REPORT ON COMPARATIVE

BACKWARDNESS

OF NORTH BENGAL REGION

A Study Sponsored by Planning Commission

Government of India

November 2002

Institute of Applied Manpower Research

I.P. Estate, Mahatma Gandhi Road

New Delhi

CONTENTS

List of Tables

IAMR

CHAPTER I

Objectives and Methodology

1.1   The Background

1.1.1   It is necessary to recognize the fact that the economic reforms that accelerated in the early nineties is geared to accelerate growth in the economy - at best, it would fail to address concerns of equity and at worst, accentuate disparities. The concerns of equity will therefore, have to be addressed separately. It is also clear that given the large backlog in the provision of social and physical infrastructure, the probability of private investment in the crucial infrastructure sector hinges upon state level reforms. Meanwhile, development gravitates towards those pockets where a semblance of infrastructure is already available. Thus, regionally also there are 'gainers and losers'. The change in the ranking of States based on per capita income in the recent years is an indication of such losers and gainers. The democratic federal structure cannot be sustained if such disparities continue to accentuate. This warrants a regional package to address areas less attractive for private investment.

1.1.2   Also, having shifted from a position of balanced regional development to one of comparative advantage, it is necessary to develop area specific development strategies based on the strength of the regional resources. In this background, the Planning Commission has initiated a number of studies to look at the development prospects of selected States and regions. This proposal, to assess the relative backwardness and to provide policy support for the future development of North Bengal region, has been prepared at the instance of the Planning Commission, Government of India. The study is expected to use available information and not designed to generate primary data.

1.2   A Brief Profile of North Bengal Region

1.2.1   The total number of districts in West Bengal currently is 19 after West Dinajpur has been divided into two districts as Uttar Dinajpur and Dakshin Dinajpur and creation of Siliguri district. The North Bengal region consists of seven districts viz. (i) Coochbehar, (ii) Jalpaiguri, (iii) Siliguri, (iv) Darjeeling, (v) Uttar Dinajpur, (vi) Dakshin Dinajpur and (vii)

Malda. There are both diversities and disparities within the districts of North Bengal region. As per the 2001 Census, the total population of the districts under North Bengal was 14.72 million, which was 18.35 percent of the State of West Bengal. The decennial population growth of the region(1991-2001) was 22.31 percent as against 17.84 percent in the case of the State as a whole.

1.2.2   The region is predominantly rural. The districts of Coochbehar, Jalpaiguri and West Dinajpur are characterized by incidence of higher proportion of Scheduled caste population (well above the State average). In Jalpaiguri and Darjeeling districts, the Scheduled tribe population account for a sizeable proportion, i.e. 21.0 per cent and 13.8 per cent respectively as compared to the State average of 5.6 per cent.

1.2.3   North Bengal covers an area of about 21,000 square kilometers, which is about 24 percent of the State. The snow-fed rivers of the Himalyas – Teesta, Mahananda and Jaldhaka flow through the region. These rivers are characterised by erratic changes in their courses and flooding. The hills and adjacent areas are covered with temperate and tropical forest composed of Pine, Fir and other evergreen types like *Gurjan*. *Sal* is also quite abundant in the forest. About 18 percent of the region is classified as forest land much of which is concentrated in the districts of Darjeeling and Jalpaiguri.

1.2.4   As per the agro-climatic regional classification, the districts of North Bengal fall under:

(a) the Eastern Himalayan Region (Hills – Darjeeling; Terai – Jalpaiguri and Coochbehar) with an annual rainfall varying between 2500 to 3500 mm, low temperatures and high humidity. Poor sun shine coupled with low soil nutrients affects agricultural productivity; and

(b) the Lower Gangetic Plain (older alluvium – Malda, Uttar Dinajpur and Dakshin Dinajpur) with an annual mean rainfall between 1500 – 2000 mm.

1.2.5   Available statistics indicate that with reference to the three main civic amenities i.e. electricity, safe drinking water and sanitation facilities, the districts of North Bengal were poorly placed in comparison to the State of West Bengal. Being predominantly rural the access to the infrastructure is even more limited.

1.2.6   Similar situation exists when we consider the region in terms of human development indicators. Districts under North Bengal were characterized by lower literacy levels (50.13 percent in 2001) whereas in the rest of Bengal it was 61.7 percent. Darjeeling district

recorded a literacy of over 64 percent. In addition to low levels of literacy there is also marked gender disparity. The educational composition of main workers in the districts of North Bengal reveals the large preponderance of illiterate workers in comparison to the State as a whole. The relative proportion of educated (matriculate and above) in the districts of North Bengal (excluding Darjeeling) was far below the State average. In comparison to the State as a whole, the level of industrialization in North Bengal is very low. The services sector is gradually picking up, whereas, in Darjeeling district, it has already taken roots. As per the income estimates available for the year 1995-96, the per capita income in all the districts of North Bengal was far below the State average. However, in Darjeeling, it was just below the State average. Over a period of time, i.e. during 1990-91 to 1995-96, the per capita incomes in all the districts have increased in the region but at a slower pace than that of the State.

1.3   Objectives of the Study

1.3.1   The main objective of the study is to bring out the inter-district disparity in different dimensions of development broadly under the following heads:

(a) Demographic attributes;
(b) Economic Sectors;
(c) Infrastructure and Human Development; and
(d) Implementation of development schemes.

1.3.2   In the process of the study, comparable district wise data matrices relating West Bengal has also been prepared. The study was envisaged as a SWOT analysis of districts of North Bengal vis-à-vis future development initiatives.

1.4   Scope, Coverage and Methodology

1.4.1   Data matrices on the above dimension at least for two points of time (during the 90's) for as many development indicators as possible were collated for each of the district in the State. In each of the five themes multivariate analysis has also been under taken to bring out the co-linearity among variables and to identify mutually exclusive dimensions. In addition to making a composite index of inter-district disparity, each of the important indicators has also been separately analysed to bring out the level of regional disparity.

1.4.2   For a number of indicators, comparable district level data on a time series basis is not available. As a result, except for some selected indicators, comparison over time has not been attempted. The choice of variables needs to be discussed in depth in order to understand the direction in which they impact on development/backwardness.

1.5   **The Choice of Variables**

1.5.1   The multidimensional nature of development is captured through a variety of variables, which may have either positive/ negative relationship with each other or may be unrelated with each other. It is necessary therefore, to conceptualise the nature of relationship of these variables as those that represent positive dimensions of development and those that represent negative dimensions. We also need to distinguish between input variables (such as infrastructure: roads, hospital/medical facilities, schools, etc.) and output variables such as income, proportion of children attending schools, mortality rates, etc.), poor correlations between these two sets of variables would indicate the inability to convert effectively investments and inputs into viable outcomes and outputs.

1.5.2   The variables for which data is available at the district level among the relevant demographic attributes are as follows:

i)   Population Growth and migration: When growth is largely through in-migration would represent relatively better economic opportunities, whereas high natural growth rate would represent a negative dimension. Since male urban in-migration is a better representative of such economic opportunities, population growth along with proportion of male in-migration in urban areas could be chosen as demographic indicators.

ii)   Population density represents the pressure of population on land, and such pressures normally are high only when the land resources are in a position to support high densities. As such population density could be taken as an indicator of development.

iii)   Literacy: Although in the Indian context, literacy is very liberally defined (ability to sign ones name), it has been found to be positively related with a number of economic and social development indicators and as such has also

been used as a component of Human Development Index in many earlier attempts. Literacy has been found to be related with modernization of agriculture, mortality rates, school enrolment of children, better earning, etc. Such relationships are found to be stronger in the case of female literacy. Thus, district literacy level has also been chosen as a variable in this analysis.

iv) Percentage of Scheduled Caste and Scheduled Tribe Population: Although there is no logical basis for relating the strength of Scheduled Caste and Scheduled Tribe Population with development indicators, several empirical results in various parts of the country indicate strong negative relationship between incidence of these segments of population with development indicators such as school enrolment, diversification of economic base, literacy levels, etc.

v) Sex ratio: The proportion of female to male population captures the gender dimension and represents such features as female mortality rates, access and utilisation of health care facilities by women, social attitudes and so on. In the country as a whole the sex ration has been consistently falling over a number of decades, but there are regional variations.

