto 24% subsequently in view of the necessity of physical infrastructure, particularly repairing of schools.
- 2) The expenditure on salary has gone up sharply due to the 5th Pay Commission revision.
- 3) The cost on equipment such as OHP, TV, printers, etc. has gone up
- 4) The Scheme of Alternative Schooling was launched in 3rd year of the project in all three project districts, where 2198 such centres have been opened till date. The Original EFC did not have this provision.

Similar excess is seen in the civil works costs and management costs in the Phase II districts. But if the revised EFC cost is approved, the amount would remain within the limits of 24% and 6% of the revised EFC costs respectively for civil works and management. The management cost of Dangs districts was exceeding the EFC cost after inclusion of the April to June 2003. So it has been reduced from Rs 2.368 lakhs to Rs 1.5 lakhs for that period. The detailed analysis is given in Tables III and IV respectively.

VIII Approvals Requested

It is requested that the Annual Work Plan and Budget 2002 -2003, as given in Table I, be approved, subject to the approval of the proposed revision in EFC limits for Phase II by the Finance department. Till such approval comes, no funds beyond the existing EFC limits should be released.

Table-1

SUMMARY STATEMENT OF AWP&B 2002-03

(Rupees lakhs)

Phase II

Name of District/SPO	AWP&B 2001-2002	Reappropriation	Revised 2001-2002	Expenditure 2001-2002	Amount saved	Spill Over	Recommended Fresh Proposal 2002-2003	Total AWP & B 2002-2003	Plan Budget April June 2003
SPO	177.57	0	177.57	105.72	71.86	90.36	45.70	136.06	14
Banaskantha	1164.24	0	1164.24	645.63	518.61	148.7	742.15	890.85	35
Panchmahal	1152.44	0	1152.44	823.97	328.47	62.33	965.80	1028.13	51
Dangs	167.28	0	167.28	135.768	31.51	16.03	140.45	156.47	30
Total	2661.53	0	2661.53	1711.08	950.45	317.42	1894.09	2211.51	92

Phase IV
(CSS)

Name of District/SPO	AWP&B 2001-2002	Reappropriation	Revised 2001-2002	Expenditure 2001-2002	Amount saved	Spill Over	Fresh Proposal 2002-2003	Total 2003
SPO	235.57	0	235.57	24.14	211.43	0	225.91	22
Surendranagar	345.99	0	345.99	83.73	262.26	129.55	850.14	97
Kutch	488.91	0	488.91	97.46	391.45	236.65	660.27	89
Sabarkantha	427.24	0	427.24	143.57	283.67	281.97	902.40	118
Total	1497.71	0	1497.71	348.9	1148.81	648.17	2638.71	328

State financed

Name of District/SPO	Total perspective plan	Exp till March 2002	AWPB 2002-03
Bhavnagar	3789	107.19	949.66
Junagadh	3947	113.37	1268.23
Jamnagar	3495	96.72	1036.06
Total	11231	317.28	3253.95

Table II

ANALYSIS OF TOTAL EXPENDITURE-2002-2003

(Rs. lakhs)

Phase II

State / District	EFC Approved	Revised EFC proposed cost	Total Cum-Exp. Till 31.3.2002	Total Provision AWP&B 2002-2003	Provision for April-June 2003	Cumulative Expenditure till 30/6/2003	Whether EFC Crossed	Whether Revised EFC Crossed
Banaskantha	3942.49	5295.88	3384.66	890.85	357.18	4632.69	Yes	No
Panchmahal	3980.93	6007.02	4173.90	1028.13	519.08	5721.11	Yes	No
Dangs	912.99	952.52	759.89	156.47	36.16	952.52	Yes	No
State Comp.	731.06	1200.49	947.56	136.06	15.35	1098.96	Yes	No
Total	9567.47	13455.91	9266.00	2211.51	927.77	12405.28	Yes	No

Phase IV (CSS)

State / District	EFC Approved	Total Cum-Exp. Till 31.3.2002	Total Provision AWP&B 2002-2003	Cumulative Expenditure till 31/3/2003	Whether EFC Crossed
Surendranagar	3350.85	88.34	979.69	1068.03	No
Kutch	3795.06	97.33	896.92	994.25	No
Sabarkantha	3917.11	148.72	1184.37	1333.09	No
State Comp.	1434.54	14.50	225.91	240.41	No
Total	12497.56	348.89	3286.88	3635.77	No

State financed

Name of District/SPO	Total perspective plan	Total Cum-Exp. Till 31.3.2002	Total Provision AWP&B 2002-2003	Cumulative Expenditure till 31/3/2003	Whether perspective plan limit crossed
Bhavnagar	3789	107.19	949.66	1056.85	No
Junagadh	3947	113.37	1268.23	1381.60	No
Jamnagar	3495	96.72	1036.06	1132.78	No
Total	11231	317.28	3253.95	3571.23	No

Table III

STATEMENT OF CIVIL WORK COST-2002-2003

(Rs. lakhs)

Phase II

State / District	EFC Approved	Total Cum-Exp. Till 31.3.2002	Total Provision AWP&B 2002-2003	Provision April-June 2003	Cumulative Expenditure till 30/6/2003	Whether EFC Crossed	24% of revised EFC cost	Whether 24% of revised cost exceeded
Banaskantha	946	889.12	43.24	0	932.36	Yes	1271.01	No
Panchmahal	955	975.20	68.66	0	1043.86	Yes	1441.69	No
Dangs	219	222.59	0.40	0	222.99	Yes	228.60	No
State Comp.	175	29.60	100.00	0	129.60	No	288.12	No
Total	2295	2116.512	212.30	0	2328.81	Yes	3229.42	No

Phase IV (CSS)

State / District	EFC Approved	Total Cum-Exp. Till 31.3.2002	Total Provision AWP&B 2002-2003	Cumulative Expenditure till 31/3/2003	Whether EFC Crossed
Surendranagar	804.00	0	353.67	353.67	No
Kutch	801.68	0	580.10	580.10	No
Sabarkantha	841.10	0	367.00	367.00	No
State Comp.	60.00	0	0.00	0.00	No
Total	2506.78	0	1300.77	1300.77	No

Table IV

ANALYSIS OF MANAGEMENT COST, 2002-2003

(Rs. lakhs)

Phase II

State/District	EFC Approved	Total Cum-Exp. Till 31.3.2002	Total Provision AWP&B 2002-2003	Provision April-June 2003	Cumulative Expenditure till 30/6/2003	Whether EFC Crossed	6% of Revised EFC cost	Whether exceeds 6% revised EFC cost
Banaskantha	99.66	67.66	12.64	3.51	83.81	No	317.75	No
Panchmahal	103.10	102.69	13.18	3.76	119.63	Yes	360.42	No
Dangs	58.28	49.40	7.37	1.50	58.27	No	58.28	No
State Comp.	114.60	210.94	21.03	6.18	238.15	Yes		
Total	375.64	430.69	54.22	14.95	499.85	Yes	807.35	No

Phase IV(CSS)

State/District	EFC Approved	Total Cum-Exp. Till 31.3.2002	Total Provision AWP&B 2002-2003	Cumulative Expenditure till 31.3.2003	Whether EFC Crossed
Surendranagar	128.62	17.20	16.39	33.59	No
Kutch	111.37	12.87	19.39	32.26	No
Sabarkantha	116.69	16.62	29.65	46.27	No
State Comp.	348.11	0.00	32.20	32.20	No
Total	704.78	46.69	97.62	144.31	No

**NOTE FOR PROJECT BOARD
DPEP - ANDHRA PRADESH
ANNUAL WORK PLAN & BUDGET (AWP&B) FOR 2002 - 2003**

I INTRODUCTION

DPEP was launched in Andhra Pradesh in 5 Districts viz., Vizianagaram, Nellore, Kurnool, Karimnagar, Warangal in 1996. The programme was further expanded in another 14 districts namely, Srikakulam, Visakhapatnam, Guntur, Prakassam, Chittoor, Cuddapah, Anantapur, Mahabub Nagar, Rangareddy, Medak, Nizamabad, Adilabad, Khamman, and Nalgonda in 1998-99. The EFC approved project cost with contingencies for Phase I is Rs. 24084 lakhs and for Phase II Rs. 71604.62 lakhs.

The approved AWP&B for 2001-2002 was Rs. 6873.44 lakhs of which Rs. 3598.803 lakhs was spent. The approval for AWP&B for 2001-02 for Phase II was Rs. 15940 lakhs of which Rs. 6534.76 lakhs was spent. The AWP&B for the year 2002-03 as proposed by the State Office is Rs. 10422.92 lakhs for DPEP Phase-I districts and Rs. 22277.96 for DPEP Phase II districts.

II Progress Overview 2001-02

Sl. No.	Item	Target		Achievement	
		DPEP-I	DPEP-II	DPEP-I	DPEP-II
1.	Opening of new schools	1258	3969	1258	3969
2.	Appointment of regular teachers to new schools	2616	3969	2616	3969
3.	Appointment of Para teachers (Vidya Volunteers) to new schools	800	3969	800	3969
4.	Setting up of Alternative Schools and Maabadi Schools	875	2754	631	1728
5.	Appointment of Alternative Schools Instructors	875	2754	631	1728
6.	Establishing Early Childhood Education Centres	2051	4024	2051	4024
7.	Establishing Mandal Resource Centres	254	739	254	739
8.	Constitution of Primary School Committees	10406	34361	10216	33314

GER: The GER in the year 2001-2002 stood at 93.44 per cent in the DPEP-I districts and 107.56 per cent in DPEP-II districts.

NER: The NER in the year 2001-2002 stood at 90.60 per cent in the DPEP-I districts and 93.04 per cent in the DPEP-II districts.

Retention: The retention rate in the year 2001-2002 was 88.10 per cent as against 86.60 per cent in the year 2000-2001 in the DPEP-I districts. In the District Primary Education Programme II districts, the rate of retention in the year 2001-2002 was 69.45 per cent as against 66.03 per cent in the year 2000-2001.

III PLANNING PROCESS

Andhra Pradesh DPEP has initiated an intensive participatory planning process for the preparation of annual plans by involving grass root level functionaries. The State and District's AWP&B clearly indicate the planning process adopted at different levels. Andhra Pradesh DPEP is in keeping with the decentralized planning and appraisal process has brought out excellent documentation in this year's Annual Work Plan. The targets have been fixed keeping in view the requirements. The planning team at different level interacted with stakeholders and identified the need, formulated strategies and developed the plans. Convergence plan for the state is well defined thought out.

IV APPRAISAL REPORT

In keeping with the process of decentralization in DPEP, the appraisal of AWP&B 2002-2003 has been done by the State. The State Appraisal Team based on the guidelines outlined in the 'AWP&B Preparation & Appraisal Manual' appraised the plan to ensure conformity with DPEP guidelines. The appraisal was conducted by the State Appraisal Mission constituted by the State.

The Bureau and TSG carried out sample appraisal of two districts - Vizianagaram from DPEP I and Nizamabad from DPEP II. The State Component Plans of DPEP I & II were also reviewed.

V Thrust Areas of the Plans 2002-03

- ❖ Building database at various levels for effective planning, implementation and monitoring.

- ❖ Introducing learning guarantee scheme on a voluntary basis where schools would give guarantee to the parents' for the achievement of required competencies to the children based on their class and age.
- ❖ Development of lists of out of school children name-wise along with family background and nature of child labour so as to set targets and initiate suitable action for their schooling.
- ❖ Improving home school links. Involving the teacher in activities like meeting the parents, community members, self-help groups, youth volunteers and others in the village for good community contact.
- ❖ Attendance monitoring of pupils and teachers by MRPs
- ❖ Academic monitoring of schools by DIET staff. Categorization of schools into ABC categories based on performance to measure the process of quality improvement in schools, and providing on the job support to the teachers of B&C categories of schools for improvement.
- ❖ Survey in the Urban Slums and development of lists of out of school children and conduct residential and non-residential bridge courses for them.
- ❖ Development of database for in school and the out of school special children i.e Visual, Hearing impaired, Orthopedic and Mentally Retarded.
- ❖ Supply of aids and appliances to the special children with the convergence with State Govt. and NGOs.
- ❖ Mainstreaming of disabled Out of School children who have never been enrolled through residential bridge courses.
- ❖ Development of bridging material for the children and Teachers in various tribal dialects for meaningful language transaction as well as development of special package for tribal teachers keeping in view their needs and requirements along with enhancement of training duration.
- ❖ Sensitization of print and electronic media at the regional level, focussing on issues like child labour, education of girls, education of minorities etc.

Comments and observations on AWP&B 2002-2003

General

1. In Andhra Pradesh, physical contingencies were approved for both DPEP-I and DPEP-II districts. If these contingencies are proportionately added to the baseline EFC approved cost district-wise, the total project cost for each district works out

to be more than Rs. 40 crores. However, since the DPEP guidelines have imposed a ceiling limit of Rs. 40 crores expenditure for each DPEP district, relaxation by Secretary (EE&L) and FA is required to be given.

2. The target of opening of new primary schools under both DPEP I and DPEP II has already been met by the State but at the primary level, AP-DPEP plans reflect that there are still unserved habitations where primary schools do not exist within a radius of one kilometer. However, it has been observed that in most of the district the gaps at the primary level are proposed to be filled in by opening new schools under SSA. In some districts, primary schools are proposed to be opened under DPEP and SSA both. In the district of Nizamabad under DPEP Phase II for which the project period extends upto June 2004, the new schools for the year 2002-03 are proposed to be undertaken under SSA and not under DPEP. PAB may like to take a view on this issue

Detailed observations

State Component Plan Phase I

Procurement

1. The management cost approved by EFC is Rs. 255 lakhs against which Rs. 444.35 lakhs has already with incurred upto 31st March, 2002. A further outlay of Rs. 102.30 lakhs has been proposed for the current year bringing the total management cost till the end of the current year at Rs. 546.65 lakhs. This is in excess of the EFC approved management cost by Rs. 291.65 lakhs. This excess may be disallowed.
2. An outlay of Rs. 10.80 lakhs has been proposed for the current year's plan under project management for hiring of 6 vehicles. Against the authorised ceiling of maximum 5 vehicles to be provided at the State level (according to the DPEP guidelines), there is a proposal for hiring of 6 vehicles for DPEP-I districts and therefore, only 5 vehicles may be allowed.
3. An outlay of Rs. 1.82 lakhs has been proposed for printing of school committee calendars under the intervention of community mobilisation and participation. It is to be noted however, that printing of calendars is not covered under DPEP guidelines and the same was observed in audit by Director General of Audit, Central Revenues.
4. Certain other activities under interventions like pedagogy, community mobilisation, project management and MIS seem to have been budgeted on the higher side (for instance, an outlay of Rs. 2.5 lakhs has been proposed under the intervention of ECCE for printing and supply of laminated cards on school readiness activities). Such activities should be reconsidered by the State.

AS

1. The budget allocated for alternative schooling in DPEP-I districts is Rs. 2.07 lakhs. However, the issue of sustainability of Alternative Schools has to be seriously debated. In order to sustain alternative schools, it is essential to upscale the alternative schools. The status of the children who have completed 2 years of schooling needs to be decided immediately. Either alternative schools have to be upgraded gradually upto 5th standard, or it may be ensured that the children who have completed class II are able to enroll in the nearby regular schools.
2. Out of Rs. 4.01 lakhs sanctioned for alternative schooling activities in the year 2001-02, Rs. 3.80 lakhs have remain unspent and only Rs. 0.20 lakhs have been spent. No reasons have been given for such low levels of expenditures.
3. All the activities proposed in the current year (2002-03) are, consequently fresh activities taken up, and not spill overs from the last year.
4. 3,382 AS and 2,367 Maabadis were planned last year, against which 2,352 AS and 398 Maabadis were opened. There was a short fall of about 33% in case of AS and almost 90% in case of Maabadis. This short fall should be accorded special attention so as to fill in the gaps this year.

Pedagogy

1. The expenditure on pedagogy and school improvement activities have been considerably low with respect to the amount sanctioned for these activities in the year 2001-02 (Rs. 17.557 lakhs spent against Rs. 107.483 lakhs sanctioned). Despite such a lot of savings, the current year planned proposes of financial outlay of Rs. 87.262 lakhs. The State should examine its capacity to spend such a large amount.
2. The State can initiate small scale pilot projects in the areas of multi-grade/ multi-level teaching, school improvement programme, pupils' evaluation etc. It is important to note that the state has good examples before them in the form of Rishi Valley Institute for educational resources.

Community Mobilisation

1. Out of the total of Rs. 6.792 lakhs sanctioned for community mobilisation activities in the year 2001-02, only Rs. 0.777 lakhs were spent. The reason for inability of the State to spend the planned amount has not been given.
2. A total outlay of Rs. 7.68 lakhs has been proposed for the activities for the current year. Keeping in mind the low expenditure of the sanctioned amount last year, it is not known whether Rs. 7.68 lakhs can be properly utilised this year.