1.5.3 Although the District Domestic Product captures the net effect of various economic inputs, at the district level, the composition of the District Domestic product is not available. It is not therefore, possible to monitor the changing structure of the district economy. Secondly, much of such data relate to estimates. Consequently, we have chosen a number of input as well as output variables from among those that are available at the district level. These are discussed below.

(i) Net sown area relative to the number of cultivators measures the pressure on agricultural land
(ii) Area under food grains as a proportion of net sown area is expected to indicate agricultural diversification and the extent of diversification is an indicator of development, since in backward areas heavy concentration of land under food crops does not represent specialisation but compulsions and subsistence agriculture.

(iii) Ratio of the number of agricultural labourers to cultivators is taken to represent land distribution, and would have an impact on productivity; a related indicator is the proportion of *bargadars*.

(iv) The percentage of main workers engaged in agriculture would indicate the strength of dependence on agricultural sector, since with the development of economy, the proportion workers engaged in primary sector is expected to move over to secondary and tertiary sectors.

(v) Proportion of land under irrigation that would impact on yields could be one of the indicators of agricultural development as an input/investment variable;

(vi) Yield levels of crops and the trend in agricultural productivity would measure inter district disparities in out put variables.

(vii) The proportion of workers in household and non-household manufacturing sector is intended to represent the capacity of the manufacturing sector in absorbing the labour force and therefore, the impact on employment/unemployment situation.

(viii) Since access to capital is a basic input in development, the available data on institutional credit such as: (a) Credit-Deposit ratio, (b) Credit disbursed for agriculture, (c) Credit disbursed for industry, (d) Per capita bank deposits and per capita credits for which district level data is available could be used as indicators of development.

1.5.4 The third broad dimension of development that we consider in this study related to development of infrastructure and the level of human development. This dimension is captured through the following variables:

i) In a predominantly rural area, with dispersed villages access to all weather roads is an important infrastructure input that increases market access, social interaction and diffusion of innovations. At the district level, the density of roads and the proportion of villages with *pucca* roads are available and could capture differences in access. To this, we can also add the spread of post offices across the villages.

ii)   Access to electricity is still limited in the country as a whole, with a number of villages without electric connection. Even when connected, a large proportion of households may not be able to afford domestic connections. At the district level we have data on proportion of villages electrified to inhabited villages, the proportion of rural households and urban households with electric connection and are being used for inter district comparisons.

iii)   Similarly, among the basic needs we also have indicators such as access to drinking water and toilet in terms of proportion of rural and urban households with these facilities. In addition, the proportion of households with none of these facilities represents another facet of lack of access to basic amenities.

iv)   Among such infrastructure facilities, access to health care centres, and schooling are important for human resource development. Variables such as hospital-bed/population ration, number of Primary Health Centres/sub-centres, number of schools at various level available per unit of population, and the proportion of teachers to students in such schools is expected to represent social infrastructure.

v)   The impact of such access to infrastructure would then be reflected on output indicators such as infant mortality or infant survival rates, child-women ratio, and proportion of children attending schools.

1.6   Constructing Indices of Development/Backwardness

1.6.1   An attempt has been made to construct composite indices for three development dimensions – Demography, Economy, Infrastructure and Human Development. The method used is a simple self weighting method (in which weights of variables are determined on the basis of skewness in the distribution. The composite index has been developed as:

$$C.I. = \Sigma \ XI/N$$

where N is the number of variables and $XI = xil/\bar{x}$, $\bar{x}$ being the mean value of the variable.

1.6.2   It must, however, be emphasized that the composite indices at two point of time are not directly comparable since the indicators used at a point of time would be different from the other

depending on availability of comparable data. However, broad conclusions based on the ranking of the districts are possible.

1.6.3   Since this method does not take into account multi-co-linearity among variable, an alternate index using principal component extraction has also been used, wherein the weights of variables are determined based on the correlation between variables used in the analysis.

1.6.4   In much of the analysis, Kolkata has been excluded, since its metropolitan character distorts inter-district comparison. Since new districts have been created, for which earlier data are not available, in much of the analysis we are using earlier district framework where in Dinajpur is considered a single district.

CHAPTER II

Demographic Attributes

2.1   Population Size and Growth

2.1.1   Table 2.1 records some of the basic demographic characteristics for the 5 districts of North Bengal as well as for the rest of the State. As per the Census 2001, North Bengal recorded a population of 14.72 million, which is a little less than 1/5th of the State's population. However, the growth rate of population in North Bengal is higher than the rest of the State. Higher growth-rate in North Bengal is partly because of the smaller population base. It may also be noted that the population growth rate has declined between 1981-91 and 1991-2001 both in North Bengal as well as in the rest of the State.

Table 2.1: Demographic Attributes of North Bengal Region and West Bengal

Sr. No.	Districts	Total Population (in million) 2001	Percent Male urban in-migrants to urban population 1981-91	Percent Population Growth			
				1991-01	1981-91	1971-81	1961-71
1	Coochbehar	2.47	23.67	14.15	22.55	25.28	38.67
2	Darjeeling	1.61	31.48	23.54	26.91	31.02	25.16
3	Jalpaiguri	3.40	32.00	21.52	26.44	26.55	28.76
4	Malda	3.29	27.06	24.77	29.78	26.00	31.98
5	Dinajpur	3.94	23.08	26.11	30.05	29.31	40.50
	North Bengal	14.72	27.46	22.31	28.17	28.12	33.66
	Rest of the State	65.50	18.36	16.88	21.43	31.07	10.33
	Total State	80.22	21.21	17.85	24.73	23.17	26.87

Source: India Census 2001, 1991

2.1.2   A study of the correlation coefficients between district decennial population growth rates in West Bengal (Table 2.2) shows that in general the current population distribution is basically the one in the previous decade, We may notice that significant spatial redistribution of population is taking place – explained variation in growth rates ranging from 31 to 64 percent in different decades.

Table 2.2: Correlation Coefficients between Decennial Population Growth Rates in West Bengal (District Data)

	1961-71	1971-81	1981-91	1991-2001
1961-71	1	0.62*	0.56*	0.43
1971-81		1	0.83**	0.66*
1981-91			1	0.80**
1991-2001				1

- Significant at 5 percent and ** significant at 1 percent levels

2.1.3   It is also important to note that the higher growth in population of North Bengal is not a result of natural growth alone but because of significant in migration. Since a large proportion of in-migration recorded in the census happens to be within-district rural migration (largely representing marriage related migration), urban male migrants as a proportion of the urban male population has been chosen as an indicator. It may be noted that while North Bengal recorded over 27 per cent male urban immigrants, the corresponding value for rest of Bengal is less than 19 per cent (Table 2.1). Within North Bengal all the districts have recorded higher immigration than the State average, highest being in the districts of Darjeeling and Jalpaiguri.

2.1.4   North Bengal is also characterized by higher proportion of Scheduled Caste population and tribal population. While the State average of Scheduled Caste population is about 24 per cent in North Bengal, it is over 29 per cent (Table 2.3) as per Census 1991.. Two districts stand out with high concentration of Scheduled Caste population (Coochbehar and Jalpaiguri). Although the region as a whole records little less than 3 times the proportion of tribal population in the State, within the region, it is concentrated in Jalpaiguri and Darjeeling. It may also be noted that both the proportion of Scheduled Caste and Scheduled Tribe population has recorded an increase between 1971 and 1991 in the State as whole and also in the North Bengal region.