3. The activity 'Computerization of Bio-data forms of school committee members' has been budgeted for Rs. 1.04 lakhs. This seems to be considerably on the higher side.
4. The activity 'Printing of monitoring forms of monthly meeting of school committees' has been budgeted for Rs. 3.90 lakhs. This seems to be exceptionally on the higher side and requires modification.

Media

1. The cumulative media budget for DPEP phase I is Rs. 27.23 lakhs which seems to be on the higher side as against 30.120 lakhs provisioned for last year, Rs. 19.51 lakhs remains unutilised. Also substantial outlays have been proposed for advertisements and notifications, documentation of success stories, empowering by education special issue on Education by Indian Express Group, etc. needs to be scaled down
2. An activity 'procurement of digital Handicam' has been listed within the state plan of DPEP-I. The reason for this procurement is not clear. Rs. 1.5 lakhs have been budgeted for this activity, so it could be beneficial if the reasons for the procurement of this instrument would have been explained in the plan.
3. The activity 'workshop for development of banners, poster, etc' seems to be over budgeted. The cost of this activity could be considerably downsized.

Girls Education

1. The total budget for the year 2002-03 for Girls Education is Rs. 7.615 lakhs . The budget seems to be on a higher side for activity of printing of the leaflets, brochures, posters, souvenirs, etc. The financial outlay for this activity is Rs. 4.00 lakhs which can be scaled down
2. All other activities listed in the plan are also on the higher side and can be scaled down considerably.

ECE

1. Out of a total amount of Rs. 2.76 lakhs sanctioned last year for ECE activities, only Rs. 0.14 lakhs was spent. This year the financial allocation for ECE activities is Rs. 9.42 lakhs. It is doubtful whether the State can utilize the allocated amount (if sanctioned) through appropriate expenditures.

MIS

1. Under the intervention MIS, substantial outlay have been proposed in the current year's plan for procurement of hardware, software, honorarium for computer personnel etc. Since hardware and software are already in place the need for the same does not arise. It is not understood as to whether the honorarium proposed for the computer personnel is in addition to their salary. If so, the same cannot be allowed.

State Component Plan Phase II

IED

1. A total budget of Rs. 8.08 lakhs has been outlaid for Integrated Education under DPEP Phase II districts.
2. The State is conducting 3 different workshops for preparation of TLM for HI, VI and MR. These could be clubbed into one item and only one workshop could be conducted, and expenditures could be reduced. Resource persons for different disabilities could be invited in this workshop and asked to prepare TLM.
3. Similarly 3 orientation workshops for language, maths and science teaching to disabled children need not be conducted. One workshop on how to make learning effective for children with special needs would be enough. Costs could be scaled down in this manner.

R&E

1. In the fresh plan for DPEP-II districts a financial outlay of Rs. 32.958 lakhs has been proposed. The major item of expenditure is the external evaluation of DPEP by IIM Bangalore which may be allowed.
2. The evaluation study MAS (Mid-term Assessment Study) is the other item which has a large sum of Rs. 7.06 lakhs proposed for 14 districts as a spillover activity.

AS

1. The budget outlaid for alternative schooling in DPEP-II districts is Rs. 11.013 lakhs. However, since the State was unable to spend more than Rs. 0.183 lakhs out of the total sanctioned amount of Rs. 7.328 lakhs in the year 2001-02, care should be taken that a similar experience does not take place in the year 2002-03 as well.
2. Several activities had been budgeted on the higher side. For instance Rs. 1.8 lakhs is proposed to be spent on Zonal Reviews Bi-monthly to NGOs of EGS and AIE. This amount could be scaled down.

Procurement

1. An outlay of Rs. 10.80 lakhs has been proposed for the current year's plan under project management for hiring of 6 vehicles. Against the authorised ceiling of maximum 5 vehicles to be provided at the State level (according to the DPEP guidelines), the provision made for hiring of 6 vehicles for DPEP-I districts cannot be allowed.
2. An outlay of Rs. 7.5 lakhs has been proposed for consumable and stationary. An additional amount of Rs. 7.5 lakhs has likewise been proposed under DPEP-I, bringing the total outlay to Rs. 15 lakhs which appears to be on the higher side and needs to be modified.
3. Under the intervention MIS, substantial outlay have been proposed in the current year's plan for procurement of hardware, software, honorarium for computer personnel etc. Since hardware and software are already in place the need for the same does not arise. It is not understood as to whether the honorarium proposed for the computer personnel is in addition to their salary. If so, the same cannot be allowed.
4. An outlay of Rs. 77.68 lakhs has been proposed in the current year's plan under the intervention of Focus Areas / Groups for child labour or exposure visits, quarterly review meeting, capacity building, campaign material, monitoring, advertisement etc. Taking into account the physical target of a small number, the outlay proposed for these activities seems to be on the higher side and needs to be scaled down.
5. An outlay of Rs. 10 lakhs has been proposed in the current year's plan for water, telephone and electricity charges. Similar, outlay of Rs. 10 lakhs has been proposed under DPEP phase I also bringing the total outlay to Rs. 20 lakhs which appears to be on the higher side and needs modification.

Community Mobilisation

1. Out of the total of Rs. 27.338 lakhs sanctioned for community mobilisation activities in the year 2001-02, Rs. 13.800 lakhs were spent. The reason for saving of almost half of the sanctioned amount has not been clarified.
2. A total outlay of Rs. 27.878 lakhs has been proposed for the activities for the current year. Keeping in mind the low expenditure of the sanctioned amount last year, care should be taken to implement the planned activities and properly utilise the proposed amount this year.

Media

1. The cumulative media budget for DPEP phase II is Rs. 46.00 lakhs.

2. One of the activities in DPEP phase II is 'advertising on Child labour through print media (White Electricity Metre Card). This activity can only be allowed if it is related to the DPEP i.e. primary education.
3. An activity has been listed as 'audio recording children' (under DPEP- II). The nature of this activity is not clear. No details have been provided whatsoever. Hence may not be allowed.
4. The activity 'workshop for development of banners, poster, etc' seems to be over budgeted. The cost of this activity could be considerably downsized.

Pedagogy

1. The expenditure on pedagogy and school improvement activities have been considerably low with respect to the amount sanctioned for these activities in the year 2001-02 (Rs. 31 796 lakhs spent against Rs. 78.893 lakhs sanctioned). Despite such a lot of amount saved the current year plan proposes financial outlay of Rs. 29.627 lakhs. The State needs to properly utilise this amount this year and not let the activities remain unfulfilled.
2. The State could lay more emphasis on the documentation of good practices in the different parts of the State in different areas of pedagogical renewal e.g. good teaching learning practices, good teachers, good schooling etc. These should be meticulously documented and shared with districts inside and outside the State.

Girls Education

1. The total budget for the year 2002-03 for Girls Education is Rs. 9.171 lakhs. The budget seems to be on a higher side for activity of printing of the leaflets, brochures, posters, souvenirs, etc. The financial outlay for this activity is Rs. 4.00 lakhs which can be scaled down.

ECE

1. Out of a total amount of Rs. 4.987 lakhs sanctioned last year for ECE activities, only Rs. 0.442 lakhs was spent. This year the financial allocation for ECE activities is Rs. 19.6 lakhs. The State should make a more realistic estimation and accordingly revise the plan.
2. The merging of ECE centres to ICDS centres should be attempted in order to ensure sustainability of the ECE centres through the convergence, especially since DPEP is at the edge of completion.

District Component

VIZIANAGARAM PHASE I

IED

1. A total of Rs. 13.73 lakhs was sanctioned last year for IED activities of which Rs. 13.706 lakhs went unspent. Considerable amount of money i.e. Rs. 10.40 lakhs has been allocated once again this year for the same activities. The State should take care to properly utilise the allocated amount this year and revise the budget realistically.

R&E

1. Out of the total budget of Rs. 7.48 lakhs sanctioned last year only Rs. 2.718 lakhs was spent. No money was spent on Cohort studies, Action Research and Training programmes. Similar activities are proposed again for 2002-03 with the budget of Rs. 7.34 lakhs. It is necessary to ensure that these activities are undertaken and completed and do not remain unimplemented as in 2001-02.

AS

1. The total budget outlay for the current year is Rs. 443.274 lakhs, out of which teachers' salaries account for the bulk of this amount (Rs. 393.048 lakhs). This amount needs to be considered carefully since it seems to be excessively high.
2. The proposed outlay for residential bridge course - DPIP is Rs. 18.00 lakhs for two camps. The amount needs to be scaled down. The accepted unit cost is genuinely Rs. 3000 per child for the bridge course.

Procurement

1. EFC approved project cost of the district is Rs. 4006 lakhs. The cumulative expenditure upto 31st March, 2002 is Rs. 2664.93 lakhs and the outlay including the spillover for the current year is Rs. 1528.13 lakhs bringing the total expenditure to Rs. 4193.06 lakhs approved project cost by Rs. 1320.06 lakhs. This will result in exceeding the maximum ceiling limit of Rs. 40.00 crores per district prescribed in DPEP guidelines.

Community Mobilisation

1. As against a total of Rs. 32.58 lakhs sanctioned last year Rs. 5.927 lakhs was spent. Huge amounts were saved in activities like 3 days training to HMs and SEC Chairpersons, working in partnership with NGOs, and Support to school committee mobilisation.

2. This year the total estimated financial outlay is of Rs. 9.341 lakhs of which Rs. 4.081 lakhs is for the activity '3 days training to HMs and SEC Chairpersons'. Keeping in view the huge amount unspent for this particular activity last year, the financial outlay for this activity in the current year should be considered carefully.

Media

1. Out of total Rs. 76,000, no amount had been spent on the activity 'photo exhibitions and albums' last year. Despite this, a fresh proposal of Rs. 38,000 has again been submitted this year for the same activity. The reason for this is not comprehended. No explanations have been provided either.
2. Rs. 50,000 has been budgeted for the activity 'documentation of community participation process'. The nature of this activity is not understood, nor is it understood what would be the means of documentation, at how frequent intervals, etc. Rs. 50,000 seems to be too high an amount for this activity. It should be downsized.
3. The overall media budget for the current year is of Rs. 5.196 lakhs.

Project Management

1. Under this intervention a cumulative expenditure of Rs. 150.03 lakhs had already been incurred upto 31.3.2002 and an outlay of Rs. 33.26 lakhs has been proposed for the current year. The total budget works out to Rs. 183.29 lakhs. This exceeds not only the EFC approved management cost but also permissible ceiling of 6% of the EFC approved project cost. Hence the State may only be allowed to incur expenditure within the ceiling limit of 6% admissible under management cost.

Pedagogy

1. In addition to the school grant @ 2000 per school per annum, an outlay of Rs. 1000 per school for children's literature has also been proposed. Since the school grant is expected to cover books, journals, furniture and other related items for improving school facilities, the additional grant of Rs. 1000 per school cannot be allowed.
2. An outlay of Rs. 7.30 lakhs has been proposed in the current year's plan for interactive learning material to primary and upper primary school. Since, upper primary schools are not covered under DPEP, the outlay proposed for upper primary schools should be reduced from the outlay.
3. An outlay of Rs. 100 lakhs has been proposed in the current year's plan for the provision of child friendly components @ Rs. 10,000 for a physical targets of

1000 schools. As far as possible this expenditure needs to be covered under the school improvement grant of Rs. 2000 instead of additionality.

Girls Education

1. The total budget allocated for Girls education last year was Rs. 20.017 lakhs out of which Rs. 19.469 lakhs went unspent. Care should be taken by the State to spent the estimated financial outlay this year (Rs. 13.901 lakhs).
2. One of the activities ' village specific model village' is very ambiguous in nature and Rs. 1.27 lakhs is the estimated financial outlay for this. The activity and the manner in which costing was done for it, both need to be clarified by the State.

NIZAMABAD PHASE II

AS

1. In the budget of the year 2001-02 only the estimated financial outlay for all interventions have been depicted and the actual expenditure and the unspent amount has not been mentioned anywhere. This applies to the intervention 'access and alternative schooling' as well.
2. The estimated financial outlay for the year 2002-03 is Rs. 224.85 lakhs. All activities are fresh activities except for one activity 'construction of Vidya Kuteer'. However, it needs to be seen how many of these activities can be actually implemented within this year.
3. An outlay of Rs. 75 lakhs has been proposed in the current year's plan under the intervention of access and alternative schooling for residential bridge course camps @ Rs. 7.5 lakhs per camp for 10 camps. The unit cost of Rs. 7.5 lakhs per camp is very much on the higher side. Normally, the unit cost for residential bridge course should not exceed Rs. 3000 per child and hence the budget needs to be revised by the State.

Community Mobilisation

1. An outlay of Rs. 28.80 lakhs for support to school committee for mobilisation and Rs. 11.40 lakhs for community mobilizers to PS to UPS to monitor attendance of pupil and reduce drop outs has been proposed in the plan. This appears to be on the higher side and needs careful consideration. Moreover, any expenditure on UPS is not covered under DPEP.

Media

1. The costing for the activity 'documentation of DPEP activities' seems to be on the higher side (Rs. 2 lakhs have been budgeted for this activity). This activity should be scaled down considerably.
2. An outlay of Rs. 0.30 lakhs has been proposed in the current year's plan under the Media for printing of academic planners. Since the printing of planners of any type in DPEP was objected to by audit in the past, this activity should not be included in the plan.

R&E

1. Out of the activities planned for 2001-02, it is not clear from costing tables which ones were completed. Out of the total budget of Rs. 6.30 lakhs, the table does not show the amount that was actually spent. In 2002-03 the budget for R&E is Rs. 12.27 lakhs.

Pedagogy

1. In addition to school improvement grant @ Rs. 2000/- per school per annum for 2130 schools amounting to Rs. 42.60 lakhs, an outlay of Rs. 15.20 lakhs has been provided for library books to schools under the above intervention. Since Rs. 2000/- per annum per school is given for improving school facilities such as books and journal, furniture, health check up, and bettering school environment etc., library grant to schools should not be included in the plan. This has been objected to by audit in the past. Hence may not be allowed.
2. An outlay of Rs. 10 lakhs has been proposed in the current year's plan for the provision of child friendly components @ Rs. 10,000/-. The actual amount works out to Rs. 100 lakhs and not Rs. 10 lakhs as shown in the plan. Normally all activities related to school improvement are to be included in the school grants. The State may consider taking up these items under school grants as far as possible.

Table - I

DPEP - Andhra Pradesh
Abstracts of Annual Work Plan & Budget 2002-2003

Phase I

(Rs. in lakhs)

S. No.	Districts/ State Project Office	AWP&B 2001-2002	Expenditure during 2001-2002	Spillover to 2002-2003	Fresh Proposals 2002-2003	Total AWP&B 2002-2003
A	B	C	D	E	F	G
1	State Project Office	390.44	170.47	124.39	309.41	433.80
2	Vizianagaram	1368.35	585.31	347.46	1180.66	1528.12
3	Nellore	1453.16	660.26	323.74	1866.69	2190.43
4	Kurnool	1243.40	522.79	178.18	1388.38	1566.57
5	Karimnagar	1070.27	677.34	81.54	1941.16	2022.71
6	Warrangal	1347.80	982.60	173.44	2540.84	2714.29
	Total	6873.42	3598.77	1228.75	9227.14	10422.92

Phase II

(Rs. in lakhs)

S. No.	Districts/State Project Office	AWP&B 2001-2002	Expenditure during 2001-2002	Spillover 2002-2003	Fresh Proposals	Total AWP&B 2002-2003
A	B	C	D	E	F	G
1	State Project Office	706.17	250.80	75.57	575.88	651.45
2	Srikakulam	1125.60	535.44	173.69	863.55	1037.24
3	Visakhapatnam	1076.01	344.63	137.07	972.81	1109.89
4	Guntur	1053.76	421.85	323.96	1383.75	1707.71
5	Prakassam	1113.78	498.28	171.23	1529.20	1700.44
6	Chittoor	1096.02	485.92	119.25	1478.66	1597.91
7	Cuddapah	1000.17	356.30	167.73	1328.66	1496.40
8	Anantapur	1093.92	226.04	193.71	1542.91	1736.62
9	Mahabub Nagar	890.68	352.93	263.98	1772.17	2036.16
10	Rangareddy	1240.06	451.68	241.04	1008.13	1249.18
11	Medak	1036.42	462.49	277.97	1176.17	1454.14
12	Nizamabad	961.30	309.94	44.08	1026.37	1070.45
13	Adilabad	1358.21	518.84	306.05	1562.78	1868.83
14	Khammam	1061.76	723.97	76.18	1894.27	1970.47
15	Nalgonda	1126.98	595.58	337.13	1253.94	1591.07
	Total	15940.84	6534.76	2908.64	19369.25	22277.90

Table II

(AWP&B 2001-2002)
Analysis of Civil Works Cost in DPEP I & II

Phase I

(Rs. in lakhs)

No.	District	EFC approved Cost with contingencies (for Civil Works)	33.33% of EFC approved Cost with Contingencies (33.33% of Total Project Cost)	Cumulative Expenditure (upto 31.3.2002)	AWPB 2002-2003	Total anticipated expenditure upto 31.3.2003 (E + F)	Whether Exceeds 33.33 % ceiling limit (D - G)
A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
	State	84.80	764.05	50.91	43.37	94.28	669.77
	Vizianagaram	943.41	1335.22	708.69	579.78	1288.47	52.81
	Nellore	981.70	1574.11	841.70	741.88	1583.58	-9.47
	Kurnool	985.38	1380.77	824.16	556.89	1381.05	-0.28
	Karimnagar	1052.33	1500.21	1008.60	509.90	1518.5	-18.29
	Warangal	1068.71	1472.79	1384.51	557.99	1942.5	-469.71
	Total	5116.33	8027.15	4818.60	2989.81	7808.38	224.83

Phase II

(Rs. in lakhs)

No.	District	EFC approved Cost with contingencies (for Civil Works)	24% of EFC approved Cost with Contingencies	Cumulative Expenditure (upto 31.3.2002)	AWPB 2002-2003	Total anticipated expenditure upto 31.3.2003 (E + F)	Whether Exceeds 24% ceiling limit (D) - (G)
A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
	State	57.56	452.88	14.12	2.34	16.46	436.42
	Srikakulam	1204.51	1194.06	1664.68	25.32	1690.00	-495.94
	Visakhapatnam	1210.97	1202.45	1679.98	46.16	1726.14	-523.69
	Guntur	1205.14	1198.04	1812.98	102.28	1915.26	-717.22
	Prakasam	1206.82	1202.81	1794.51	114.43	1908.94	-706.13
	Chittoor	1205.57	1203.06	1661.05	75.42	1736.48	-533.42
	Cuddapah	1203.40	1195.33	1555.94	-	1555.94	-360.61
	Anatapur	1208.00	1203.49	1732.67	46.62	1779.29	-575.8
	Mahabub Nagar	1205.98	1193.55	1699.92	162.70	1862.62	-669.07
0.	Rangareddy	1205.41	1182.26	1568.71	226.33	1795.04	-612.78
1.	Medak	1205.95	1201.45	1768.38	144.98	1910.36	-708.91
2.	Nizamabad	1207.55	1182.91	1713.63	40.13	1753.76	-570.85
3.	Adilabad	1205.74	1198.75	1604.30	166.47	1770.77	-572.02
4.	Khanumam	1210.44	1190.11	1746.35	156.06	1901.41	-711.3
5.	Nalgonda	1206.02	1183.82	1668.32	139.03	1807.35	-623.53
	Total	16949.06	17184.97	23655.59	1448.34	25103.93	-7944.85

- * (-) Excess over the ceiling limits
 (+) Savings over the ceiling limits

Note: No expenditure in excess over and above the ceiling limits of 33.33% for DPEP-I and 24% for DPEP-II of the EFC costs are permissible to the State.

Table - III

DPEP - Andhra Pradesh
Analysis of Expenditure in DPEP Phase I & II

Phase I

(Rs. in lakhs)

S. No.	District	EFC approved Cost with contingencies	Cumulative Expenditure (upto 31.3.2002)	AWPB 2002-2003	Total anticipated expenditure upto 31.3.2003 (D + E)	Whether Exceeds E.F.C. Cost (C - F)
A	B	C	D	E	F	G
1.	State	2292.39	874.35	433.80	1308.15	984.24
2.	Vizianagaram	4006.09	2658.41	1528.12	4186.53	-180.44
3.	Nellore	4722.81	2887.55	2190.43	5077.98	-355.17
4.	Kurnool	4142.74	2577.37	1566.57	4143.94	-1.2
5.	Karimnagar	4501.10	2705.95	2022.71	4728.66	-227.56
6.	Warangal	4418.83	3426.20	2714.29	6140.49	-1721.66
	Total	24083.96	15129.83	10455.92	25585.75	-1501.79

Phase II

(Rs. in lakhs)

S. No.	District	EFC approved Cost with contingencies	Cumulative Expenditure (upto 31.3.2002)	AWPB 2002-2003	Total (D + E)	Whether Exceeds E.F.C. Cost (C - F)
A	B	C	D	E	F	G
1.	State	1887.28	949.84	651.45	1601.29	285.99
2.	Srikakulam	4975.26	2963.02	1037.24	4000.26	975.00
3.	Visakhapatnam	5010.23	2889.86	1109.89	3999.75	1010.48
4.	Guntur	4992.30	2567.02	1707.76	4274.78	717.52
5.	Prakassam	5011.73	3131.96	1700.44	4832.4	179.33
6.	Chitoor	5012.77	3323.32	1597.91	4921.23	91.54
7.	Cuddapah	4981.01	2874.15	1496.40	4370.55	610.46
8.	Anatapur	5014.56	2832.37	1736.62	4568.99	445.57
9.	Mahabub Nagar	4973.14	2882.63	2036.16	4918.79	54.35
10.	Rangareddy	4926.09	2209.44	1249.68	3459.12	1466.97
11.	Medak	5006.04	2404.25	1454.14	3858.39	1147.65
12.	Nizamabad	4928.81	2539.30	1070.45	3609.75	1319.06
13.	Adilabad	4994.82	2786.14	1868.83	4654.97	339.85
14.	Khammam	4958.79	3257.76	1970.47	5228.23	-269.44
15.	Nalgonda	4932.60	2994.97	1591.07	4586.04	346.56
	Total	71605.43	40606.03	22277.96	62883.99	8721.44

Table IV

DPEP - Andhra Pradesh
(AWP & B 2001 - 2002)
Analysis of Management Cost in DPEP I & II

(Rs. in lakhs)

District	Total Project Cost with Contingencies	EFC approved Cost with contingencies	6 % of Total Project Cost with Contingencies	Cumulative Expenditure (upto 31.3.2002)	AWPB 2002-2003	Total (F + G)	Whether Exceeds 6% ceiling limit (E - H)
B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
State	2292.39	338.35	137.54	449.35	102.30	551.65	-414.11
Vizianagaram	4006.09	210.72	240.36	156.39	33.26	189.65	50.71
Nellore	4722.81	210.63	283.36	201.46	58.44	259.9	23.46
Kurnool	4142.74	210.45	248.56	86.23	109.29	195.52	53.04
Karimnagar	4501.10	210.65	270.06	193.86	57.52	251.38	18.68
Warangal	4418.83	210.33	265.12	218.21	52.25	270.46	-5.34
Total	24083.96	1391.13	1445.00	1395.52	413.06	1808.58	-363.58

II

(Rs. in lakhs)

District	Total EFC Approved cost with Contingencies	EFC approved Cost for management with contingencies	6 % of Total Project Cost with Contingencies	Anticipated Cumulative Expenditure (upto 31.3.2001)	AWPB 2002-2003	Total (F + G)	Whether Exceeds 6% ceiling limit (E - H)
B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
State	1887.28	639.97	113.23	270.24	84.30	354.54	-241.31
Srikakulam	4975.26	145.27	298.51	183.70	47.80	231.5	67.01
Visakhapatnam	5010.23	145.29	300.61	208.07	65.73	273.8	26.81
Guntur	4992.30	139.28	299.53	176.12	94.99	271.11	28.42
Prakassam	5011.73	146.34	300.70	150.67	63.48	214.15	86.55
Chittoor	5012.77	139.85	300.76	147.15	37.50	184.65	116.11
Cuddapah	4981.01	136.48	298.86	163.21	66.24	229.45	69.41
Anatapur	5014.56	142.91	300.87	143.05	48.82	191.87	109
Mahabub Nagar	4973.14	145.21	298.38	144.73	57.91	202.64	95.74
Rangareddy	4926.09	149.26	295.56	133.69	90.42	224.11	71.45
Medak	5006.04	149.17	300.36	126.31	74.17	200.48	99.88
Nizamabad	4928.81	149.34	295.72	163.25	42.15	205.4	90.32
Adilabad	4994.82	67.43	299.68	171.12	69.80	240.92	58.76
Khammam	4958.79	144.30	297.52	193.91	52.91	246.82	50.7
Nalgonda	4932.60	141.07	295.95	160.26	63.92	224.18	71.77
Total	71605.43	2581.17	4296.24	2535.48	960.14	3495.62	800.62

- * (-) Excess over the ceiling limits
(+) Savings over the ceiling limits

Note: No expenditure in excess over and above the ceiling limits of 6% of the Total Project Cost for Project Management will be allowed.

ANNUAL WORK PLAN & BUDGET (AWP&B) FOR 2002-2003

DPEP- UTTAR PRADESH

A. Introduction:

DPEP is being implemented in two stages i.e. DPEP - II and DPEP - III, in Uttar Pradesh.

DPEP - II

DPEP - II programme was extended to Uttar Pradesh in 15 districts in September 1997, and will continue upto June 2003. Due to subsequent bifurcation of three district, the number of districts has increased to 18. Four more districts viz. Barabanki, Rampur, Bahraich and Shrawasti having very low female literacy rate have also been taken under DPEP-II from July, 1999. The total project outlay is Rs. 629.93 crores (567.55 crores for 18 districts and 62.38 crores for three years for four new districts). The project cost of these four districts for the entire project period of five years is Rs. 102.38 crores. With additional new districts the total number of districts covered under DPEP-II comes to 22.

DPEP - III

DPEP - III programme was extended to Uttar Pradesh in 1998-99 for the 32 districts. There were 6 more districts in UP DPEP III programme which have now been transferred to Uttaranchal, subsequent to the creation of new State of Uttaranchal out of Uttar Pradesh. The total EFC approved cost for above mentioned 32 districts is Rs. 77011.12 lakhs.

B. Process of Appraisal.

The district and state plans of U.P. DPEP II and III were appraised by SIEMAT Allahabad in Feb and March 2002. During this process many issues and budget problems were identified and these plans were corrected. The appraisal done by SIEMAT Allahabad is found to be quite comprehensive. However the appraisal would benefit if a more comprehensive analysis is undertaken of expenditure as against approved EFC costs. Particularly, analysis of expenditure limits for civil works and management needs to be more rigorous. Following the state appraisal a sample of two plans each from phase II and phase III, i.e Bareilly, Agra, Ballia and Deoria were appraised at national level. **Comments of the appraisal would apply to all plans.**

C. Financial:

(Details in tables attached)

- The total EFC cost for DPEP-II is Rs. 669.94 crores and Rs. 690.04 crores with 3% price contingencies. The expenditure till March, 2002 was Rs. 488.64 crores, i.e.70.8%. For DPEP-II the State proposes to spend Rs. 145.98 crores (Rs. 6.50 crores spill over and Rs. 139.84 crores fresh proposals) in the forthcoming year, which would bring the total expenditure to 634.62 crores, i.e. 91.9%.
- For DPEP-III, the total approved EFC cost is Rs. 764.26 crores and Rs. 787.19 crores with 3% price contingency. The expenditure till March, 2002 was Rs. 322.91 crores i.e. 41.81% of the approved EFC cost.

D. Comments on Functional Areas:

(i) Process of Planning:

- It was found that the districts had attempted to analyse existing data, take stock of the progress in various functional areas during the previous years, and identify strategies for the forthcoming year. However, some district plans such as that of Deoria are found to be sketchy.

(ii) Civil Works:

- All DPEP-II districts have proposed construction activities up to 33% of project cost. Two conditions that need to be fulfilled for spending upto 33% on the civil works are: (a) Submitting a detailed infrastructure plan and (b) 50% expenditure in the non-civil work - project management category. The previous year, proposals upto 33% expenditure on civil works were approved subject to these conditions. On the current year, these conditions are found to be fulfilled in almost all districts. Bahraich does not fulfill the criteria of about 50% expenditure in non civil works/management items, but this should be fulfilled over the course of this year.
- For DPEP-II, funds have largely been disbursed to VECs. The state needs to ensure that works are completed.

(iii) Alternative Schooling:

DPEP-II Districts

- Current coverage under AS in the state is as follows:

	Shiksha Garh	Bal Shala	Prehar Shala	Maktab/Madarasa	Rishi Valley	Camp	EGS	Total
Operational	865	175	88	357	169	10	1890	3554

- The DPEP-II districts have not proposed any new interventions in the Alternative Schooling as this is the last year of DPEP-II. However, the plans is to continue on going AS/EGS centers and focus on summer camps .

DPEP-III Districts

The plan document states that during 2002-2003 concerted efforts will be made to open AS/EGS centers in the 32 DPEP-III districts of the state. The major activities proposed to be carried out this year are:

- Micro levels survey of low literacy pockets in the selected districts with a view to find out of concentration of going street and working children from each household.
- Identification of child labours/working children who are not going to school by house survey in child labour districts viz. Azamgarh, Kanpur Dehat, Agra, Mathura, Farrukabad, Kannoj etc.
- Strengthening of SRG as a measure towards strengthening of academic support system for effective implementation of AS/Education models in selected models..
- Capacity building of District Coordinators and other functioning of AS unit.
- SRG meetings.
- Development of TLM.
- Training/Orientation of AS functionaries.
- Monitoring, Evaluation and Action Researches.
- Physical targets for different strategies/activities are not given.
- The total number of children who will be covered is also not provided.

Budget:

- Provision for the above mentioned activities are made in the table of Alternative Schooling budget provision for the year 2002-2003.
- A budget proposal of Rs.15,615 thousand (7,433.00 thousand spill over plus 8,182 thousand fresh proposal) has been made for different strategies of AS in the state plan for DPEP-III districts.
- It is recommended that the state make efforts to systematize its village records so that the data regarding out of school children can be updated annually. A methodology regarding the same has been suggested from the national level.

(iv) Pedagogy:

- The state had taken several initiatives for quality improvement of schools. These includes:
 - Text book revision.
 - Teacher Training in a large scale each year.
 - A new system of pupil evaluation.
 - A learning improvement programme: VIKALP
 - School grading.
- **While the above activities are appreciated there are considerable issues that remain at the school level. For this the following suggestions are made:**
 - **More 'VIKALP' like small projects.**
 - **Attention to issues relating to teacher motivation and attendance.**
 - **Improvements in DIETs and SCERTs.**
- Teacher recruitment measures are being taken. Intake of BTC trained teachers has been increased. Shortfall is to be filled by appointment of Shiksha Mitras. This is an important issue as the Hamirpur plan indicated a shortage of almost 50%.

(v) Community mobilization and participation:

The AWP & B of the state presents a sensible proposition so far as state level interventions in regard to community participation are concerned. Apart from continuing with awareness generation activities like "School Chalo Abhiyan", the AWP & B also proposes to take up certain fresh activities like:

- Publishing regular columns in the newspapers propogating project messages.
- Printing books on success stories.
- Regular review of activities.
- Refresher orientations to VECs/SRGs.
- Orientations to newly elected Gram Sabha members (though not reflected in the budget proposal).
- Habitation wise computerization of micro-planning data.

However, the same are not articulated in the district plans. The State may ensure that districts take up these systematically.

E. *Proposal :-*

It is proposed that AWP&B for DPEP-II for Rs. 14598.470 lacs and AWP&B for DPEP-III for Rs.28061.68 lacs may be approved subject to the comments in the appraisal note. Details as per statements attached.