Table 2.3: Distribution of Scheduled Caste and Scheduled Tribe Population

Sr. No.	Districts	Percent Scheduled Caste Population			Percent Scheduled Tribe Population		
		1991	1981	1971	1991	1981	1971
1	Coochbehar	51.76	49.84	47.03	0.61	0.57	0.60
2	Darjeeling	16.15	14.25	12.58	13.78	14.75	10.60
3	Jalpaiguri	36.99	34.61	34.02	21.04	22.20	19.35
4	Malda	18.12	16.89	16.48	6.50	7.54	6.43
5	Dinajpur	28.97	28.57	23.10	5.41	10.82	9.20
	North Bengal	29.10	29.91	27.69	16.92	11.29	11.21
	Rest of the State	21.99	20.33	18.33	4.55	4.44	3.62
	Total State	23.62	21.98	25.22	5.59	6.63	5.72
Source: Census of India							

2.1.5   However, unlike general population the increasing concentration of Scheduled Caste population is found to be in the same districts that had higher proportion of Scheduled Castes – for example, the correlation coefficient between the percent Scheduled Caste Population in 1981 and 1971 was 0.98. This is also true in the case of tribal population – the correlation being 0.99.

2.2   Sex Ratio

2.2.1   Despite significant magnitude of male in-migration, the sex ratio is more favorable in North Bengal than the rest of the State and has increased significantly both in the State as a whole as well as in all the districts of North Bengal (Table 2.4). This would indicate that besides male selective migration, family migration is also high in the State and in North Bengal Region.

Table 2.4: Sex Ratio

Sr. No.	Districts	Sex Ratio (Females per 1000 males)				
		2001	**1991**	**1981**	**1971**	**1961**
1	Coochbehar	949	935	935	916	889
2	Darjeeling	943	914	888	874	864
3	Jalpaiguri	941	927	909	886	853
4	Malda	948	938	949	948	965
5	Dinajpur	942	930	936	921	906
	North Bengal	944	**930**	**927**	913	898
	Rest of the State	**931**	**914**	**907**	886	874
	Total State	933	917	911	891	878

Source: Census of India 1991, 2001. Note: Dinajpur includes both Uttar and Dakshin Dinajpur.

2.2.2   The sex ratio is negatively related with population density and urban male migration and positively with child-women ratio. Districts of North Bengal tend to portray this combination of lower population density, higher sex ratio and lower urban male migration.

2.3   **Population Density**

2.3.1   The pressure of population on land, denoted by population density, is also an expression of the resources to support the population base and of economic opportunities. The densities have been increasing over the years across the country as much as in West Bengal and the North Bengal Region. It may be noted that the densities in North Bengal are substantially lower than the rest of the State (Table 2.5).

Table 2.5: Population Density

Sr. No.	Districts	Population Density (persons per square kilometre)			
		1991	**1981**	**1971**	**1961**
1	Coochbehar	641	523	418	301
2	Darjeeling	413	325	254	203
3	Jalpaiguri	450	356	280	218
4	Malda	706	544	434	329
5	Dinajpur	584	449	357	254
	North Bengal	**551**			
	Rest of the State	**838**			
	Total State	767	615	504	398

Source: Census of India

2.4 Ranking of Districts on the Basis of Demographic Attributes

2.4.1 The Ranking of Districts by Demographic Characteristics: From the variables discussed above 6indicators have been chosen to rank two districts on the basis of demographic attributes. Variables such as population growth, density, sex ratio and per cent urban male immigrants could be taken as positive indicators of demographic characteristics. Variables such as child-women ratio and proportion of Scheduled Caste population may be treated as a negative indicator of demographic strength. Since these 6 variables are measured in different scales, they have been brought under a scale free measure by dividing the values of each district of a particular variable by the mean value of the variable for the State. In the case of negative indicators an inverse of this has been used. The resultant values and the composite index are tabulated in Table 2.6.

2.4.2 The index value of unity would indicate State average, values above and below the value of one the relative positive and negative distance from the State average. The values indicate that in so far as demographic attributes are concerned, the districts of Darjeeling and Malda score higher than the State average and the other three districts (Jalpaiguri, Dinajpur and Coochbehar) record below State average values. The analysis would show that demographic attributes do not constrain development any more than in the rest of the State.

Table 2.6: Demographic Attributes – Scale Free Index

S.No	Districts	Sex ratio	Percent Population Growth	Percent Scheduled Caste Population	Population Density	Child/women Ratio 1991		Percent Urban Male in-migrants	Aggregate Score	Average Score	Rank
		2001	91-2001	1991	1991	0-4 age	5-9 age	1981-91			
1	Coochbehar	1.01	0.76	0.48	0.78	0.91	0.93	1.13	6.00	0.86	14
2	Darjeeling	1.00	1.26	1.70	0.50	1.22	1.13	1.50	8.30	1.19	2
3	Jalpaiguri	1.00	1.15	0.70	0.55	0.98	0.98	1.52	6.88	0.98	9
4	Malda	1.01	1.33	1.43	0.86	0.81	0.90	1.29	7.61	1.09	4
5	Dinajpur	0.99	1.36	0.85	0.71	0.89	0.91	1.10	6.82	0.97	10.5
6	Burdwan	0.98	0.77	0.96	1.05	1.12	1.08	1.33	7.28	1.04	8
7	Birbhum	1.01	0.96	0.81	0.68	0.93	1.01	0.70	6.10	0.87	13
8	Bankura	1.01	0.74	0.84	0.50	1.09	1.07	0.40	5.65	0.81	15
9	Midnapur	1.01	0.84	1.65	0.72	1.01	0.96	0.58	6.78	0.97	10.5
10	Howrah	0.96	0.78	1.58	3.09	1.20	1.12	0.78	9.51	1.36	1
11	Hoogli	1.00	0.84	1.12	1.68	1.27	1.15	1.10	8.17	1.17	3
12	24'Pgs	1.00	1.16	0.97	1.20	1.07	1.00	1.01	7.41	1.06	6.5
13	Nadia	1.00	1.04	0.92	1.19	1.03	1.02	1.28	7.48	1.07	5
14	Murshidabad	1.01	1.27	1.85	1.08	0.79	0.86	0.54	7.40	1.06	6.5
15	Purulia	1.01	0.75	1.29	0.43	0.96	0.98	0.73	6.14	0.88	12

CHAPTER III
The Economic Indicators

3.1 Introduction

3.1.1 Four broad categories of indicators to represent various dimensions of the regional economy have been used: (a) distribution of workers across occupational category; (b) agricultural productivity; (c) institutional credit; and (d) district domestic product. As mentioned earlier, the lack of data compels us in some cases to use estimated and interpolated values based on recent trends. These have been indicated at appropriate sections.

3.1.2 As the economy develops it is generally believed that workers in the agriculture sector would move out to other sectors of the economy, owing to the increased agricultural productivity and partly because of pull factors of manufacturing and service sectors that grow with economic development. Within agricultural sector the distribution of land among agricultural workers is an important determinant of productivity. These two indicators: the proportion of agriculture workers and the cultivators to land-less agriculture labour ratio have been analysed. The manufacturing sector is represented by the proportion of workers in the household and non-household manufacturing activities. These four indicators are based on 1991 population Census. Corresponding figures for 2001 census is yet to be made available at district level.

3.2 Distribution of Workers

3.2.1 Table 3.1 records the value of workforce related indicators. A study of this Table tells us that North Bengal has substantially larger proportion of workers in agriculture as compared to the rest of the State. This coupled with the effect of increasing number of land-less agricultural labourers (1991-2001) as compared to land-owning cultivators inhibits agricultural productivity.

Table 3.1: Occupational Structure

Sr. No.	Districts	Percent Agricultural workers		Agricultural labourers per cultivator		Percent workers in Manufacturing (Household Sector)	Percent workers in Manufacturing (Non-Household Sector)
		1991	2001	1991	2001		
1	Coochbehar	74.22	85.86	0.54	0.78	2.31	4.80
2	Darjeeling	36.55	29.43	0.47	0.70	0.62	6.59
3	Jalpaiguri	46.29	48.22	0,58	0.87	1.13	5.97
4	Malda	69.21	71.20	1.00	1.48	3.55	8.71
5	Dinajpur	78.15	89.13	0.59	1.27	1.94	4.01
	North Bengal	63.47	68.67	0.72	1.08	2.02	5.91
	Rest of the State	55.61	58.37	0.91	1.39	5.00	11.03
	Total State	57.18	60.49	0.86	1.31	4.40	10.00

Source: Census of India, 1991 and 2001.