ABSTRACT OF AWP & B PROPOSALS (2002-2003)

State - Uttar Pradesh

ANNEXURE - I

DPEP- Phase III

(Rs. in Lakh)

S.	Districts	EFC Cost	EFC Cost (with 3% pr. Config.	Rev. EFC cost after excess Exp. for DPEP	Cumulative Amount Expenditure (2000-2002)		Average expenditure per year	Approved AWP&B upto 2001-02	Expend- ing 2001-02	Antici- pated amount saved	Spill Over 2002-2003 (Finan. outlay)	Fresh Proposal for 2002-03	Total AWP&B for 2002-03	Total AWP&B as % of av. yea. Expen.	Total AWP&B as % of EFC Cost
					Amount till March'2002	% of EFC									
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N
1	Unnao	2389.37	71.68	2461.05	1175.29	49.19	587.65	1444.23	779.44	291.82	99.64	833.88	933.52		39.07
2	Kanpur (Dehat)	2349.17	70.48	2419.65	1271.56	54.13	635.78	1592.90	797.06	259.97	165.85	864.07	1029.92		43.84
3	Sultanpur	2924.59	87.74	3012.33	1197.11	40.93	598.56	1603.69	783.12	198.61	170.58	600.26	770.84		26.36
4	Raibareilly	2465.78	73.97	2539.75	1190.98	48.30	595.49	1369.65	801.52	233	126.86	740.12	866.98		35.16
5	Pratapgarh	2602.33	78.07	2680.40	1276.74	49.06	638.37	1737.18	868.1	854.53	161.22	986.41	1147.63		44.10
6	Hamirpur	1546.47	46.39	1592.86	767.27	49.61	383.64	747.69	548.22	77.63	0.00	360.09	360.09		23.28
7	Jaunpur	3158.67	94.76	3253.43	1572.54	49.78	786.27	2011.78	1080.7	42.64	0.00	1106.62	1106.62		35.03
8	Mirzapur	2525.76	75.77	2601.53	945.03	37.42	472.52	1757.05	665.59	186.25	124.67	970.48	1095.15		43.36
9	Fatehpur	2436.45	73.09	2509.54	1058.99	43.46	529.50	1279.57	777.78	163.76	90.21	666.43	756.64		31.06
10	Farrukhabad	1873.94	56.22	1930.16	946.89	50.53	473.45	1139.27	608.57	199.4	7.64	387.60	395.24		21.09
11	Faizabad	1982.19	59.47	2041.66	892.93	45.05	446.47	1202.63	599.67	507.53	322.16	610.33	932.49		47.04
12	Ambedkar Nagar	2063.64	61.91	2125.55	1002.12	48.56	501.06	1326.82	707.85	236.79	163.96	781.65	945.61		45.82
13	Etah	2409.51	72.29	2481.80	960.27	39.85	480.14	1600.35	659.47	10.58	10.58	1127.84	1138.42		47.25
14	Bijnour	2576.39	77.29	2653.68	1113.61	43.22	556.81	1465.04	756.63	195.59	90.60	690.64	781.24		30.32
15	Bulandshahar	2803.60	84.11	2887.71	1141.48	40.71	570.74	1549.07	820.57	97.37	61.71	910.20	971.91		34.67
16	Muzaffernagar	2677.96	80.34	2758.30	1008.06	37.64	504.03	1477.92	684.14	450.68	203.41	586.46	789.87		29.50
17	Jhansi	1717.30	51.52	1768.82	856.86	49.90	428.43	1181.84	575.78	182.58	136.00	682.50	818.50		47.66
18	Jalaun	1969.59	59.09	2028.68	599.27	30.43	299.64	923.38	437.85	287.29	136.00	608.63	744.63		37.81
19	Gaziabad	1919.05	57.57	1976.62	785.85	40.95	392.93	1259.56	495.24	309.79	79.09	689.18	768.27		40.03
20	Gautambudh N.	1155.44	34.66	1190.10	417.73	36.15	208.87	617.91	264.66	91.4	28.70	419.34	448.04		38.78
21	Merrut	1882.07	56.46	1938.53	739.62	39.30	369.81	1068.53	524.34	212.94	0.00	867.02	867.02		46.07
22	Baghpat	1277.08	38.31	1315.39	411.46	32.22	205.73	765.22	242.41	194.21	60.04	471.14	531.18		41.59
23	Agra	3149.22	94.48	3243.70	1112.68	35.33	556.34	1961.32	798.27	949.4	322.42	1145.21	1467.63		46.60
24	Mathura	1880.17	56.41	1936.58	618.78	32.91	309.39	1132.15	435.01	111.68	92.50	678.07	770.57		40.98
25	Kushinagar	2424.67	72.74	2497.41	1408.17	58.08	704.09	1506.93	947.97	55.44	0.00	592.16	592.16		24.42
26	Mau	1901.20	57.04	1958.24	852.24	44.83	426.12	1103.96	613.55	249.03	54.87	458.39	513.26		27.00
27	Azamgarh	3380.34	101.41	3481.75	1670.02	49.40	835.01	2666.22	1275.63	1092.95	140.40	927.20	1067.60		31.58
28	Ballia	2656.05	79.68	2735.73	1235.63	46.52	617.82	1825.27	866.00	704.32	56.00	942.13	998.13		37.58
29	Chazipur	2560.44	76.81	2637.25	1182.76	46.19	591.38	1545.45	837.96	277.61	111.21	734.72	845.93		33.04
30	Kannauj	1714.14	51.42	1765.56	822.20	47.97	411.10	1223.46	518.76	258.06	16.04	375.65	391.69		22.85
31	Mahoba	1396.61	41.90	1438.51	428.61	30.69	214.31	776.12	303.95	305.38	85.72	447.71	533.43		38.19
32	Mainpuri	1828.76	54.86	1883.62	822.99	45.00	411.50	1105.15	548.15	274.9	56.01	605.86	661.87		36.19
33	SPO	4828.24	144.85	4973.09	1005.38	20.82	502.69	1808.33	668.45	145.73	777.48	1242.12	2019.60		41.83
	Total	76426.19	2292.79	78718.98	32491.12	1414.15	16245.56	45775.64	22292.41	9708.86	3951.57	24110.11	28061.68		

annexure-II
Rs in lacs

	District	EFC	EFC	6 % of	Cumulative	Allocation made for the		Total	Expenditure
		approved	approved	EFC approved	Expenditure	year 2002-2003		AWP & B	till March
		Cost	Cost	Cost	upto 2001-02	Fresh Plan	Anticipated	for	2002 +
		A	For Management B	C	D	E	spill over F	2002-2003 G	S.O.+ F.P. H
1	Unnao	2389.37	143.36	143.36	33.75	26.65	0	26.65	60.4
2	Kanpur (Dehat)	2349.17	140.95	140.95	31.36	37.19	3.6	40.79	72.15
3	Sultanpur	2924.59	175.48	175.48	34.00	27.95	3.6	31.55	65.55
4	Raibareilly	2465.78	147.95	147.95	30.00	27.41	1.05	28.46	58.46
5	Pratapgarh	2602.33	156.14	156.14	37.25	32.7	11.8	44.5	81.75
6	Hamirpur	1546.47	92.79	92.79	29.15	35	0	35	64.15
7	Jaunpur	3158.67	189.52	189.52	25.03	25.65	0	25.65	50.68
8	Mirzapur	2525.76	151.55	151.55	23.15	17.35	14.22	31.57	54.72
9	Fatehpur	2436.45	146.19	146.19	20.11	21.3	1.07	22.37	42.48
10	Farrukhabad	1873.94	112.44	112.44	24.24	23	0	23	47.24
11	Faizabad	1982.19	118.93	118.93	35.26	32.14	5.45	37.59	72.85
12	Ambedkar Nagar	2063.64	123.82	123.82	22.36	28.45	0.25	28.7	51.06
13	Etah	2409.51	144.57	144.57	32.52	38.25	0	38.25	70.77
14	Bijnour	2576.39	154.58	154.58	25.36	7.25	0.25	7.5	32.86
15	Bulendhshashar	2803.60	168.22	168.22	38.07	23.27	0	23.27	61.34
16	Muzaffernagar	2677.96	160.68	160.68	27.17	27.65	0	27.65	54.82
17	Jhansi	1717.30	103.04	103.04	34.00	25.97	11.3	37.27	71.27
18	Jalaun	1969.59	118.18	118.18	28.45	24.42	0	24.42	52.87
19	Gaziabad	1919.05	115.14	115.14	37.00	12.76	0	12.76	49.76
20	Gotambudhnagar	1155.44	69.33	69.33	31.16	23.86	2.05	25.91	57.07
21	Meerut	1882.07	112.92	112.92	31.26	30.3	0	30.3	61.56
22	Baghpat	1277.08	76.62	76.62	22.86	27.25	0.64	27.89	50.75
23	Agra	3149.22	188.95	188.95	35.68	35.96	0	35.96	71.64
24	Mathura	1880.17	112.81	112.81	25.00	11.62	8.63	20.25	45.25
25	Kushinagar	2424.67	145.48	145.48	15.08	33.73	0	33.73	48.81
26	Mau	1901.20	114.07	114.07	19.00	22.9	0	22.9	41.9
27	Azamgarh	3380.34	202.82	202.82	30.99	22.67	0	22.67	53.66
28	Ballia	2656.05	159.36	159.36	25.23	50.58	0	50.58	75.81
29	Chazipur	2560.44	153.63	153.63	29.16	33.11	0	33.11	62.27
30	Kannauj	1714.14	102.85	102.85	32.78	29.07	0	29.07	61.85
31	Mahoba	1396.61	83.80	83.80	34.26	23.45	4.5	27.95	62.21
32	Mainpuri	1828.76	109.73	109.73	26.97	28.75	3.46	32.21	59.18
33	SPO	4828.24	289.69	289.69	210.54	141.53	67.8	209.33	419.87
	Total	76426.19	4585.57	4585.57	1138.2	1009.14	139.67	1148.81	2287.01

**STATEMENT OF CIVIL WORKS COST 2002-2003
STATE-UTTAR PRADESH**

Annexure -III
Rs in lacs

Phase -DPEP-III

	District	EFC	EFC app.	24% of	33 % of	Cumulative	Allocation made for the		Total	Expenditure till March 20001 + S.O.+ F.P.
		approved	for civil	EFC app.	EFC	Expenditure	year 2002-2003			
		Cost	works	Cost	app. Cost	uoto 2001-02	Fresh Plan	Anticipated		
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G		
1	Unnao	2389.37		573.45	788.49	403.87	192.89	56.00	248.89	652.76
2	Kanpur (Dehat)	2349.17		563.80	775.23	569.31	0	135.91	135.91	705.22
3	Sultanpur	2924.59		701.90	965.11	332.36	77.7	138.20	215.90	548.26
4	Raibareli	2465.78		591.79	813.71	380.68	36.52	90.00	126.52	507.2
5	Pratapgarh	2602.33		624.56	858.77	486.45	247.4	75.92	323.32	809.77
6	Hamirpur	1546.47		371.15	510.34	414.14	30.60	0	30.60	444.74
7	Jaunpur	3158.67		758.08	1042.36	590.71	42.0	0.0	42.0	632.71
8	Mirzapur	2525.76		606.18	833.50	345.22	188.30	0.00	188.30	533.52
9	Fatehpur	2436.45		584.75	804.03	418.33	125.75	50.44	176.19	594.52
10	Farrukhabad	1873.94		449.75	618.40	468.54	0.00	15.28	15.28	483.82
11	Faizabad	1982.19		475.73	654.12	363.63	15.50	273.92	294.42	658.05
12	Ambedkar Nagar	2063.64		495.27	681.00	395.15	89.65	96.20	185.85	581
13	Etah	2409.51		578.28	795.14	233.49	169.10	0.00	169.10	402.59
14	Bijnour	2576.39		618.33	850.21	428.98	11.46	79.40	90.86	519.84
15	Bulandshehar	2803.60		672.86	925.19	468.49	132.30	131.78	264.08	732.57
16	Muzaffernagar	2677.96		642.71	883.73	394.62	157.02	178.66	335.68	730.3
17	Jhansi	1717.30		412.15	566.71	344.66	48.00	96.70	144.70	489.36
18	Jalaun	1969.59		472.70	649.96	128.26	128.24	136.00	264.24	392.5
19	Gaziabad	1919.05		460.57	633.29	358.89	182.00	50.00	232.00	590.89
20	Gautambudh Nagar	1155.44		277.31	381.30	201.38	102.96	0.00	102.96	304.34
21	Meerut	1882.07		451.70	621.08	268.58	347.79	0.00	347.79	616.37
22	Baghpat	1277.08		306.50	421.44	177.81	125.50	52.30	177.80	355.61
23	Agra	3149.22		755.81	1039.24	415.42	195.37	311.22	506.59	922.01
24	Mathura	1880.17		451.24	620.46	171.9	152.22	91.00	243.22	415.12
25	Kushinagar	2424.67		581.92	800.14	661.18	0.00	0.00	0.00	661.18
26	Mau	1901.20		456.29	627.40	336.75	42.84	34.66	77.50	414.25
27	Azamgarh	3380.34		811.28	1115.51	615.9	159.60	132.40	292.00	907.9
28	Ballia	2656.05		637.45	876.50	447.95	107.10	56.00	163.10	611.05
29	Ghazipur	2560.44		614.51	844.95	387.06	29.77	70.00	99.77	486.83
30	Kannauj	1714.14		411.39	565.67	347.12	0.00	16.04	16.04	363.16
31	Mahoba	1396.61		335.19	460.88	156.7	64.58	65.60	130.18	286.88
32	Mainpuri	1828.76		438.90	603.49	305.48	10.20	51.70	61.90	367.38
33	SPO	4828.24		1158.78	1593.32	24.79	0.00	58.85	58.85	83.64
	Total	76426.19		18342.29	25220.64	12043.8	3212.36	2549.18	5761.54	17805.34

ABSTRACT OF AWP&B PROPOSALS 2002-2003

Annexure-I

STATE : UTTAR PRADESH

DPEP Phase - II

(Rs. In Lacs)

Sl. No.	State / District	EFC Cost	EFC Cost (with 3% Price Contg.)	Revised EFC cost after excess expen. (For DPEP)	Cumulative Amount Expenditure (1997-2002)		Average expend. per year	Approved AWP&B upto 2001-02	Expend. during 2001-02	Anticipated Amount saved	Spill Over to 2002-2003 (Financial outlay)	Fresh proposal for 2002-03	Total AWP&B for 2002-03 S.O.+F.P.	Total AWP&B as % of av. Yearly expenditure	Total AWP&B as % of EFC Cost
					Amount till March'2002	% of EFC									
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N
1	Maharajganj	3640.202	109.206	3749.408	2689.74	73.89	537.95	3019.09	933.79	118.34	0.00	652.93	652.93	17.82	17.94
2	Siddharth Nagar	3968.423	119.053	4087.476	2964.49	74.70	592.90	3149.13	860.92	54.04	13.87	982.90	996.77	18.83	25.12
3	Gonda*	3953.034	118.591	4071.625	3518.92	89.02	703.78	4149.03	1140.35	385.14	7.74	221.01	228.75	16.96	5.79
4	Badaun	3916.572	117.497	4034.069	3062.73	78.20	612.55	3390.70	1169.92	173.18	0.00	807.56	807.56	18.07	20.62
5	Lakhimpur Kheri	3977.019	119.311	4096.330	2994.95	75.31	598.99	3452.45	1020.80	212.25	4.03	818.40	822.43	17.35	20.68
6	Lalipur	2381.103	71.433	2452.536	1574.37	66.12	314.87	1756.44	521.61	54.94	0.00	503.44	503.44	17.93	21.14
7	Pilibhit	3027.462	90.824	3118.286	2138.60	70.64	427.72	2297.79	785.35	48.66	1.58	684.32	685.90	18.61	22.66
8	Basti**	3995.767	119.873	4115.640	3239.61	81.08	647.92	4256.30	1336.93	530.35	30.08	443.28	473.36	15.22	11.85
9	Moradabad***	3893.006	116.790	4009.796	3438.86	88.33	687.77	3763.18	1199.84			313.61	313.61	18.28	8.06
10	Shahjahanpur	3935.223	118.057	4053.280	3153.92	80.15	630.78	3585.30	1110.74	134.41		778.90	778.90	17.59	19.79
11	Sonbhadra	3141.245	94.237	3235.482	2029.87	64.62	405.97	2630.26	745.85	314.34	24.64	1072.95	1097.58	15.43	34.94
12	Deoria	3878.019	116.341	3994.360	3064.86	79.03	612.97	3401.37	1041.98	58.33		768.20	768.20	18.02	19.81
13	Hardoi	3937.625	118.129	4055.754	3392.05	86.14	678.41	4128.02	977.87	536.70		545.55	545.55	16.43	13.85
14	Bareilly	3795.631	113.869	3909.500	2859.55	75.34	571.91	2934.54	911.51	70.46		903.07	903.07	19.49	23.79
15	Firozabad	2765.004	82.950	2847.954	1963.03	71.00	392.61	2060.07	662.57	20.05	20.05	620.81	640.86	19.06	23.18
16	Rampur	2399.710	71.991	2471.701	1144.36	47.69	228.87	1778.11	534.22	253.63	76.75	543.47	620.22	12.87	25.85
17	Barbanki	3852.200	115.566	3967.768	1918.11	49.79	383.62	2542.35	853.17	328.85	112.46	975.07	1087.53	15.09	28.23
18	Bahraich****	3987.070	119.612	4106.682	2409.03	60.42	481.81	3004.59	1361.38	214.77	30.30	547.90	578.20	16.04	14.50
19	S.K.Nager	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00		14.78	239.22	254.00	0.00	0.00
20	J.P.Nager	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00		0.00	135.53	135.53	0.00	0.00
21	Shrawasti	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00		0.20	304.23	304.43	0.00	0.00
22	Balrampur	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00		0.00	198.26	198.26	0.00	0.00
23	S.P.O.	2549.709	76.491	2626.200	1307.18	51.27	261.44	2527.80	331.81	114.68	313.96	887.43	1201.39	10.34	47.12
	Total	66994.024	2009.821	69003.845	48864.23		9772.85	57826.52	17500.61	3623.12	650.440	13948.040	14598.470		

* Gonda also includes the EFC cost of Balrampur.