3.2.2   Within North Bengal region there are sharp variations both in the proportion of agriculture labourers as well as the ratio of land owning cultivators to land-less agriculture labourers. The position is somewhat better in Darjeeling and Jalpaiguri in so far as the proportion of agriculture labourers is concerned. However, this is partly a result of substantial tea gardens in these two districts, wherein plantation workers are not included as a part of the agriculture labour. The cultivator-agricultural labourers ratio is particularly worse in Malda.

3.2.3   The absorption capacity of labour in the manufacturing sector also appear to be low in North Bengal where only about 2 per cent of workers are in the household manufacturing sector and about 6 per cent in the non-household sector. The corresponding figures for the rest of the State is 5 and 11 respectively. Within North Bengal, Malda is better placed in terms of the absorption of workers in manufacturing sector.

3.3   Agricultural Productivity

3.3.1   The figure yield in North Bengal was of the order of 1400 Kg per hectare in 1991 as compared to over 1800 Kg in the rest of Bengal (Table 3.2). The growth in agricultural productivity is again much lower in the North Bengal than the rest of the State. Coochbehar and Jalpaiguri have recorded very low growth in agricultural productivity (Table 3.3), lower than even the drought prone district of Purulia.

Table 3.2: Food Grain Yield

Sr. No.	Districts	Food Grain Yield (kg. Per ha.) 1990-91
1	Coochbehar	1303
2	Darjeeling	1151
3	Jalpaiguri	931
4	Malda	1693
5	Dinajpur	1601
	North Bengal	1411
	Rest of the State	**1833**
	Total State	1735

Source: Statistical Abstract, West Bengal (1994-95)

Table 3.3: Growth in Agricultural Productivity (1977-78 to 1995-96)

S.No	Districts	Growth in Agricultural Productivity
1	Coochbehar	2.47
2	Darjeeling	-
3	Jalpaiguri	1.91
4	Malda	5.81
5	Dinajpur	5.02
6	Burdwan	4.47
7	Birbhum	2.08
8	Bankura	5.62
9	Midnapur	6.42
10	Hawrah	4.37
11	Hoogli	5.28
12	24'Pgs (North+ South)	4.46
13	Nadia	7.22
14	Murshidabad	5.22
15	Purulia	2.86
	W.Bengal	**4.97**

Source: Directorate of Agriculture, Government of West Bengal

3.3.2 This is despite the fact that the per capita agriculture credit in North Bengal was higher than the rest of the State (Table 3.4). Average agricultural credit in North Bengal appears higher because of the high per capita credit in Dinajpur. Generally, we find that the agricultural productivity index of districts of North Bengal is just about the same as those of low productive drought-prone districts such as Purulia in the southern part of Bengal. This is despite the fact that the North Bengal does not suffer from drought although it does suffer flood and therefore, soil erosion.

3.4   **Institutional Credit**

3.4.1 Given the poor development of secondary sector in the region, the per capita institutional credit for industries is found to be significantly lower in the districts of North Bengal. Within the region, however, Darjeeling and Jalpaiguri which record higher proportions of urban population and based on plantation economy have received almost twice the per capita industrial credit as that of the West Bengal. The per capita bank deposits in 1995 was Rs. 5080 whereas per capita credit was less than half of this amount. The situation is exactly reverse in the case of southern districts of the State (Table 3.4).

Table 3.4: Institutional Credit - 1995

Sr. No.	Districts	Per Capita Agricultural Credit (Rs.)	Per Capita Industrial Credit (Rs.)	Deposit/Credit Ratio	Per Capita Deposit (Rs.)	Per Capita Credit (Rs.)
1	Coochbehar	59	46	1.81	2845	1539
2	Darjeeling	128	428	2.99	24951	8333
3	Jalpaiguri	77	455	1.97	3547	1804
4	Malda	80	51	2.46	2668	1082
5	Dinajpur	380	31	2.23	1737	777
	North Bengal	159	179	2.49	5080	2036
	Rest of the State	71	239	3.70	3385	5190
	Total State	104	226	3.09	3709	4633

 Source: Reserve Bank of India

3.4.2 As a result the deposit-credit ratio works out to 3.7 in the case of southern districts and only 2.49 for North Bengal region, except for slightly higher deposit-credit ratio in the case of Darjeeling, which was close to that of the State ratio in 1991. The Deposit-Credit ratio has increased significantly between 1995 and 2001 (Table 3.5). In the case of North Bengal Region, it increased from 2.49 to 3.42 and in the case of rest of the State from 3.70 to 5.73. Both per capita deposits and credits reduced significantly in North Bengal region, where as in the rest of the State the per capita deposits increased from Rs.3385 to Rs.4820 and the credit decreased sharply from Rs.5190 to Rs. 841.

Table: 3.5: Institutional Credit - 2001

Sr. No.	Districts	Deposit/Credit Ratio	Per Capita Deposit (Rs.)	Per Capita Credit (Rs.)
1	Coochbehar	3.33	2010	603
2	Darjeeling	3.64	9855	2706
3	Jalpaiguri	3.26	3337	1023
4	Malda	3.57	2205	617
5	Dinajpur	3.13	1647	526
	North Bengal	**3.42**	**3119**	912
	Rest of the State	**5.73**	**4820**	841
	Total State	5.25	4489	854

Source: Reserve Bank of India

3.5 State Domestic Product

3.5.1 About 14 per cent of the State Domestic Product was from the districts of North Bengal in 1988-89. The average District Domestic Product from the districts of North Bengal amounted to Rs. 496 crore as against Rs.1352 crore from the rest of Bengal during 1995-96 (Table 3.6). The ranking of districts based on SDP indicates that between 1981-91, the districts of North Bengal had come down as compared to the district of South Bengal. Within North Bengal, Darjeeling district stands out with a ranking of 5 in 1981 and 6 in 1991 (Table 3.7).

3.5.2 However, since the population densities in North Bengal are lower than the rest of the State the per capita SDP in North Bengal is higher than the rest of the States. In fact between 1981-91 the per capita SDP in Southern districts of the State has recorded significant decline whereas those of North Bengal have improved the position barring Jalpaiguri district (Table 3.7).

Table 3.6: Share of State Domestic Product and Projected Value of District Domestic Product

S.No	Districts	Percent Share of SDP (1988-89)	Projected Values for DDP 1995-96* (Rs. In crores)
1	Coochbehar	2.02	383.66
2	Darjeeling	1.86	372.85
3	Jalpaiguri	3.23	614.22
4	Malda	2.44	459.20
5	Dinajpur	3.14	649.55
6	Burdwan	10.40	2060.51
7	Birbhum	3.7	680.95
8	Bankura	3.68	667.21
9	Midnapur	9.25	1687.65
10	Howrah	7.00	1410.96
11	Hoogli	7.84	1542.44
12	24'Pgs (N+ S)	22.32	4525.20
13	Nadia	4.53	849.71
14	Murshidabad	4.74	910.55
15	Purulia	2.77	537.69
	W.Bengal	88.99	19623.94

Source: Banerjee and Ray (1998); * Three different methods of projection have been used, the one tabulated in this column is based on average percent share

Table 3.7: Ranking of Districts Based on SDP

S.No.	Districts	Per Capita SDP		SDP (1981)	SDP 1991
		1981	1991	Rank	Rank
1	Coohbehar	0.974	0.989	15	15
2	Darjeeling	0.448	0.578	5	6
3	Jalpaiguri	0.804	0.773	10	11
4	Malda	1.000	1.000	16	16
5	Dinajpur	0.915	0.930	13	14
6	Burdwan	0.384	0.414	3	5
7	Birbhum	0.645	0.607	7	7
8	Bankura	0.812	0.694	11	8
9	Midnapur	0.939	0.831	14	12
10	Howrah	0.328	0.244	2	2
11	Hoogli	0.422	0.326	4	3
12	24'Pgs (North + South)	0.449	0.345	6	4
13	Nadia	0.803	0.771	9	10
14	Murshidabad	0.827	0.844	13	13
15	Purulia	0.736	0.712	8	9

Source: Bhattacharya (1998)

3.6   Composite Index of Economic Development

3.6.1   Using 8 selected indicators of economy a composite index of development has been computed for the districts of West Bengal. Interestingly, Darjeeling ranks number one as per this index (Table 3.8).   A study of this Table suggests that this high score of Darjeeling is almost entirely because of the high per capita bank deposits.   If this indicator is omitted it slides down to 5th rank.