** Basti also includes the EFC cost of S.K.Nager .

*** Moradabad also includes the EFC cost of J.P.Nager.

**** Bahraich also includes the EFC cost of Shrawasti.

STATEMENT ON CIVIL WORKS COST 2002-2003
DPEP - II

Annexure-III

Phase - II

(Rs.In Lacs)

Sl. No.	State / District	EFC approved Cost	EFC app. for Civil Works	24% of EFC approved Cost	33 % of EFC approved Cost	Cumulative Expenditure upto 2001-02	Allocation made for the year 2002 - 2003		Total	Expenditure till March'2002+ S.O.+F.P.
							Fresh Plan	Anticipated Spillover		
		A	B	C		D	E	F	G	H
1	Maharajganj	3640.202	873.648	873.648	1201.267	894.84			0.00	894.84
2	Siddharth Nagar	3968.423	952.422	952.422	1309.580	883.32			0.00	883.32
3	Gonda*	3953.034	948.728	948.728	1304.501	916.24			0.00	916.24
4	Badaun	3916.572	939.977	939.977	1292.469	1079.78			0.00	1079.78
5	Lakhimpur Kheri	3977.019	954.485	954.485	1312.416	888.90			0.00	888.90
6	Lalitpur	2381.103	571.465	571.465	785.764	493.33	10.00		10.00	503.33
7	Pilibhit	3027.462	726.591	726.591	999.062	730.37			0.00	730.37
8	Basti**	3995.767	958.984	958.984	1318.603	1037.13			0.00	1037.13
9	Moradabad***	3893.006	934.321	934.321	1284.692	993.72			0.00	993.72
10	Shahjahanpur	3935.223	944.454	944.454	1298.624	1141.44			0.00	1141.44
11	Sonbhadra	3141.245	753.899	753.899	1036.611	676.52		10.00	10.00	686.52
12	Deoria	3878.019	930.725	930.725	1279.746	1082.05			0.00	1082.05
13	Hardoi	3937.625	945.030	945.030	1299.416	972.73			0.00	972.73
14	Bareilly	3795.631	910.951	910.951	1252.558	819.39			0.00	819.39
15	Firojabad	2765.004	663.601	663.601	912.451	559.60		20.00	20.00	579.60
16	Rampur	2399.710	575.930	575.930	791.904	561.50	71.15		71.15	632.65
17	Barabanki	3852.200	924.528	924.528	1271.226	797.24	143.12	46.80	189.92	987.16
18	Bahraich****	3987.070	956.897	956.897	1315.733	1098.60		23.50	23.50	1122.10
19	S.K.Nager	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.00			0.00	0.00
20	J.P.Nager	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.00			0.00	0.00
21	Shrawasti	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.00			0.00	0.00
22	Balrampur	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.00			0.00	0.00
23	S.P.O.	2549.709	119.100	611.930	841.404	28.00			0.00	28.00
	Total	66994.024	15585.736	16078.566	22108.028	15654.70	224.27	100.30	324.57	15979.27

* Gonda also includes the EFC cost of Balrampur.

** Basti also includes the EFC cost of S.K.Nager.

*** Moradabad also includes the EFC cost of J.P.Nager.

**** Bahraich also includes the EFC cost of Shrawasti.

STATEMENT ON MANAGEMENT COST 2002-2003

Annexure-II

DPEP - II

Phase - II

(Rs.In Lacs)

Sl. No.	State / District	EFC approved Cost	EFC approved Cost for Management	6% of EFC approved Cost	Cumulative Expenditure upto 2001-02	Allocation made for the year 2002 - 2003		Total AWP&B for 2002-2003	Expenditure till March'2002+ S.O.+F.P.
						Fresh Plan	Anticipated Spillover		
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
1	Maharajganj	3640.202	218.41	218.41	85.28	35.10		35.10	120.38
2	Siddharth Nagar	3968.423	238.11	238.11	99.18	34.98		34.98	134.16
3	Gonda*	3953.034	237.18	237.18	110.14	31.92		31.92	142.06
4	Badaun	3916.572	234.99	234.99	93.75	27.25		27.25	121.00
5	Lakhimpur Kheri	3977.019	238.62	238.62	91.00	23.70		23.70	114.70
6	Lalitpur	2381.103	142.87	142.87	55.00	29.05		29.05	84.05
7	Pilibhit	3027.462	181.65	181.65	70.00	35.42	1.58	37.00	107.00
8	Basti**	3995.767	239.75	239.75	84.25	20.75	12.29	33.04	117.29
9	Moradabad***	3893.006	233.58	233.58	102.56	16.30		16.30	118.86
10	Shahjahanpur	3935.223	236.11	236.11	94.73	41.72		41.72	136.45
11	Sonbhadra	3141.245	188.47	188.47	64.36	21.73	2.03	23.76	88.12
12	Deoria	3878.019	232.68	232.68	92.92	19.90		19.90	112.82
13	Hardoi	3937.625	236.26	236.26	114.00	48.05		48.05	162.05
14	Bareilly	3795.631	227.74	227.74	92.00	30.55		30.55	122.55
15	Firojabad	2765.004	165.90	165.90	65.00	28.55	0.05	28.60	93.60
16	Rampur	2399.710	143.98	143.98	36.00	26.30	0.00	26.30	62.30
17	Barabanki	3852.200	231.13	231.13	53.60	40.53	12.51	53.04	106.64
18	Bahraich****	3987.070	239.22	239.22	52.00	29.50	0.00	29.50	81.50
19	S.K.Nager	0.000	0.00	0.00	0.00	13.40	6.04	19.44	19.44
20	J.P.Nager	0.000	0.00	0.00	0.00	13.05		13.05	13.05
21	Shrawasti	0.000	0.00	0.00	0.00	20.43	0.00	20.43	20.43
22	Balrampur	0.000	0.00	0.00	0.00	14.15		14.15	14.15
23	S.P.O.	2549.709	152.98	152.98	138.36	86.07	35.41	121.48	259.84
	Total	66994.024	4019.64	4019.64	1594.13	688.40	69.91	758.31	2352.44

* Gonda also includes the EFC cost of Balrampur

** Basti also includes the EFC cost of S.K.Nager

*** Moradabad also includes the EFC cost of J.P.Nager

**** Bahraich also includes the EFC cost of Shrawasti

Appraisal Note-Uttaranchal AWP&B 2002-03

A. Introduction:

- DPEP-III was launched in 38 districts of Uttar Pradesh in April, 2000. Subsequent to creation of the new State of Uttaranchal from Uttar Pradesh, six DPEP-III districts of erstwhile Uttar Pradesh have been transferred to Uttaranchal. The six districts that are now in Uttaranchal DPEP-III are Bageshwar, Champawat, Pithoragarh, Tehri, Uttar Kashi and Haridwar.
- The six DPEP districts of Uttaranchal will complete implementation on March, 2005.
- EFC approved project cost for DPEP in Uttaranchal is Rs.8303 lakhs.

B. Process for Appraisal:

- The state did not make available its appraisal report. The state appraisal is being done by NIAR. The state is strongly advised to take up the appraisal process on time in the forthcoming year.
- Two district plans, i.e. Uttar Kashi and Champawat were appraised in detail at the national level. **The comments made for these districts would apply to all and the state may take cognizance of the same.**

C. Financial and Management Issues:-

(Detailed financial tables may be seen in annexure)

- The project cost of the districts of Uttaranchal ranges from Rs.8 crores to Rs.18 crores, which is much less than most DPEP plans.
- The expenditure so far is Rs.2623.33 lakhs, i.e. 31.6%. The state would need to increase its pace of implementation and expenditure.

- The expenditure so far is Rs.2623.33 lakhs, i.e. 31.6%. The state would need to increase its pace of implementation and expenditure.
- 30 posts have been approved for the state office, but only 15 have been filled up so far. In order to implement DPEP programmes effectively, the state may fill up these vacancies at the earliest.
- The overall expenditure on management + current year's expenditure is below 6%.

State level interventions

- According to the perspective plan, the amount allocated for the state level intervention is Rs.9.74 crore of which Rs.56.93 lakhs has been incurred during 2001-2002. An outlay of Rs.353.55 lakhs has been proposed for the current year which is within the ceiling.
- DPEP guidelines one vehicle for SPD and two vehicles for common pool at SPO. An outlay of Rs.7.45 lakhs has been proposed for the current year for the purchase of vehicles at State Project Office. However, the number of vehicles to be purchased has not been indicated. During last year, an outlay of Rs.4.25 lakhs was proposed of which Rs.3.80 lakhs was spent on the procurement of vehicles. **Since DPEP guidelines envisages a provision of only 3 vehicles at state project office, it should be ensured that the number of vehicles should not exceed the entitlement.**
- An outlay of Rs 15 lakhs has been proposed during the current year for consultancy/professional fee. **It should be ensured that the Bank's guidelines for selection and employment of consultants are strictly followed.**

Champawat District

- (i) An outlay of Rs.2 lakhs has been proposed in the current year's plan under BRC for purchase of 4 two-wheelers for BRC. The entitlement of one vehicle for 4 BRCs has been prescribed in the DPEP guidelines. **In last year's**

appraisal two two-wheelers were approved against each vehicle. District Champawat has proposed one two wheeler for each block. This may be approved, as each BRC would need its own vehicle.

- (ii) The EFC approved project cost is Rs.847.82 lakhs against which the cumulative expenditure upto March,2002 is Rs.273.78 lakhs and outlay of Rs.281.31 lakhs has been proposed in the current year which is within the ceiling of EFC approved project cost.
- (iii) 24% of the EFC approved project cost for civil works is Rs.203.48 lakhs against which a cumulative expenditure of Rs.86.46 lakhs was incurred upto March 2002 and outlay of Rs.100.53 lakhs has been proposed during the current year which is within the ceiling.
- (iv) An outlay of Rs.22.51 lakhs has been proposed during the current year bringing the total amount to Rs.60.77 lakhs which is in excess of the 6% ceiling by Rs.10.16 lakhs.

Uttarkashi District

- (i) The total expenditure so far is Rs.381.92 lakhs, Civil Works expenditure is within ceiling. An outlay of Rs.424.17 lakhs has been proposed which is within the ceiling of EFC approved project cost.

D. Functional area-wise comments:-

(i) Planning.

- The plans indicate that a consultative process of planning has been followed, with involvement of local elected representatives.
- The district plans indicate systematic planning for universalizing access including opening of new schools, EGS and AS centres.

(ii) *Alternative Schooling*

- The general scenario regarding AS centres is as follows:
 - 395 EGS centres are functional in un-served habitations covering 9624 children.
 - 26 AS centres are operational covering 755 children.
 - In the state plan, provision has been kept for SRG, district coordinators meetings, workshops etc. A survey of urban areas of district Haridwar has been proposed.

District Uttarkashi

- 60 new EGS schools (Vidya Kendras) are proposed.
- 1 month training for 60 new Acharyaji (EGS teachers) and 15 days training for 66 old Acharyaji.
- 8 Rishi Valley Education Centre have been proposed.

Budget provision has been made for following activities/items:-

- Honorarium of Acharyaji @ Rs.1000/month for 126 Acharyaji.
- Education materials for EGS schools @ Rs.2350/ school.
- Textbooks for children @ Rs.1000/schools.
- Contingency @ Rs.500/school/year.
- Training of instructors.
- For 5 RVECs a sum of Rs.6965 has been budgeted.

District-Champawat

- 45 EGS and 11 Alternative Schools are operational in the district.
- 4 new Alternative Schools and 10 new EGS have been proposed.
- The list of villages where EGS will be opened is yet to be finalised.

- During the year 2002-03 following activities have been proposed and budget provision for these activities has been made in the AWP & B.
 - honorarium of instructor @ Rs.1000/per month.
 - TLM for EGS and AS schools @ Rs.2350/per school/per year.
 - Free textbook for children @ Rs.1000/per year/per school.
 - Pre-service and In-service training for EGS and AS teachers.
 - Contingency amount @ 500/per centre/per year.
- A sum of Rs.9,65,260 has been budgeted for all the above activities.
- The state has not budgeted for TLM grant and School Improvement Grant for EGS and AS schools.

(iii) Pedagogy

- The plan mentions that a coordinated plan of action was developed to cover the following key area of pedagogical renewal:-
 - Improving the curriculum and textbooks
 - Changing teacher style and practices
 - Enhancing teacher motivation and competence
 - Strengthening academic support to teachers
 - Promoting joyful, child-centred and activity based learning
 - Providing education to special focus group
- Accordingly in **2001-2002** the state had carried out the following activities.
 1. Formation, visioning and conceptual orientation of State Resource Group.
 2. Tool development by SRG for school grading and improvement.
 3. Two internal missions conducted to study educational scenario in selected districts, assess achievement levels at schools and share findings.
 4. Development of Teacher Training module and orientation of 95% teachers in six DPEP districts.

5. Appointment and orientation of BRC/NPRC coordinators.
Teachers and schools provided with TLM and improvement grants respectively.
6. Teachers encouraged through TLM meals to design innovative TLMs.
7. Curriculum based on local specific inputs designed in collaboration with resourceful NGOs and TSG (DPEP).
8. Workshops conducted to build the capacity of Academic Resource institutions.

- In **2002-2003** the state plan proposes to carry out the following major activities:
 1. Second round of teacher training based on the module developed by SRG.
 2. Weeklong orientation of BRCCs & NPRCCs.
 3. Tool development for Continuous and Comprehensive Evaluation.
 4. MGT piloting in 5 selected schools each of six districts.
 5. Periodic meetings of SRG to review and plan for regular pedagogical improvement.
 6. Internal monitoring missions for quality improvement.
 7. Research studies to be conducted for need assessment in different areas of TLP and school management.
 8. Exposure visits to different educational resource centres in different states.
 9. Mid Term Assessment study to measure the achievement level of children.
 10. Textbook development basing on the revised curriculum.
 11. Research studies in the following areas:-
 - a) Social acceptability of govt. primary schools in comparison to other schools.
 - b) Relation between enrolment and completion rate of primary schooling.
- On the whole the state appears to be in a hurry to achieve a lot within a short period. More care and preparation appear to be needed regarding the textbook development and their scrupulous trialling. The state can develop good quality textbooks by

looking at the textbooks and their development process in different DPEP states. The state can take the help of experienced textbook writers in different subject areas for better results.

- The state can plan for orientation programmes like Resource Enrichment Programme for its SRG. Such a programme can contribute substantially and philosophically to good quality teacher training, textbook development and other TLM development.
- The exposure visits to different educational resource centres need to be carried out with a thorough planning and preparation for better achievement.
- The state can also plan to invite resourceful teachers/teacher trainers/planners from other DPEP states by organizing specific seminars and workshops on different areas of pedagogy.

Although it is important to base the interventions on the learnings from the parent state, but in light of the above issues it may be pertinent to strike a note of caution that the state should also chart out its own path suiting the local needs.

It would help:

- **To undertake a need assessment of the ground reality through action research studies in identified areas related to quality.**
- **To strongly develop the academic support system comprising NPRC, BRC and DIETs.**

To form strong SRG & DRGs and build their capacities to continually.

(iv) *Civil Works*

- Both Champawat and Uttarkashi have proposed works within their approved ceiling, and these may be approved.
- The state proposes to construct prototype school buildings using the Civil Works Innovation Fund, using designs developed by CBRI-this needs to be done very

quickly, since it is likely that most of the districts will be nearing completion of their civil works programmes by the end of this year.

- No technical staff has been proposed at state level for management of the civil works programme-at least two engineers need to be appointed at state level for this.
- At district level, the RES engineering services have been given the task of providing technical support to the VECs-no technical monitoring staff is envisaged from DPEP. This makes for a very weak monitoring structure, especially as the technical staff has no accountability to anyone within the project.
- The state plan mentions that the RES engineers, and VEC members, have been trained by Ed. CIL's TSG-this is not true. It may be ensured that engineers and VECS are trained for their tasks.

E. General:

The financial approval sought are in Tables A, B & C attached. These may be approved.