3.6.2   Since there would be a problem of co-linearity among variables, we have also attempted an index by extracting principal components. In doing so we have also used a slightly modified set of variables, in order to see whether the ranking of districts remain similar. The results of the analysis are tabulated in Tables 3.9A, B, C, and D. The correlation matrix (Table 3.9A) suggests that cultivators/agricultural labourers ratio is positively related with proportion of land devoted to food grain production, and proportion of workers in manufacturing activity, and negatively related with proportion of workers in primary sector, credit deposit ratio and per capita state domestic product. This would indicate that large concentration workforce in the primary sector is accompanied by lager number of land less agricultural workers, subsistence cropping devoted to food grain production and low per capita income. The positive feature is that this heavy dependence on primary sector is also accompanied by labour absorption in manufacturing sector.

3.6.3   While larger proportion of workers in manufacturing sector results in higher share of the domestic product and the value of District Domestic Product, it also results in higher density of population and therefore, lower per capita SDP. That the districts with higher concentration of workers in manufacturing are characterized by low Deposit-credit ratios and districts with higher proportion of workers in primary sector are characterized by higher credit-deposit ratios is also clear.

3.6.4   From the nine variables three components have been extracted which together explain about 90 percent of the variance contained in the nine variables (Table 3.9B), of which the first component explains almost two thirds of the total variance. The first component is loaded positively on variables such as proportion of manufacturing workers, the district share of SDP, and the District Domestic Product and negatively loaded on variables such as proportion of workers in primary sector, credit-deposit ratio and per capita SDP (Table 3.8C).

3.6.5   The first component scores indicate the relative ranking of districts that are characterized by manufacturing and share of SDP (Table 3.9 D). This indicates four of the five districts of North Bengal region occupy the bottom rung of the development ladder with ranking 12, 13, 14, and 15 among the districts of the State. Darjeeling district is ranked ninth.

Table 3.8: Composite Scores - Economic Indicators (1991)

	Cultivator to agricultural labour ratio	Percent Workers Manufacturing (NHH+HH)	Deposit-Credit ratio	Food Grain yields (kg/ha)	Per capita Agricultural credit	Per capita Industrial credit	Per capita deposits	Per capita credit	Aggregate Score	Average Score
Coochbehar	0.44	1.03	1.62	0.76	0.63	0.20	0.59	0.99	6.27	0.78
Darjeeling	0.98	0.44	1.00	0.68	1.37	1.90	5.21	5.34	16.93	2.12
Jalpaiguri	0.68	0.72	1.52	0.55	0.82	2.02	0.74	1.16	8.21	1.03
Malda	0.57	0.94	1.21	0.99	0.86	0.23	0.56	0.69	6.06	0.76
Dinajpur	1.96	0.98	1.24	0.94	4.07	0.14	0.36	0.50	10.19	1.27
Burdwan	0.74	1.18	0.87	1.48	0.91	1.64	0.88	0.79	8.49	1.06
Birbhum	0.35	1.02	1.12	1.24	1.07	0.27	0.89	1.03	7.00	0.87
Bankura	0.40	1.05	0.93	1.13	0.85	0.20	0.76	0.73	6.05	0.76
Midnapur	0.64	1.11	0.98	0.87	1.51	0.33	0.28	0.29	6.01	0.75
Howrah	1.97	1.41	0.69	1.00	0.45	3.95	1.63	1.15	12.24	1.53
Hoogli	1.56	1.09	0.79	1.30	1.02	2.65	1.02	0.83	10.25	1.28
24' Pgs (N)	2.35	1.05	0.58	1.27	0.17	0.70	0.77	0.45	7.34	0.92
24' Pgs(S)	0.85	0.93	0.72	0.70	0.15	0.56	0.41	0.30	4.61	0.58
Nadia	1.01	1.14	0.82	1.20	0.94	0.81	0.63	0.53	7.09	0.89
Murshidabad	0.99	1.06	1.00	1.16	0.82	0.12	0.32	0.33	5.81	0.73
Puralia	0.51	0.84	0.92	0.73	0.35	0.28	0.94	0.89	5.47	0.68

Table 3.9A: Correlation Between Economic Indicators

Vaiables	Cultivator to agricultural labour ratio	Percent Workers Manufacturing (NHH+HH	Percent Workers in Primary Sector	Area under Food grain /Net Sown Area	Credit Deposit Ratio	State Domestic Product 1981	State Domestic Product 1991	Share of SDP (1991)	District Domestic Product
Cultivator to agricultural labour ratio	1.000	0.604	- 0.548	0.712	- 0.544	- 0.574	- 0.627	0.411	0.416
Percent Workers Manufacturing (NHH+HH		1.000	- 0.816	0.347	- 0.661	- 0.678	- 0.756	0.777	0.788
Percent Worker in Primary Sector			1.000	- 0.374	0.680	0.755	0.794	- 0.614	- 0.626
Area under Food grain /Net Sown Area				1.000	- 0.401	- 0.141	- 0.299	0.363	0.353
Credit/Deposit Ratio					1.000	0.665	0.740	- 0.626	- 0.624
State Domestic Product 1981						1.000	0.962	- 0.475	- 0.490
State Domestic Product 1991							1.000	- 0.581	- 0.589
Share of SDP (1991								1.000	0.999
District Domestic Product									1.000

*significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)
**significant at the 0.01 level(2-tailed)

Table 3.9B: Total Variance Explained

Component	Eigen values		Cumulative Percentage
	Total	Percent of Variance Explained	
1	**5.855889**	**65.06544**	**65.06544**
2	**1.133857**	**12.59841**	**77.66385**
3	**1.021411**	**11.34901**	**89.01286**
4	0.380482	4.227583	93.24044
5	0.301705	3.352273	96.59271
6	0.199488	2.216535	98.80925
7	0.091841	1.020458	99.82971
8	0.014782	0.164247	99.99395
9	0.000544	0.006048	100

Table 3.9C: Component Matrix

	Component		
	1	2	3
Cultivator to agricultural labour ratio	.729	.533	-.256
Percent Workers Manufacturing (NHH+HH	.903	-.112	.114
Percent Worker in Primary Sector	-.871	.108	.135
Area under Food grain /Net Sown Area	.507	.825	9.004E -02
Credit/Deposit Ratio	-.827	2.011E -02	6.319E -02
State Domestic Product 1981	-.816	.287	.456
State Domestic Product 1991	-.894	.178	.344
Share of SDP (1991	.817	-.117	.547
District Domestic Product	.823	-.129	.535

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Table 3.9D: Factor Scores – Economic Indicators (1991)

	First Factor Scores	Rank
Coochbehar	-1.22	15
Darjeeling	-0.38913	9
Jalpaiguri	-0.88359	14
Malda	-0.73789	12
Dinajpur	-0.85996	13
Burdwan	1.01021	4
Birbhum	-0.23644	6
Bankura	-0.39678	10
Midnapur	-0.29998	7
Howrah	1.56308	2
Hoogli	1.19311	3
24' Pgs	2.15132	1
Nadia	0.03589	5
Murshidabad	-0.31817	8
Purulia	-0.61169	11

CHAPTER IV

Infrastructure and Human Development

4.1 Introduction

4.1.1   It has been realised that social indicators and level of social development may not necessarily move with economic development and economic indicators.   As a result, studies relating to disparities in development, attempt to measure social development independent of indicators such as per capita income, poverty and so on. It may also be worthwhile to distinguish between indicators of input and those of output.   The former would indicate efforts of government as well as of private sector and NGOs in providing infrastructure facilities and the later would indicate the ability of the population to access such facilities and the impact of such access.