Table - A

D.P.E.P. III
ABSTRACT OF AWP&B PROPOSALS 2002-2003
STATE - UTTARANCHAL

(Rs. In Lakhs)

State/ Districts	EFC approved Project cost	Proposed revised EFC cost	Cumulative Ant. Expenditure		Average exp. Per year	Approved AWP&B 2001-02 (incl.S.O.)	Expenditure 2001-02	Anticipated amount saved 2001 02	Spill Over 2002-03	Fresh Proposal for 2002-03	Total AWP&B for 2002-03 S.O.+F.P.	Total AWPB 2002-03 as % of av. Yearly exp. (K% of Col.E)	Total AWP&B 2002- 03 as % of (proposal revised) EFC cost
			Amount till March 2002	As % of A									
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
Bageshwar	898.16	890.06	351.53	39.1	175.76	308.90	237.15	71.75	20.88	223.27	244.15	138.9	27.4
Champawat	847.83	831.64	257.06	30.3	128.53	315.53	165.75	149.78	78.79	204.35	283.14	220.3	34.0
Haridwar	1660.75	1625.75	417.76	25.2	208.88	386.55	255.19	131.36	20.18	349.42	369.60	176.9	22.7
Pithoragarh	1264.14	1246.53	504.33	39.9	252.17	519.15	349.10	170.05	51.93	338.54	390.47	154.8	31.3
Tehri	1833.66	1822.19	652.10	35.6	326.05	693.58	466.84	226.74	102.61	472.95	575.56	176.5	31.6
Uttarkashi	1213.94	1195.75	381.92	31.5	190.96	454.15	235.70	218.45	118.41	305.76	424.17	222.1	35.5
SPO	584.58	974.00	58.63	10.0	56.64	195.64	56.64	139.00	27.90	325.65	353.55	624.2	36.3
Total	8303.06	8585.92	2623.33	31.6	1338.99	2873.50	1766.37	1107.13	420.70	2219.94	2640.64	197.2	30.8

Table - B

D.P.E.P. III
STATEMENT OF CIVIL WORKS COST 2002-2003
STATE - UTTARANCHAL

(Rs. In Lakhs)

State/ Districts	EFC approved Project cost	Proposed revised EFC cost	33.33% of proposed revised cost	Civil work cost proposed by State	Cumulative exp. Till March 2002	Allocation made for 2002-03			Expenditure Till March 2002 S.O.+F.P. 2002-03
						Fresh Plan	Anticipated spill over	Total	
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Bageshwar	898.16	890.06	296.66	202.12	130.99	21.59	20.88	42.47	173.46
Champawat	847.83	831.64	277.19	183.07	86.40	14.56	76.30	90.86	177.26
Haridwar	1660.75	1625.75	541.86	336.26	186.19	86.36		86.36	272.55
Pithoragarh	1264.14	1246.53	415.47	296.49	185.58	51.19	50.92	102.11	287.69
Tehri	1833.66	1822.19	607.34	410.51	237.70	89.90	70.78	160.68	398.38
Uttarkashi	1213.94	1195.75	398.54	266.10	109.47	37.25	118.41	155.66	265.13
SPO	584.58	974.00	324.63	70.65	1.50	5.00	10.00	15.00	16.50
Total	8303.06	8585.92	2861.69	1765.20	937.83	305.85	347.29	653.14	1590.97

Table-C

D.P.E.P. III
STATEMENT OF MANAGEMENT COST 2002-2003
STATE - UTTARANCHAL

(Rs. In Lakhs)

State/ Districts	EFC approved Project cost	Proposed revised EFC cost	6% of proposed revised cost	Management cost proposed as per the EFC	Cumulative exp. Till March 2002	Allocation made for 2002-03			Expenditure Till March 2002 S.O.+F.P. 2002-03
						Fresh Plan	Anticipated spill over	Total	
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Bageshwar	898.16	890.06	53.40	106.05	41.31	22.45		22.45	63.76
Champawat	847.83	831.64	49.90	105.90	38.23	23.41		23.41	61.64
Haridwar	1660.75	1625.75	97.55	107.60	33.76	28.50	0.78	29.28	63.04
Pithoragarh	1264.14	1246.53	74.79	106.10	33.72	25.70		25.70	59.42
Tehri	1833.66	1822.19	109.33	124.85	31.97	20.82	0.15	20.97	52.94
Uttarkashi	1213.94	1195.75	71.75	97.35	45.87	28.55		28.55	74.42
SPO	584.58	974.00	58.44		31.70	75.68	8.25	83.93	115.63
Total	8303.06	8585.92	515.16	647.85	256.56	225.11	9.18	234.29	490.85

DISTRICT PRIMARY EDUCATION PROGRAMME - III UTTARANCHAL
Statement showing the original budget allocations and expenditure incurred upto
03/2002

Uttaranchal

(Rs. in Lakhs)

Activity/ head of account	Base line cost	Expenditure	Expenditure	Total Expenditure	Balance
		04/2000 to 31.03.2001	04/2001 to 31.03.2002		
2	3	4	5	6	7
Civil works(Original)	1765.20	296.31	641.52	937.83	827.37
Civil works(Additional)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Furniture	58.60	11.83	20.25	32.08	26.52
Equipment	194.02	12.43	10.75	23.18	170.84
Vehicles	95.35	25.82	4.55	30.37	64.98
Books and libraries	468.73	103.60	75.21	178.81	289.92
Training cost	801.29	38.27	107.15	145.42	655.87
Work shop & seminars	111.04	6.92	26.55	33.47	77.57
Awareness campaign	138.13	0.89	0.58	1.47	136.66
Staff salaries	2349.29	225.73	595.58	821.31	1527.98
Consumable	71.84	5.23	10.30	15.53	56.31
Teaching, Learning material	566.88	85.70	126.78	212.48	354.40
Research & studies	94.75	0.07	0.34	0.41	94.34
Vehicles operation/	63.83	3.52	7.09	10.61	53.22
Equipment operation/	30.35	0.03	0.78	0.81	29.54
Local consultants	106.81	0.00	11.10	11.10	95.71
Civil works maintenance	5.67	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.67
Alternative schooling	438.06	19.64	44.97	64.61	373.45
Innovations	108.35	0.00	0.00	0.00	108.35
Honorarium/ ALS&C	109.23	0.00	0.50	0.50	108.73
Capacity building	215.29	15.32	34.98	50.30	164.99
Text book development	45.90	0.00	0.00	0.00	45.90
Integrated Education	147.73	0.00	1.75	1.75	145.98
Girls child education	502.79	5.65	45.61	51.26	451.53
Distance education	96.79	0.00	0.03	0.03	96.76
TOTAL	8585.92	856.96	1766.37	2623.33	5962.59

D P E P – Bihar

Annual Work Plan & Budget (AWP & B) for 2002-2003

1. Introduction

1.1 DPEP in Bihar is being implemented in 11 educational districts (20 revenue districts) from October 1997. The project which covers a 6 years time frame 1997-2003 is now in its final year of operation.

1.2 The Bureau in its appraisal for Note for Project Board has examined.

- SAR – State Appraisal Report
- State Component Plan
- 2 district plans

Bureau's choice of districts for appraisal note were (i) Bhagalpur (ii) Munger
These two districts have not been included in the previous years work plan for sample check by the Bureau.

2. PROGRESS DURING 2001-2002

2.1 Project Management

- Out of 56 sanctioned posts 39 posts have been filled.
- The SLO and DLOs are fully functional
- State Resource Groups (SRGs) for components are in position

2.2 Alternate Schooling

- 2975 Alternate Schools have been opened covering 58651 children.
- As envisaged in the Perspective Plan process of phasing of those AS centres which have completed 3 years of instruction has been started. A total of 726 centres have since been phased out during the previous year.
- Development and printing of text books for Hindi, Language, Maths and EVs from Satra I to IV with the help of SCERT.
- State level Workshops organised with the help of SCERT

2.3 Civil Works

- * Workshop on preparation of Manual for Repairs has been organised. Out of 140 BRCS, 102 BRCs have been completed and the rest are in the last stage of completion. Districts have also taken up CRCs, BRCs and the School buildings in a big way.

2.8 Mahila Samakhya

- * There are 6 Mahila Shikshan Kendras. The evaluation of learners in core MS case was completed by MS district trainers. The report on the performance during 1992-2000 has been prepared and is at the stage of final printing.
- * 39 women masons were trained by SLO in collaboration with PHED, Govt. of Bihar, UNICEF and DLO Muzaffarpur for installation of toilets. These are being undertaken in convergence with Civil Works component of DPEP.
- * 2-days Conference of about 300 collected Panchayati Raj Members and MS functionaries was organised during 9-10 February, 2002.

3. General Observations on Plans

- 3.1 Plans documents of BSPP show positive evidence of considerable district & sub district strengths in planning capacities. What is equally & perhaps more positive, is the meticulous & scientific approach adopted in the presentation of budgets this year also. The budgetary information is presented in a cogent & manner. The office of SLO must be complimented on the excellent & systematic presentation of budgets.
- 3.2 Process of AWP preparation: The plans have been formulated in a participatory manner. District plans highlights details of meetings, as well as the issues & problems discussed. Evidence was also present of prioritisation of issues. There exists considerable capacity in Bihar DPEP to upgrade planning skills by allowing for capacity building/training on the linkages between indicators & strategy in a focused & targeted block specific way.
- 3.3 Expenditure trends: (a) A composite view of the expenditure trends & spill over in BSPP is given below in Tables I&II. The trend of expenditure on Civil Works & Management Cost is given in Tables III&IV.

TABLE-I
DPEP - BIHAR
Abstract of AWP&B Proposals 2002-2003

State/ District	EFC Approved Project Cost	Approved AWP&B 2001-2002	Expenditure during 2001-2002	Savings (2001-2002)	Spillover to 2002-03	Fresh Proposals (2002-2003)	Total AWP&B (2002-2003)
1	2	3	4	5-3-4	6	7	8-7+6
Bhagalpur	4000.000	1088.949	631.43	457.519	153.779	790.584	944.363
Bhojpur	3719.315	1263.557	681.19	582.367	474.292	920.153	1394.445
Darbhanga	3586.012	983.053	343.88	639.173	418.453	980.241	1398.694
Gaya	3928.926	1084.947	543.84	541.107	258.298	1119.725	1378.024
Munger	4000.000	1038.082	435.28	602.802	204.650	1018.561	1223.211
Muzaffarpur	3247.643	968.343	546.01	422.333	231.292	682.564	913.856
Purnea	4000.000	1211.438	612.35	599.088	429.411	626.863	1056.275
Rohtas	3707.908	946.570	618.42	328.150	181.206	866.728	1047.934
Sitamarhi	3280.667	873.064	491.21	381.854	256.931	721.619	978.550
Vaishali	3673.007	942.723	393.73	548.993	446.061	893.854	1339.915
W.Champaran	3589.499	1048.197	593.68	454.517	245.212	840.530	1085.742
S.L.O. Patna	2802.350	513.727	181.37	332.357	198.564	289.793	488.356
Total	43535.327	11962.651	6072.390	5890.261	3498.151	9751.213	13249.364

Table II
DPEP – BIHAR
Abstract of AWP&B Proposals 2002-2003

State/District	EFC Approved Project Cost	Cumulative Expenditure upto 31.3.2002	AWP&B (2002-2003)	Cumulative Expenditure for 2002-2003	Whether EFC Limit Crossed
1	2	3	4	5=3+4	6
DPEP-III					
Bhagalpur	4000.000	1578.640	944.363	2523.003	No
Bhojpur	3719.315	1732.210	1394.445	3126.655	No
Darbhangha	3586.012	819.170	1398.694	2217.864	No
Gaya	3928.926	1489.390	1378.024	2867.414	No
Munger	4000.000	1167.500	1223.211	2390.711	No
Muzaffarpur	3247.643	1669.700	913.856	2583.556	No
Purnea	4000.000	1478.900	1056.275	2535.175	No
Rohtas	3707.908	1592.180	1047.934	2640.114	No
Sitamarhi	3280.667	1378.560	978.550	2357.110	No
Vaishali	3673.007	970.050	1339.915	2309.965	No
W.Champaran	3589.499	1263.910	1085.742	2349.652	No
S/O, Patna	2802.350	1514.000	488.356	2002.356	No
Total	43535.327	16654.210	13249.364	29903.574	No

Table III
Trends of Expenditure Component-wise
Annual Work Plan & Budget 2002-2003

(Rs. in Lakhs)

Sl. No	Description	Target for the Year 2001-02	Achieved till March 2002 against AWP&B 2001-02	% achievement against AWP&B 2001-02	Focus for 2002-03
1	Alternative Schooling				
a.	Apna Vidyalaya	139	139	100	159
b.	Angana Vidyalaya	575	576	100	209
	TOTAL	714	715	100	368
2	Early Child Education				
	ECE centres *	168	166	99	57
3	Civil Works				
a.	Block Resource Centre	59	26	44	32
b.	Cluster Resource Centre	740	429	58	508
c.	Additional Classroom	871	295	34	983
d.	New School Building	480	92	19	972
e.	Building less School	158	26	16	169
f.	Toilet	1160	416	36	1840
g.	Drinking Water	775	241	31	1513
h.	Mahila Kutir	27	7	26	60
4	Village Education Committee				
a.	VEC formation	463	5	1	135
b.	1 day orientation Trg	21754	34632	159	21512

c.	5 day Trg.	5221	3191	61	4630
d.	Micro Planning	5896	4598	78	4268
e.	VEC grant	48722	29793	61	25452
5	Training				
a.	Ujala-I	6141	3348	55	1560
b.	Ujala-II	35326	22284	63	9289
c.	5 day Sub. Spec. Trg.	22536	6186	27	54187
6	Primary Formal Schooling				
a.	Opening of New Schools	707	304	43	310
b.	No. of Sahyogi Teacher	1976	316	16	995
c.	No. of Regular Teacher		804		2762
d.	No. of TLM Grants	64235	38500	60	72466
7	Mahila Samakhya				
a.	Mahila Samakhya Trg.	245	264	108	345
b.	Jagjagi Centre	171	236	138	675
c.	Baljagjagi Centre	135	161	119	615

* Upto March, 2002, the BSPP had been able to spend only 38.25% of the EFC cost. Even with this year's outlay, the expenditure would not go beyond 69% of the EFC cost.

TABLE-4
DPEP - BIHAR
Statement of Civil Works Cost in AWP&B Proposals 2002-2003

State/ District	EFC Approved Project Cost	33% of EFC Cost	Cumulative civil works expenditure upto 31.3.2002	Civil Works proposal for 2002-2003	Cumulative expenditure upto 2002-2003	Whether EFC Limit Crossed	EFC approved Civil Works Cost
1	2	3	4	5	6=4+5	7	8
DPEP-III							
Bhagalpur	4000.000	1320.000	588.31	262.921	851.231	No	915.903
Bhojpur	3719.374	1227.374	496.89	511.331	1008.225	No	892.000
Darbhanga	3586.012	1183.384	183.32	647.430	830.750	No	860.000
Gaya	3928.926	1296.546	453.77	518.790	972.560	No	900.254
Munger	4000.000	1320.000	364.62	367.074	731.694	No	903.375
Muzaffarpur	3247.643	1071.722	428.33	313.085	471.411	No	775.000
Purnea	4000.000	1320.000	390.47	442.186	832.661	No	952.525
Rohtas	3707.908	1223.610	467.41	421.878	889.290	No	863.500
Sitamarhi	3280.667	1082.620	530.55	321.338	851.891	No	780.000
Vaishali	3673.007	1212.092	271.72	608.392	880.117	No	880.000
W. Champaran	3589.499	1184.535	324.73	376.941	701.672	No	860.000
S.O. Patna	2802.350	924.776	0.28	42.253	42.534	No	45.413
Total	43535.327	14366.658	4500.416	4833.620	9334.035	No	9627.970

* Civil Works component would have utilised 97% of the EFC Civil Works estimate by end of 2002-03

Table-V
DPEP - BIHAR
Statement of Management Cost(AWP&B Proposals 2002-2003)

State/District	EFC Approved Project Cost	6% of approved Cost	Cumulative Expenditure till 31.3.2002	Management Cost proposal (2002-2003)	Cumulative management Cost upto 2002-2003	Whether EFC Limit Crossed	EFC approved Management cost
1	2	3	4	5	6=4+5	7	8
DPEP-III							
Bhagalpur	4000.000	240.000	68.640	37.158	105.798	No	205.459
Bhojpur	3719.315	223.159	93.040	44.703	137.743	No	209.660
Darbhanga	3586.012	215.161	54.350	38.447	92.797	No	215.169
Gaya	3928.926	235.736	57.730	31.645	89.375	No	151.375
Munger	4000.000	240.000	77.090	43.970	121.060	No	210.209
Muzaffarpur	3247.643	194.859	133.872	43.110	176.982	No	194.860
Purnea	4000.000	240.000	88.260	51.271	139.531	No	216.206
Rohtas	3707.908	222.474	93.930	44.098	138.028	No	218.519
Sitamarhi	3280.667	196.840	85.851	41.780	127.590	No	196.840
Vaishali	3673.007	220.380	60.890	40.840	101.730	No	213.260
W.Champaran	3589.499	215.370	76.410	40.238	116.648	No	215.380
S.O, Patna	2802.350	168.141	355.430	130.450	485.880	No	490.278
Total	43535.327	2612.120	1245.452	587.711	1833.163	No	2737.215

* Management cost would comprise 67% of the EFC approved management cost by end of 2002-03.

4. Comments on the State Appraisal Report

4.1 The State appraisal Report (SAR,2002-2003) has been prepared by an appraisal team comprising of members from Patna University & resource institutions in Patna. The team has reported that they interacted with all the district teams as well as the state team in the appraisal.

4.2 The SAR is a well-written document & encapsulates district profile, planning processes and progress overview & strategies of DPEP. The SAR has highlighted several areas of concerns that impinge on implementation of programme of DPEP, i.e.,

- * All the activities included in the perspective plan target have already been achieved.
- * Slow pace of civil works including construction of SIEMAT building.
- * Provision for salaries of government teachers of DPEP schools to make DPEP schools sustainable beyond project period.
- * Continuation of ECF intervention
- * Consolidation of gains and documentation of achievements of Mahila Samakhya component.
- * Adverse impact of vacant posts on the pace and quality of programme implementation.

The above aspects should be looked into by Bihar DPEP.

5. Thrust Areas of AWPB 2000-2001

Thrust areas for 2002-03 is given below :-

5.1 Management Information System (MIS)

Proposals under this component have an outlay of Rs.14.60 lakhs for conducting Post Survey, Cross Check survey for the data collected during 2001-02, compilation of State level data for assessing actual enrolment for 6-14 years age group through Household Survey, etc.