4.1.2   Essentially in this section we are using indicators of education and health to represent social infrastructure. For the year 1981 and 1991 index of human development for different districts of West Bengal was computed by Bhattacharya (1998)[1]. She has used the now commonly known approach of UNDP: of infant-mortality, literacy and per capita income. For ready reference and comparison to the analysis of data in this Chapter we have also included results of Bhattacharya's study.

4.2   Education Related Indices

4.2.1   For the year 1991 we have data on number of lower primary schools per unit of population, percentage of children attending school in the age group of 6-14 and educational institution of higher studies in age group of 15-24.   For the year 2000 we have teacher-pupil ratio for primary and high schools as well as number of seats in engineering colleges.

4.2.2   The education related indicators are tabulated in Table 4.1.   A study of this Table indicates that while the overall provision of primary school is slightly lower in North Bengal as compared to rest of the State, there are districts such as Darjeeling and Dinajpur which are better off than some of the districts in the southern parts of Bengal. The same situation also prevails when we consider middle and higher levels of schooling.

---

[1] Basabi Bhattacharya (1998), Urbanization and Human Development in West Bengal, Economic and Political Weekly, XXXIII, December 4, 1998

Table 4.1: Educational Infrastructure and Use - 1991

S.No	Districts	Lower Primary School per unit of population	Upper Primary School per unit of population	Percent Children Attending Schools (6-14 age)	Percent Attending Educational Institutions (15-24 age)
1	Coochbehar	81.88	4.42	15.61	8.31
2	Darjeeling	90.92	4.33	23.80	16.13
3	Jalpaiguri	71.43	3.8	15.06	12.15
4	Malda	72.9	3.97	11.97	6.69
5	Dinajpur	85.41	3.55	13.72	7.71
6	Burdwan	63.81	3.99	24.01	19.77
7	Birbhum	93.83	6.74	18.04	9.71
8	Bankura	115.45	7.18	22.00	6.78
9	Midnapur	90.419	4.72	21.45	10.15
10	Howrah	60.85	4.87	26.89	28.84
11	Hoogli	70.27	2.82	25.75	19.97
12	24'Pgs(N)	34	2.22	26.19	25.34
13	24 Pgs(S)	26.45	2.34	17.53	11.78
14	Nadia	63.24	3.5	20.63	16.21
15	Murshidabad	62.65	5.77	12.63	9.30
16	Purulia	132.99	5.83	18.62	9.23

Source: Census of India, 1991

4.2.3   On the other hand when we look at the utilization of these facilities in terms of proportion of relevant population age groups attending educational institutions, we find that the North Bengal region is significantly lower than that rest of Bengal. The only exception to this is Darjeeling, with a number of schools in which children from other parts of the country enroll. The proportion of attendance in institutions of higher learning is also significantly lower in the North Bengal region. It is also to be noted that there is no relationship between the provision of schools per unit of population and the proportion of children attending school (Table 4.1)

4.2.4   For the year 1999-2000 we have information on teacher-pupil ratio. The study of this (Table 4.2) indicates that at the primary and high school level the situation in North Bengal is comparable to that of rest of Bengal and the inter-district variations are not very large. However, at the level of higher secondary, the teacher-pupil ratio is quite adverse in North Bengal. We may also note that the total number of seats available in engineering colleges in North Bengal is substantially lower than in the State.

Table 4.2:Teacher Pupil Ratios and Intake Capacity in Engineering Colleges (1999)

Districts	Number of Intake per year in Engineering Colleges	Number of Teachers per 100 students in Lower and Upper Primary Schools	Number of Teachers per 100 students in High Schools
Coochbehar	110	1.40	6.19
Darjeeling	530	1.74	4.98
Jalpaiguri	320	1.50	7.52
Malda	0	1.55	7.27
Dinajpur	0	1.58	8.67
Burdwan	1710	1.48	11.70
Birbhum	260	1.48	8.83
Bankura	0	1.91	12.04
Midnapur	730	1.54	7.96
Howrah	880	1.72	6.55
Hoogli	1810	1.35	9.53
24'Pgs(N)	300	1.26	6.52
24 Pgs(S)	570	1.29	8.94
Nadia	785	1.23	5.34
Murshidabad	360	1.23	8.25
Purulia	0	2.21	5.66

Source: All India Council for Technical Education, 2000; Statistical Abstract, West Bengal, 1999-2000; Directorate of School Education, Government of West Bengal.

4.3   Health Infrastructure

4.3.1   The provision of health infrastructure does not appear to distinguish between the districts of North Bengal region and rest of the State (Table 4.3). Within North Bengal, Jalpaiguri is poorly served when we consider number of PHCs per hundred inhabited villages. In terms of the number of hospitals-beds available per unit of population, also the difference between North Bengal and rest of the State is marginal. In fact, Darjeeling records the highest number of hospitals-beds per unit of population compared to any other district in the State. However, within the North Bengal region, Malda and Dinajpur districts have smaller number hospital-beds per unit of population. In terms of outcome we find, for example, that the deprivation index of infant survival rate was substantially higher in the districts of North Bengal as compared to the other districts with Dinajpur ranking the most deprived (1991), a position that was held by Malda in 1981 number one in terms of infant survi val.

IAMR

Table 4.3: Distribution of Health Facilities

S.No	Districts	Number of PHCs per 100 inhabited villages 1991	Number of hospital-beds per lakh of population (1991)	Number of Medical Institutions per lakh population (1999)	Number of hospital beds per lakh population (1999)
1	Coochbehar	3.42	54.67	14.61	62.62
2	Darjeeling	5.00	207.09	14.14	168.25
3	Jalpaiguri	7.08	87.30	12.90	72.78
4	Malda	3.11	50.25	12.98	37.96
5	Dinajpur	1.94	37.38	12.52	32.48
6	Burdwan	5.27	105.28	12.11	96.16
7	Birbhum	3.45	75.71	15.97	72.93
8	Bankura	2.47	103.49	19.02	93.24
9	Midnapur	1.83	55.01	15.51	50.17
10	Howrah	7.63	87.22	10.01	80.07
11	Hoogli	4.11	85.35	13.67	74.17
12	24'Pgs(N)	4.56	54.16	8.03	47.64
13	24 Pgs(S)	4.34	47.26	12.19	34.88
14	Nadia	4.99	131.18	9.90	111.65
15	Murshidabad	5.21	63.84	12.67	50.09
16	Purulia	2.93	94.80	18.62	96.28

Source: Statistical Abstract, West Bengal (1999-2000)

4.3.2   When we consider deprivation index of infant survival rate, we find significant changes in the inter-district patterns between 1981-91. The details of the district performance of this indicator are available in Table 4.4. It may be noted that relative deprivation in infant survival rate increased in the case of West Dinajpur and Darjeeling districts of North Bengal during the decade 1981-91.

Table 4.4 Deprivation Index of Infant Survival

S.No	Districts	1981	1991
1	Coochbehar	0.988	0.942
2	Darjeeling	0.310	0.760
3	Jalpaiguri	0.583	0.544
4	Malda	1.000	0.406
5	Dinajpur	0.857	1.000
6	Burdwan	0.286	0.255
7	Birbhum	0.702	0.242
8	Bankura	0.238	0.394
9	Midnapur	0.714	0.352
10	Howrah	0.143	0.217
11	Hoogli	0.167	0.329
12	24'Pgs(North + South)	0.512	0.356
13	Nadia	0.655	0.465
14	Murshidabad	0.714	0.664
15	Purulia	0.321	0.466

4.3.3   Infant mortality rate and child-women ratio are taken as an indicator of health status, particularly of women and they also have a bearing on demographic structure of the population. The infant mortality rates in North Bengal are significantly higher than that of Bengal . This is also the case when we consider child-women ratio both in the case of children in the age group of 0-4 and that of 5-9 (Table 4.5). The only exception is Darjeeling district where these indicators record lower than State averages.