5.2 Alternative Schooling (AS):

Since alternative schooling is being phased out as per the targets laid down only a sum of Rs.4.88 lakhs has been earmarked during this year.

5.3 Early Childcare and Education (ECE):

There is a spill over from the previous year and the total budget for this year is kept at Rs.11.90 lakhs which will be utilised for strengthening of AWICs, preparation of Handbook for ECE trainers, organizing convergence workshops for better convergence with ICDS and others, capacity building of SRGs, etc.

5.4 Mahila Samakhya:

It is proposed to conduct workshops, trainings, and meetings for capacity building of the executive members of the newly formed Mahila Samuh Federations to ensure sustainability of the programme, strengthening the mobile library system.

5.5 Primary Formal Education:

The Plan proposals include -

- a) Printing of MLL based textbooks (Rs.18 875 lakhs).
- b) An amount of Rs.3 lakhs has been proposed for TLM.
- c) Seminars and Conferences at Rs.29.10 lakhs.

5.6 Innovation:

As directed by Govt. of India an amount of Rs.50 lakh has been earmarked for construction/preparation of "Child Friendly Elements" outside/inside the classroom. Out of this an amount of Rs 43.5 lakhs consists of spill over activities from the previous year.

5.7 Community participation and environment building:

A total of Rs.15.68 lakhs proposed. Under this category, Bal Mela, Ma-Beti Mela to be organised at a cost of Rs.5 lakhs, running State level Newsletter at a cost of Rs.4 lakhs etc. are proposed.

6. **Comments on the Annual Work Plan 2002-2003**

6.1 **Civil Works – State Component Plan**

- * An amount of Rs.42 lakhs proposed for construction of SIEMAT building. However, the construction has not been started due to delay in site finalisation. This should be expedited.

- * It is seen that several workshops, trainings, meetings, study tours etc. have been budgeted under Civil Works which is not proper. This may be budgeted under respective heads.

District Plan

- * Construction of school buildings needs to be expedited.
- * The budget proposed for this year including spill over from the previous year from the districts of Bhojpur, Darbhanga, Gaya and Vaishali are Rs.511.33 lakhs, Rs. 647.43 lakhs, Rs.518.79 lakhs and Rs.608.392 lakhs respectively appears unreasonable. It would be very difficult to achieve these targets unless State and District authorities address the identified impediments immediately. The Civil Works budgets of Bhojpur Darbhanga, Sitamarhi, Vaishali and West Champaram districts are found exceeding not only approved budgets but also 24% of the approved project budget. This may be brought down accordingly.

6.2 Community Mobilisation and participation

Both the State Plan and District Plans have not been given due importance to this aspect. In the budget part only 2 heads are there which may have linkage with Community Participation – *Melas of any type* and *Capacity Building for Micro Plan*. The AWP is silent about any specific issues these activities would like to highlight.

6.3 Alternative Schools

- * House to House Survey 2001 reveals 11,73,982 out of school children in the age group 6-10. This group constitutes 24% of the population of 6-14 age group. However, no data in respect of children in age group 11-14 has been mentioned and also the State Plan does not reflect any strategy adopted for addressing this age group.
- * The State has initiated mainstreaming children from AS in the nearby primary schools and phasing out the existing ASs. The total number of children mainstreamed up to 26.1.2002 is 7996. For monitoring of the mainstreamed children, their retention and completion of education, the State has chalked out a clear strategy. The state Plan of mainstreaming of remaining children from the existing centres is not known.
- * After phasing out of AS, there would still be need for such schools and the State proposes to cover such children through EGS centres (under SSA) and the EGS programme would be implemented through the Mass Education Programme in non-DPEP districts and by BSPP in the DPEP districts. **However, it is not clear regarding the fund to be utilised for running the EGS centres in DPEP districts. As per the EGS guidelines in DPEP districts, DPEP funds will have to be utilised for EGS unless the fund gets exhausted.**
- * There is some discrepancy in the write up and the AWP&B. The AWP shows a total plan estimate of only Rs.2.70758 lakh (Rs.2.08058 lakh spill over plus Rs.0.62700 lakhs current budget) for activities under AS and not Rs.4.88 lakhs as stated in the write up.

- * In the chosen district of Bhagalpur, there are no new proposals for opening AS and a budget of Rs.25.433809 lakhs (spill over of Rs 4.02000 lakhs plus Rs.21.41380 in the current budget) has been proposed for maintaining the existing AS and no provision for TLM grants/school improvement grants have been kept.
- * In the district Munger, 19 Apna Vidyalayas and 14 Angana Vidyalayas (Alternative Schools) are proposed to be closed during the current year and the proposals are for payment of honorarium for Instructors and no provision for TLM grant/School Improvement grants have been kept.

6.4 R&E Activities

- * There is already a spill over of Rs.33.84 lakhs which is 84% of the budget. Again for the current year an amount of Rs.28.95 lakhs has been proposed. This large amount is unlikely to be utilised considering the rate of expenditure during 2001-02. The special efforts proposed to be made for utilizing the entire amount have not been indicated.
- * The major projects to be undertaken during the current year are evaluation of DPEP by external agencies and "Terminal Assessment Survey" for which Rs.33.62 lakhs and Rs.18.00 lakhs respectively. The State Govt. should ensure that these projects are undertaken and completed in the current year.
- * The EE Bureau in their letter dated 26 April 2002 addressed to all the SPDs suggested the following two studies during 2002-03:-
 - 1 Social Acceptability of Government Primary Schools in comparison with other type of schools functioning in the same area; and
 - 2 Relationship between enrolment and completion rate of primary schooling.

Adequate funds may be kept for these activities for the current year.

- * In the district Bhagalpur, though a sum of Rs.20,69,138 has been provided in the current year's budget, there is no description of the actual activities to be undertaken.
- * In the district Munger, though a sum of Rs.23.18270 lakhs has been budgeted for the year 2002-03, there is no description of the actual activities to be undertaken.

6.5 Procurement and Disbursement

1 State Level Interventions

* Project Management

An outlay of Rs.6 lakhs has been provided for R&M office building and others, Rs.10 lakhs for rent, Rs.6 lakhs for telephone and Rs.6 lakhs for audit fee. These expenses are very much on the higher side and need review.

* Primary Formal Education

- * An outlay of Rs.18.875 lakhs has been proposed for printing of M.L. based textbooks for trial. The proposed expenditure for this purpose is very much on the higher side.

- * In the district of Bhagalpur an outlay of Rs.1.5 lakhs has been proposed for purchase of vehicle and Rs.35 lakhs for Library grant which is not covered under DPEP guidelines.
- * In Munger district also an outlay of Rs.62.60 lakhs has been proposed. This includes Rs.2000/- per school in 3130 schools as Library grants which is not covered under DPEP guidelines as separately Rs.2000/- per school in 3121 schools under VEC component has been provided. The outlay of Rs.30.84 lakhs for orientation of VECs appears to be very much on the higher side and may be reduced.

6.6 Pedagogy

* State Plan

- i) The State Appraisal Report makes some important recommendations in form of tasks and activities to be undertaken during the current year. However, these do not find a place in the pedagogical intervention plans for this year.
- ii) Unit costs and physical targets have not been indicated in the budget summary thereby making it difficult to review.
- iii) A number of activities critical to the pedagogical renewal process have been spilled over and have to be completed in the current year which is the final year of DPEP.
- iv) A budget outlay of Rs.4 lakhs has been indicated for assessing the teacher training programme. However, the amount has not been shown in the budget summary.
- v) There is no plan to provide onsite support through BRC/CRC to teachers regarding the usage of new textbooks.
- vi) No description of activities to be undertaken under teaching-learning materials has been provided. It is hoped that an effort would be made to link the TLM activities with textbooks and teacher training activities.
- vii) In the district plan of Bhagalpur it is seen that out of 25 listed activities, 17 are spill over from previous year. Delay in completion of the activities affects classroom transition.
- viii) Learners evaluation finds a mention in the write up and the budget outlay but the district strategy for this activity has not been indicated.

6.7 IED

- * In the State Component Plan there is no budgetary allocation for IED and it is not clear as to what will be the focus of IED this year.
- * In the district Plan of Bhagalpur, no detailed write up for IED activities has been indicated. Therefore the justification of Rs.6.25 lakhs is difficult to consider
- * In the district of Munger, no detailed write up has been given as to what strategy has been adopted for by the district under IED and whether there is any plan for conducting long term training of teachers.

7. Approval of AWP&B of Bihar for 2002-03

7.1 Abstract of AWP&B for 2002-03 and analysis of expenditure trends and Civil Works and Management are given in Tables I-V above.

7.2 Annual Work Plan & Budget for 2002-03 is 13,249.364 lakhs including spill over of Rs.3498.151 lakhs and fresh proposals for Rs.9751.213 crores.

7.3 The AWP&B of 2002-03 may be approved by the Project Board subject to the comments and observations made above.

DPEP - RAJASTHAN**ANNUAL WORK PLAN & BUDGET (AWP &B)****DPEP INTERVENTIONS IN RAJASTHAN**

19 districts of Rajasthan are covered under DPEP. In the first phase 10 districts were covered in 1999-2000 and in the 2nd phase the programme was extended to 9 additional districts in 2001-02. The district-wise approved project cost, expenditure upto 31.3.2000 and the project closing dates areas follows :-

Phase-I (1994-2004)	Phase-II (2001-2006)
Alwar, Bhilwara, Jhalawar, Jhunjhunu, Kota, Nagaur, Sikar, Sirohi, Sriganganagar, Tonk	Bharatpur, Dausa, Dholpur, Karauli, Churu, Sawaimadhopur, Jaipur, Bundi, Hanumangarh

(Rs. in Lacs)

S.No.	District	EFC approved project cost	Cumulative Expenditure till 31.3.2002	Balance left for the project	Project Closing Date
1.	DPEP-IV	41114.46	11239.639	29874.821	Dec, 2004
2.	DPEP-IV Expansion	37242.794	1103.483	36139.311	Dec, 2006

Functional Areas :

The Physical & Financial progress against the project targets in major components is given below :-

I. ACCESS :

Since the inception of DPEP access to school facilities have been improved. Children have been provided school facilities with in 1 km. of radius in all the habitations. 18173 Rajiv Gandhi Swaran Jayanti Pathshalas, 714 Alternative Schools (6 hourly), 45 Alternative School (4 hourly), adoption of 122 Madarsas and 13 Bridge Course have been opened for the purpose.

Due to the above interventions, the over all increase in enrolment in 10 DPEP districts has been 24.73 %, as shown in the following table:-

INCREASE IN ENROLMENT

S.N.	Districts	Enrollment		Increase in Enrollment	%increase
		1997-98	2001-02		
1	ALWAR	367246	434421	67175	18.29
2	BHILWARA	220669	257178	36509	16.54
3	JHALAWAR	156016	190064	34048	21.82
4	JHUNJHUNU	240487	321057	80570	33.50
5	KOTA	202889	228122	25233	12.44
6	NAGPUR	304887	419381	114494	37.55
7	SIKAR	293180	388955	95775	32.67
8	SIROHI	91341	107502	16161	17.69
9	SRI GANGANAGAR	210615	258777	48162	22.87
10	TONK	147497	182066	34569	23.44
	TOTAL	2234827	2787523	552696	24.73

II. RETENTION :

In 1997-98 the average retention rate in the state was 44.65%, 46.02% and 41.90% for boys and girls respectively. To improve over this retention rate among boys and girls following specific strategies have been introduced in primary schools in all the districts :-

- Class rooms were made attractive and colorful. In classroom of I & IInd standard, the lower walls were painted black to be used by children as a black board. The upper position of the walls is depicted with pictorial stories.
- Activity based teaching, involving children, started in primary schools.
- The toilets, water facility specially in or where girls are more in number, made available.
- Priority construction of school buildings, additional classrooms and maintenance work have been taken up.
- Female teacher / para teacher in all the schools have been deployed on priority basis.
- TLM to SC/ST and minority girls being provided.
- ECE centers started in the school campus to reduce drop outs due to sibling care.
- Angan Bari centres strengthened by providing Rs. 150/- to AWW and Rs. 50/- to Help for providing education & retention.
- Provision of Mid day meal to reduce drop out rate.

The year wise physical progress and proposals for the year 2002-03 are shown in the following table –

PHYSICAL PROGRESS

S.No.	Name of Activities	Project Target	Year wise Progress against Project Target			Phase-II
			2000-01	2001-02	Total	
COMMUNITY MOBILISATION						
1	Bal Mela	3177	636	1161	1797	979
2	Mahila Meeting	4882	874	1048	1922	1096
3	Kala Jatha	4001	798	863	1661	1248
4	Formation of SMC	14361	9347	8538	17885	7331
5	Formation of MTA			10753	10753	961
PRIMARY FORMAL EDUCATION						
1	School Facilities Grant	75590	12691	16195	28886	4253
2	T.L.M.to Teacher	215040	34592	41795	76387	5625
3	Library Grant for school	16262	2461	1086	3547	0
4	Additional Parateacher	2971	0	0	0	0
EARLY CHILD EDUCATION						
1	Opening ECE Center	700	0	219	219	0
2	Additional Honorarium to AWW	32162	4621	9095	13716	0
3	Honorarium to helper	32162	4617	9095	13712	0
4	Training of AWW	32162	1241	9472	10713	872
5	Training of AW helper	0	0	7604	7604	0
GENDER & GIRLS EDUCATION						
1	Appointment of GCM	578	0	481	481	0
2	Formation of Balika Manch	54	46	12903	12949	0
ALTERNATIVE SCHOOLING						
1	Opening of A.S. 6 Hourly	1743	70	644	714	0
2	Opening of A.S.4 Hourly	712	0	45	45	0
3	Madarsa	160	112	10	122	0
4	Bridge Course	556	0	13	13	0
5	Enrollment in AS		9484	28345	37829	0
TRAINING						
1	Induction Training for PS Teachers	43148	11280	20981	32261	5445
2	Foundational Training	6653	182	753	935	0
3	Training of Girl Child Motivator	578	0	369	369	0
4	Training of Gender Sensitization	3604	40	7879	7919	0
5	Orientation of SMC Members	201016	32940	53988	86928	308

	CIVIL WORKS					
1	Construction of BRC	84	0	41	41	
2	Construction of CRC	1041	677	312	989	
3	Building for Building less school	262	23	240	263	
4	Construction of Additional Classroom	1058	140	485	625	
5	Construction of Toilet	6000	1737	3788	5525	10
6	Installation of Handpump	798	139	524	663	
7	Installation of Water Connection	1113	59	418	477	
8	Major Repair	682	863	1121	1984	3
9	Minor Repair	1654	764	844	1608	2

III. QUALITY IMPROVEMENT :

To improve the quality, following interventions has been successfully started :

- Continuous teachers training have been envisaged in the plan. In all 37706 teachers have been given induction training during the year 2000-01, 2001-02 and training for remaining 26440 teachers have been planned for the year 2002-03.
- Foundational training for 935 para teachers appointed in the year 2000-01, 2001-02 has been given and training for 3272 Additional and AS para-teachers has been planned for the year 2002-03.
- TLM grant of Rs.500/- has been given to 82012 teachers for preparing teaching learning material in last two years i.e. 2000-01 & 2001-02.
- To improve the overall physical and educational environment of the schools, Rs.2000/- has been given to 33139 School Management Committees in last two years.

IV. CIVIL WORKS :

- 41 Block Resource Centres (BRC) have been constructed in last two years and remaining 82 BRC have been planned for the year 2002-03.
- 989 Cluster Resource Centres (CRC) have been constructed in last two years and remaining 720 CRC have been planned for the year 2002-03.
- 263 Building less schools, 796 Additional Classrooms, 6561 Toilets, 663 Handpump 629 Water Connection, 2356 Major Repairs and 1890 Minor Repairs have been completed in last two years.
- For the year 2002-03 344 Buildingsless school, 1464 Additional Classrooms, 579 Toilets, 1366 Handpumps, 1217 Water Connections, 5034 Repairs have been planned.

IV. AWP & B PROPOSALS FOR 2002-03 & STRATEGIES :

(A) **Opening of New School :** Due to opening of Rajiv Gandhi Swaran Jyanti Pathshala since smaller habitations by the Govt. of Rajasthan no new formal school was proposed to be opened under the project.

(B) **Alternative school facilities :** Where Govt. norms does not permit to open Primary School, Alternative School of 6 hours has been proposed in smaller habitation where there is 20 non enrolled children were available. In all 744 AS will be opened in Phase-I districts and 337 AS will be opened in Phase-II districts.

For working children alternative school facilities will be provided in the evening or any other suitable time. In all 785 AS (4 hours) will be opened in phase-I districts and 245 AS will be opened in phase-II districts. For children's of minority Madararas were adopted to provide general education. In Madararas one para teacher will be given to teach general education. In all 93 Madarassas will be opened in phase-I districts & 144 Madarsas will be opened in Phase-II districts. For non enrolled and dropped out elderly girls residential bridge courses will be started. In all 506 bridge courses will be started in which 284 in Phase-I districts and 222 in Phase-II districts.