Table 4. 5: Child Women Ratio (1991)

Sr. No.	Districts	Infant Mortality Rate	Number of Children (age 0-4) per 1000 Woman (age 15-49)	Number of Children (age 5-9) per 1000 Woman (age 15-49)
1	Coochbehar	98	552	699
2	Darjeeling	58	415	576
3	Jalpaiguri	79	515	666
4	Malda	96	626	727
5	Dinajpur	89	567	713
	Total State	62	481	629

Source Census of India, 1991

4.4   Human Development Index 1981-91

4.4.1   As mentioned earlier, Bhattacharya (1998) has combined the inter-district indices on infant survival rate, literacy rate and State Domestic Product and using the methodology adopted by UNDP. As per her computation most of the low ranking districts are found in North Bengal - Coochbehar, Jalpaiguri, Malda and Dinajpur (Table 4.6). Except for minor variation the situation between 1981 and 1991 has not changed substantially. In the larger context, it has been observed that the HDI reveals the extent of relative deprivation at the district level is much more than at the inter-state level.   This was found to be true both in 1981 and 1991.

4.4.2   It has also been observed that urbanised districts have higher levels of human development depriving the less urbanised ones.   Further, it has been summarised that the structural system in West Bengal continues to remain geared to Calcutta-centric. The coefficient of variation in HDI was found to be higher than that of the all India inter-state level indicating a higher degree of relative deprivation in West Bengal.   The most deprived districts of West Bengal were Dinajpur, Coochbehar and Malda. However, this inter-district variation has marginally reduced during1981-91. A drastic fall in Human Development Index for Darjeeling can be seen as a result of increase in relative deprivation with reference to infant survival rate and per capita domestic product.

Table 4.6: Deprivation of Districts by HDI Components

S.No	Districts	Literacy		Infant Survival		Per Capita SDP	
		1981	1991	1981	1991	1981	1991
1	Coochbehar	0.808	0.758	0.988	0.942	0.974	0.989
2	Darjeeling	0.568	0.468	0.310	0.760	0.448	0.578
3	Jalpaiguri	0.854	0.775	0.583	0.544	0.804	0.773
4	Malda	1.000	1.000	1.000	0.406	1.000	1.000
5	Dinajpur	0.896	0.913	0.857	1.000	0.915	0.930
6	Burdhwan	0.533	0.375	0.286	0.255	0.384	0.414
7	Birbhum	0.736	0.692	0.702	0.242	0.645	0.607
8	Bankura	0.638	0.609	0.238	0.394	0.812	0.694
9	Midnapur	0.498	0.197	0.714	0.352	0.939	0.831
10	Howrah	0.317	0.238	0.143	0.217	0.328	0.244
11	Hooali	0.381	0.258	0.167	0.329	0.422	0.326
12	24'Pgs(N+ S)	0.429	0.377	0.512	0.356	0.449	0.345
13	Nadia	0.652	0.598	0.655	0.465	0.803	0.771
14	Murshidabad	0.946	0.937	0.714	0.664	0.827	0.844
15	Purulia	0.854	0.817	0.321	0.466	0.736	0.712

Source: Bhattacharya (1998)

4.5   A Composite Index of Health and Education Infrastructure

4.5.1   Using seven variables representing educational and health infrastructure a composite index has been constructed for 1991 (Table 4.7).   This indicates that in terms of infrastructure while North Bengal has some of the poorly served districts such as Malda and Dinajpur, the region as a whole is comparable to the rest of the State. Clearly, this is because of lower density of population in the region and the infrastructure indicators are per unit of population.

4.5.2   The previous analysis would tend to suggest that the districts of North Bengal are not that poorly provided in terms of social infrastructure but they have not been successful in converting the access to the infrastructure in terms of outcomes, such as infant survival rate or literacy rate.   The problem appears to be the failure of the region to utilise the infrastructure provided efficiently.

4.5.3   Among the infrastructure that contribute to better health and quality of life we also have information on the proportion of rural and urban households that have access to safe drinking water, toilet facilities, electricity connection and transportation facilities. The proportion of rural and urban households with access to electricity, drinking water and toilet across districts for the year 1991 is tabulated in Table 4.8.   A study of this Table reveals that among the rural households the access to electricity in North Bengal is much less than the rest of the State whereas in the case of urban households the North Bengal is placed better. This is partly because of greater concentration of urban population in a few centers in North Bengal as against southern parts of Bengal where the urban centres are more dispersed. The access to drinking water indicates that in both urban and rural areas, North Bengal has lesser proportion of households, which have access as compared to the districts in southern parts of the State.

4.5.4   The proportion of households having access to sanitary toilets, in general, is much lower than the proportion of households having access to drinking water. The differences between North and South Bengal is not as sharp - there are districts in both region which are relatively better served as much as there are districts which are poorly served. In fact, North Bengal districts are better off when we consider access to toilets in urban centres. This may be, because of concentration of urban population in a few centres in the north, as compared to a more diffused distribution in the south. No significant difference across districts can be found when we consider percentage of villages that have connection to electricity.

4.5.5   Information is also available on the proportion of households having all these three facilities and those that have none of these facilities. If we combine the 11 indicators given in Table 4.8, into a composite index we find most of the districts in North Bengal have low index value compared to districts in southern parts of the State (Table 4.9). However, it may also be noted that a few districts such as Purulia and Bankura in southern parts of the State have lower index value than the districts in North Bengal.

Table 4.7 Composite Index of Health and Education Infrastructure

S.No	Districts	Number of Primary Health Centres per 100 inhabited Villages	Number of Upper Primary School per Unit of Population	Number of Upper Primary School per Unit of Population	Number of Hospital Beds per Unit of Population	Teacher Pupil Ratio (Lower and Upper Primary)	Teacher Pupil Ratio (High School)	Teacher Pupil Ratio (Higher Secondary)	Aggregate Score	Average Score	Rank
1	Coochbehar	0.81	0.65	1.01	0.83	0.93	4.93	1.01	10.16	1.27	3
2	Darjeeling	1.19	0.72	0.99	3.16	0.75	2.51	1.61	10.92	1.36	2
3	Jalpaiguri	1.68	0.56	0.87	1.33	1.13	1.99	1.27	8.84	1.10	5
4	Malda	0.74	0.57	0.91	0.77	1.09	0.52	0.96	5.56	0.69	14
5	Dinajpur	0.46	0.67	0.81	0.57	1.30	1.43	0.86	6.11	0.76	13
6	Burdwan	1.25	0.50	0.91	1.60	1.75	1.09	1.22	8.33	1.04	7
7	Birbhum	0.82	0.74	1.54	1.15	1.32	0.75	1.23	7.56	0.94	8
8	Bankura	0.59	0.91	1.64	1.58	1.81	0.55	1.40	8.47	1.06	6
9	Midnapur	0.44	7.13	1.08	0.84	1.19	0.52	2.38	13.57	1.70	1
10	Howrah	1.81	0.48	1.11	1.33	0.98	0.17	1.39	7.28	0.91	10
11	Hoogli	0.98	0.55	0.64	1.30	1.43	0.95	1.02	6.87	0.86	12
12	24'Pgs(N)	1.08	0.27	0.51	0.83	0.98	0.44	0.84	4.94	0.62	15
13	24 Pgs(S)	1.03	0.21	0.53	0.72	1.34	0.15	0.80	4.79	0.60	16
14	Nadia	1.19	0.50	0.80	2.00	0.80	0.52	1.20	7.00	0.88	11
15	Murshidabad	1.24	0.49	1.32	0.97	1.24	0.93	1.14	7.33	0.92	9
16	Purulia	0.70	1.05	1.33	1.44	0.85	2.35	1.42	9.13	1.14	4