(C) **Teachers Appointment :** In alternative school facilities provided under the projects details of the teachers to be appointed in alternative school facilities in given below :

S.No.	Name of Alternative Facilities	No. of Para Teacher to be Appointed
1.	Alternative School (6 Hourly)	1081
2.	Alternative School (4 Hourly)	1030
3.	Madarassas	237
4.	Bridge Course	1518

924 para teachers will be appointed in formal school, where is TPR is more than 50.

(D) **Teachers Training :** During the year regular teachers and para teachers will be trained, the details of various type of training given below :

S.No.	Name of Alternative Facilities	No. of Teacher to be trained
1.	Induction training of Primary School Teachers	26440
2.	Refresher training of Primary School Teachers	54280
3.	Foundational Training of Para Teachers	3272
4.	Content base Training of Para Teachers	933

- (E) **Civil Works** : The Civil Works of amounting to Rs.80.72 crores have been proposed in both phase. The detailed of major civil works to be under taken are as under :-

S.No.	Name of Alternative Facilities	Phy. No. proposed
1.	Construction of AS Room (Big & Small)	478
2.	Construction of School Building (PS&RGSJP)	344
3.	Additional Classroom	1464
4.	Construction of BRC Building	82
5.	Construction of CRC	720
6.	Construction of Toilets	5792
7.	Drinking Water Facilities (Handpumps)	1366
8.	PHED Connections	1217
9.	Repairs (Major and Minor)	5034
10.	ECE Rooms	569

- (F) **Pedagogy** : Review of curriculum have been undertaken by the SIERT on the basis of new curriculum books of I & IInd standard are already in the field and books of III standard will be launched in this year. Under the project workbooks and teacher guide for I to V standard have been prepared and will be provided in this year.
- (G) **Community Mobilization** : Bal Melas, Kala Jatha and Mahila Meetings have been planned in the programme for the year 2002-03. The SMC members will be oriented through trainings under capacity building. NGO's will also be involved in community mobilization.
- (H) **IED** : Medical check-up camps will be organized for 6-11 age group children. In all 1757 Medical check-up camps will organized at the cluster level. Aids and appliances costing Rs. 138.00 lacs will be provided to the disabled children through DPEP.
- (I) **ECE** : In all 1450 new ECE Centres will be opened during the year 2002-03.
- (J) **Gender** : In all 629 girl child motivators will be provided at cluster level. Workshops for gender sensitization will be conducted at district and block level.

V. APPRAISAL OF AWP&B FOR 2002

The district Plans are stated to have been prepared by RCPE, Rajasthan. Attempts have reportedly been made to involve community, particularly SMCs in reviewing progress of the programme as well as in the preparation of AWP&B for 2002-03.

VI. COMMENTS ON DISRICT PLANS :

Based on the appraisal by the Bureau and the State Project Office it was decided to delete the following activities from the AWP&B 2002-03 as per the following reasons given against each of them :

S.No.	Activities	Reasons
1.	Exposure visits out of State	The members from districts will included in SPO visits.
2.	Workshops for preparation of low cost teaching material	Low cost teaching learning will be prepared in refreshed trainings to be organized at block level
3.	Meeting AWP&B	There is no need for separate AWP&B meetings as it will be discussed in other regular meetings being held at cluster and block level.
4.	Quarterly meeting of NPA and monthly meetings of "Mothers"	The meetings of SMC's and MTAs will be held jointly.
5.	'Kits' to Anganwari centers	There is no provision for it in DPEP guide lines
6.	TLM to Children	According to DPEP guidelines incentive to children is not allowed.
7.	Escort for children	Now the problem of access has not remained so serious.
8.	Book Bank	The provision of library grant and book bank has been made in the same year. So it should be made in alternate years.
9.	School improvement Fund for UPS	UPS does not fall in the preview of DPEP. It can be kept under 'SSA'
10.	Formation of SMC in UPS and Shiksha Karni School	UPS dosen't fall in the perview of DPEP. Shiksha Karni School also forms SMCs and as such there is no need for it in DPEP.
11.	Development of Language Inventory	It can be kept for the next year.
12.	Quarterly meeting of AWW and Prerak Dal	CRCF will review at the centres while supervising them.
13.	Training of School Mapping and micro planning	There is no need for separate training as it has been covered in regular trainings.

Subject to above observations, the AWP&B of DPEP, Rajasthan is placed before the Project Board for approval. as follows :-

S.No.	District	Spill Over to 2002-03	Fresh Activities	Total AWP&B 2002-03
1.	DPEP Phase-IV	2204.99	8687.13	10892.12
2.	DPEP Phase-IV (Expn.)	1879.31	8738.96	10618.27
	Total	4084.30	17426.09	21510.39

Summary tables indicating the component-wise AWP&B for DPEP Phase-IV and phase IV(Expansion) is given in Annex.I. Abstract of AWP&B indicating the spill over and fresh proposal provision is given at Annex-II & III . Statements regarding Management cost and Civil Works are given in Annex.-IV and VII respectively.

PHYSICAL PROPOSALS ANNUAL WORK PLAN & BUDGET -2002-03

S.No.	Name of Activity	Physical Proposals		
		Phase - IV	Phase-IV expansion	Total
1	Construction of buildingless Schools	193	151	344
2	Construction of additional classrooms	464	1000	1464
3	Construction of Toilets	2736	3056	5792
4	Handpumps	416	950	1366
5	PHED Connection/Storage Tank	825	392	1217
6	Repairs	1680	3354	5034
7	Construction of BRC	42	40	82
8	Construction of CRC	143	577	720
9	Construction of AS Room	214	264	478
10	Construction of ECE Rooms	119	450	569
11	School facilities grant	13851	8375	22226
12	TLM to teachers	41041	32446	73487
13	Additional Para Teachers	924	0	924
14	Induction Training	5720	20720	26440
15	Refresher Training	39240	15040	54280
16	Opening of AS (6 hours)	744	337	1081
17	Opening of AS (4 hours)/Evening School	785	245	1030
18	Strengthening of Madarsa	93	144	237
19	Bridge Course	284	222	506
20	Foundational Training	2453	726	3179
21	Bal Mela	1104	9970	11074
22	Mahila Meeting	1104	9970	11074
23	Kala Jattha	1104	9970	11074
24	ECE Centres	1000	450	1450

Summary of AWP & B Proposals 2002-03 Under DPEP

Annexure - II

State: Rajasthan

Phase - IV

S.No.	Name State / District	EFC cost	Cumulative Amount Expenditure (1999-2002)		Average Expenditure per year	Approved AWP&B 2001-02 (Incl. SO)	Expenditure during 2001-02 till March,2002	Anticipated amount saved	Spill over to 2002-03 (Financial outlay)	Fresh Proposals for 2002-03	Total AWP&B for 2002-03 S.O. + F.P.
			Amount till March 2002	% of EFC							
1	Alwar	3999.52	1247.40	31.19	415.80	1135.63	764.84	130.16	240.63	903.69	1144.32
2	Bhilwara	3997.05	1283.58	32.11	427.86	1254.39	818.53	284.78	151.08	1012.16	1163.23
3	Jhalawar	3995.71	997.91	24.97	332.64	1063.58	725.15	278.55	59.88	882.53	942.41
4	Jhunjunu	3996.93	728.06	18.22	242.69	1154.81	458.78	347.30	348.73	779.68	1128.41
5	Kota	3982.38	1049.86	26.36	349.95	997.07	665.40	58.60	273.08	548.10	821.17
6	Nagaur	3993.25	1270.91	31.83	423.64	1290.37	815.31	270.44	204.62	869.18	1073.80
7	Sikar	3996.87	823.51	20.60	274.50	1146.06	517.39	482.62	146.05	950.72	1096.77
8	Sirohi	3491.13	842.62	24.14	280.87	1020.48	601.37	171.45	247.66	494.74	742.40
9	Sri Ganganagar	3999.35	1159.10	28.98	386.37	1247.18	761.88	192.50	292.79	926.15	1218.94
10	Tonk	3999.52	1066.93	26.68	355.64	1078.62	787.46	183.95	107.20	907.76	1014.96
11	SPO *	1662.75	769.75	46.29	256.58	447.39	438.81	-124.70	133.27	412.43	545.70
Grand Total DPEP - I		41114.46	11239.64	311.37	3746.55	11835.57	7354.93	2275.65	2204.99	8687.13	10892.12

* This includes expenditure incurred on procurement of District Furniture & equipment by SPO

Summary of AWP & B proposals 2002-03 under DPEP

Annexure - III

State: Rajasthan Phase - IV (Expansion)

S.No.	Name State / District	EFC cost	Cumulative Amount		Average Expenditure per year	Approved AWP&B 2001-02 (Incl. S.O)	Expenditure during 2001-02 till March, 2002	Anticipated amount saved	Spill over to 2002-03 (Financial outlay)	Fresh Proposals for 2002-03	Total AWP&B for 2002-03 S.O. + F.P
			Amount till March 2002	% of EFC							
1	Bharatpur	3999.30	141.74	3.54	141.74	586.46	141.74	219.10	225.63	1145.51	1371.14
2	Bundi	3845.44	116.39	3.03	116.39	443.47	116.39	213.84	113.24	841.40	954.64
3	Churu	3999.45	124.98	3.12	124.98	502.57	124.98	199.00	178.59	975.54	1154.13
4	Dause	3964.74	155.21	3.91	155.21	482.26	155.21	165.74	161.32	908.16	1069.47
5	Dholpur	3999.83	99.32	2.48	99.32	472.15	99.32	208.08	164.76	811.23	975.99
6	Hanumangarh	3947.14	189.70	4.81	189.70	431.83	189.70	83.25	158.89	813.69	972.57
7	Jaipur	3999.94	49.31	1.23	49.31	642.63	49.31	284.58	308.74	1245.12	1553.86
8	Karauli	3981.98	66.29	1.66	66.29	507.77	66.29	142.41	299.07	846.78	1145.85
9	Sawai Madhopur	3996.13	120.53	3.02	120.53	456.39	120.53	145.81	190.06	879.61	1069.67
10	SPO	1508.84	40.03	2.65	40.03	407.96	40.03	288.91	79.01	271.93	350.94
Grand Total		37242.79	1103.48	29.47	1103.48	4933.49	1103.48	1950.70	1879.31	8738.96	10618.26

Statement of Civil Works Cost 2002-03

Annexure - IV

State: Rajasthan

Phase - IV

S.No.	Name State / District	EFC cost	EFC approved cost for Civil Works	24% of EFC approved Cost	33.333% of EFC approved cost	Comulative Expenditure till march 2002	Allocation made for the year 2002-03		Total	Expenditure till March 2002+ SO+FP
							Fresh Plan 2002-03	Anticipated spill over		
1	Alwar	3999.52	709.28	959.885	1333.173	496.75	52.5	175.486	227.986	724.736
2	Bhilwara	3997.05	809.36	959.292	1332.350	690.667	23	95.72	118.72	809.387
3	Jhalawar	3995.71	935.768	958.970	1331.903	613.019	273.087	43.693	316.78	929.799
4	Jhunjhunu	3996.93	918.618	959.263	1332.310	434.004	186.25	289.436	475.686	909.69
5	Kota	3982.38	941.22	955.771	1327.460	589.131	102.77	247.761	350.531	939.662
6	Nagaur	3993.25	768.9	958.380	1331.083	599.91	15	153.49	168.49	768.4
7	Sikar	3996.87	935.9	959.249	1332.290	496.16	301.42	123.071	424.491	920.651
8	Sironi	3491.13	812.51	837.871	1163.710	548.8	102.75	152.696	255.446	804.246
9	Sri Ganganagar	3999.35	815.75	959.844	1333.117	518.784	158.24	138.146	296.386	815.17
10	Tonk	3999.52	949.87	959.885	1333.173	582.11	303.22	63.002	366.222	948.332
11	SPO	1662.75	53.7	399.060	554.250	30.818	11.48	9.022	20.502	51.32
Grand Total DPEP - I		41114.46	8650.876	9867.470	13704.820	5600.153	1529.717	1491.523	3021.24	8621.393

Statement of Civil Works Cost 2002-03

Phase - IV Expansion

Annexure - V

State - Rajasthan

S.No.	Name State / District	EFC cost	EFC approved cost for Civil Works	24% of EFC approved Cost	33.333% of EFC approved cost	Cumulative Expenditure till march 2002	Allocation made for the year 2002-03		Total	Expenditure till March 2002+ SO+FP
							Fresh Plan 2002-03	Anticipated spill over		
1	Bharatpur	3999.302	1016.73	959.832	1333.101	25.95	527.78	99.87	627.65	653.6
2	Bundi	3845.436	991.63	922.905	1281.812	45.03	435.05	38.69	473.74	518.77
3	Churu	3999.448	1006.9	959.868	1333.149	38.99	480.215	93.199	573.414	612.404
4	Dausa	3964.743	1000.565	951.538	1321.581	36.66	419.54	81.077	500.617	537.277
5	Dholpur	3999.83	1128.79	959.959	1333.277	48.43	435.51	89.386	524.896	573.326
6	Hanumangarh	3947.144	1179.66	947.315	1315.715	0	446.36	108.83	555.19	555.19
7	Jaipur	3999.938	841.5	959.985	1333.313	0	506.6	127.8	634.4	634.4
8	Karauli	3981.978	1311.15	955.675	1327.326	72.8	401.15	221.24	622.39	695.19
9	Sawai Madhopur	3996.134	1246.8	959.072	1332.045	60.82	472.64	67.01	539.65	600.47
10	SPO	1508.841	0	362.122	502.947	0	0	0	0	0
Grand Total		37242.794	9723.725	8938.271	12414.265	328.68	4124.845	927.102	5051.947	5380.627

Statement on Management Cost 2002-03

Annexure - VI

State: Rajasthan

Phase - IV

S.No.	Name State / District	EFC Cost	EFC approved cost for Management	6% of EFC approved cost	Cumulative Expenditure from 1999-2002 till	Allocation made for the year 2002-03		Total AWP&B for 2002-03	Expenditure March 2002 + SO + FP
						Fresh Plan	Anticipated spill over		
1	Alwar	3999.52	180.16	239.9712	52.347	63.118	0	63.118	115.465
2	Bhilwara	3997.05	194.216	239.823	51.438	56.698	0	56.698	108.136
3	Jhalawar	3995.71	198.68	239.7426	56.327	48.574	0	48.574	104.901
4	Jhunjhunu	3996.93	192.52	239.8158	36.128	50.198	0	50.198	86.326
5	Kota	3982.38	191.818	238.9428	69.014	47.774	0	47.774	116.788
6	Nagaur	3993.25	197.826	239.595	50.782	54.158	0	54.158	104.94
7	Sikar	3996.87	196.622	239.8122	42.154	50.198	0	50.198	92.352
8	Sirohi	3491.13	180.802	209.4678	44.228	46.238	0	46.238	90.466
9	Sri Ganganagar	3999.35	199.028	239.961	47.169	51.518	0	51.518	98.687
10	Tonk	3999.52	192.945	239.9712	53.348	47.774	0	47.774	101.122
11	SPO	1662.75	251.094	99.765	483.544	115.992	0	115.992	599.536
Grand Total DPEP - I		41114.46	2175.711	2466.8676	986.479	632.24	0	632.24	1618.719

Statement on Management Cost 2002-03

Annexure - III

State - Rajasthan Phase - IV (Expansion)

S. No.	Name State / District	EFC Cost	EFC approved cost for Management	6% of EFC approved cost	Cumulative Expenditure from 2001-	Allocation made for the year		Total A.P.&B for 2002-03	Expenditure March 2002 + SO + FP
						Fresh Plan	Anticipated spill over		
1	Bharatpur	3999.302	182.54	239.958	12.53	34.964	0.057	35.021	47.551
2	Bundi	3845.436	170.04	230.726	10.175	32.464	4.065	36.529	46.704
3	Churu	3999.448	182.54	239.967	12.56	34.964	3.712	38.676	51.236
4	Dausa	3964.743	170.04	237.885	14.052	31.964	5.16	37.124	51.176
5	Dholpur	3999.83	170.04	239.990	11.528	32.464	3.196	35.66	47.188
6	Hanumangarh	3947.144	170.04	236.829	17.23	32.464	5.28	37.744	54.974
7	Jaipur	3999.938	182.54	239.996	13.983	34.964	4.065	39.029	53.012
8	Karauli	3981.978	170.04	238.919	11.782	32.464	4.533	36.997	48.779
9	Sawai Madhopur	3996.134	170.04	239.768	8.26	32.704	6.095	38.799	47.059
10	SPO	1508.841	336.896	90.530	12.84	25.752	15.6	41.352	54.192
Grand Total		37242.794	1904.756	2234.568	124.94	325.168	51.763	376.931	501.871



D-12106
28-11-2003