Table 4.8: Percent Households with Access to Electricity, Drinking Water and Toilets

Sr. No.	Districts	Rural	Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural	Urban
		Electricity		Drinking Water		Toilet		All three		None of Three	
1	Coochbehar	8.35	73.79	78.67	84.52	9.69	83.36	3.47	60.54	18.81	3.12
2	Darjeeling	17.57	71.24	36.1	39.22	27.23	69.03	6.25	23.03	12.05	48.99
3	Jalpaiguri	14.28	64.26	40.58	42.08	15.43	72.25	4.48	29.81	48.95	15.86
4	Malda	39.71	76.6	73.34	93.48	7.84	71.55	5.19	60.12	16.15	0.96
5	Dinajpur	15.23	72.4	73.86	84.46	6.15	75.45	2.93	54.65	22	2.73
6	Burdwan	19.99	62.27	82.64	69.93	15.32	60.38	8.13	42.05	7.76	9.97
7	Birbhum	41.73	64.27	88.11	73.43	6.79	49.8	3.99	27.93	9.54	7.29
8	Bankura	20.17	61.1	55.91	67.44	3.94	47.69	1.45	27.31	35.71	9.87
9	Midnapur	8	52	75.41	75.73	4.74	56.61	2.11	34.43	22.91	8.41
10	Howrah	15.41	57.58	97.26	89.86	13.6	77.9	6.66	48.29	1.59	1.36
11	Hoogli	26.74	68.3	96.41	92.09	21.34	82.87	13.57	59.56	1.88	0.94
12	24'Pgs (N)	13.56	69.11	95.08	91.09	28.33	86.84	9.36	60.31	3.2	0.84
13	24' Pgs (S)	9.44	61.31	98.13	94.8	13.7	70.87	5.13	50.34	1.35	0.78
14	Nadia	22.23	64.28	97.03	91.95	22.71	75.51	11.96	51.83	1.84	0.67
15	Murshidabad	14.83	49.22	94.15	94.89	8.36	51.11	4.5	40.05	4.78	1.3
16	Purulia	22.53	73.89	36.4	66.34	3.27	53.91	1.06	33.63	50.47	7.14

Source: Census of India 1991

Table 4.9:Index Values of Households with Access to Electricity, Drinking Water and Toilets

Sr. No.	Districts	Rural	Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural	Urban	Aggregate Score	Average Score	Rank
		Electricity		Drinking Water		Toilet		All three		None of Three(-)				
1	Coochbehar	0.43	1.13	1.03	1.08	0.74	1.23	0.62	1.38	0.86	2.41	10.9	1.09	9
2	Darjeeling	0.91	1.09	0.47	0.5	2.09	1.02	1.11	0.52	1.34	0.15	9.21	0.921	12
3	Jalpaiguri	0.74	0.99	0.53	0.54	1.18	1.07	0.79	0.68	0.33	0.47	7.32	0.732	13
4	Malda	2.05	1.18	0.96	1.2	0.6	1.05	0.92	1.37	1	7.82	18.16	1.816	6
5	Dinajpur	0.79	1.11	0.97	1.08	0.47	1.11	0.52	1.24	0.74	2.75	10.78	1.078	10
6	Burdwan	1.03	0.96	1.08	0.89	1.18	0.89	1.44	0.96	2.09	0.75	11.27	1.127	8
7	Birbhum	2.16	0.99	1.16	0.94	0.52	0.73	0.71	0.63	1.7	1.03	10.56	1.056	11
8	Bankura	1.04	0.94	0.73	0.86	0.3	0.7	0.26	0.62	0.45	0.76	6.68	0.668	16
9	Midnapur	0.41	0.8	0.99	0.97	0.36	0.83	0.37	0.78	0.71	0.89	7.12	0.712	14
10	Howrah	0.8	0.88	1.28	1.15	1.04	1.15	1.18	1.1	10.18	5.52	24.27	2.427	5
11	Hoogli	1.38	1.05	1.27	1.18	1.64	1.22	2.41	1.35	8.61	7.99	28.09	2.809	3
12	24'Pgs (N)	0.7	1.06	1.25	1.16	2.17	1.28	1.66	1.37	5.06	8.94	24.65	2.465	4
13	24' Pgs (S)	0.49	0.94	1.29	1.21	1.05	1.04	0.91	1.14	11.99	9.63	29.7	2.97	2
14	Nadia	1.15	0.99	1.27	1.18	1.74	1.11	2.12	1.18	8.79	11.21	30.74	3.074	1
15	Murshidabad	0.77	0.76	1.24	1.21	0.64	0.75	0.8	0.91	3.38	5.78	16.24	1.624	7
16	Purulia	1.16	1.14	0.48	0.85	0.25	0.79	0.19	0.76	0.32	1.05	7	0.7	15

Note: Based on Table 4.8

4.5.6   Similar information is not however available for recent years. The proportion of electrified villages, the density of roads, percentage villages connected with Pucca road and access to Post Office are the 4 indicators available for 1999-2000. A composite index of these four variables show that generally the districts in North Bengal have low index value compared to other districts in the State (Table 4.10).

Table 4.10: Indicators of Physical Infrastructure (1999-2000)

Sr. No.	Districts	Percent Villages Electrified	Road length per sq. km.	Number of Post Offices per 100 Villages	Percent Villages connected by pucca road	Aggregate Score	Average Score	Rank
1	Coochbehar	98.16	30.35	31.08	40.63	4.70	1.18	1
2	Darjeeling	82.90	15.43	34.35	36.86	3.87	0.97	8
3	Jalpaiguri	98.77	20.81	39.51	0.00	3.53	0.88	12.5
4	Malda	97.26	16.34	19.68	35.20	3.50	0.88	12.5
5	Dinajpur	45.71	16.91	11.59	52.61	3.09	0.77	16
6	Burdwan	97.87	27.59	30.51	45.10	4.67	1.17	2
7	Birbhum	99.15	21.89	20.83	65.54	4.61	1.15	4
8	Bankura	66.93	15.63	13.38	58.25	3.49	0.87	14.5
9	Midnapore	52.06	14.79	13.38	75.59	3.72	0.93	11
10	Howrah	102.86	36.81	46.73	0.00	4.56	1.14	5
11	Hoogly	100.05	34.93	26.46	36.32	4.65	1.16	3
12	24-Parganas(N)	94.13	29.21	38.94	0.00	3.83	0.96	9
13	24-Parganas(S)	82.02	12.05	36.67	25.75	3.50	0.87	14.5
14	Nadia	93.37	24.78	33.51	30.45	4.22	1.05	7
15	Murshidabad	93.43	22.24	28.83	43.52	4.27	1.07	6
16	Purulia	62.87	12.94	17.47	70.94	3.79	0.95	10

Source: Stattistical Abstract, West Bengal, 1999-2000

CHAPTER V

Implementation of Central Schemes

5.1 Introduction

5.1.1 An important indicator of development is the status of performance relating to development programmes. Although a detailed analysis at the grass-root level through beneficiary survey may be necessary for such an assessment, broad indications are derivable from official statistics on the items like resource allocated, expenditure incurred, employment generated, assets created, etc.

5.1.2 The implementation of development programmes envisages a close-knit integration and coordination of various agencies viz. District Rural Development Agencies; Panchyati Raj Institutions, NGOs, Banks and other quasi-government organizations, particularly when multiple line departments float development programmes that over lap and have different implementation guidelines. For purpose of this analysis, the programmes may be grouped as follows:

    a. Creating Assets and Infrastructure building;
    b. Generation of supplementary wage employment and encouraging self-employment initiatives among unemployed; and
    c. Social welfare/Assistance Schemes.

5.1.3 This chapter attempts to study these programmes in the context of five districts of North Bengal vis‑à‑vis rest of Bengal, on the basis of the information like funds allocated funds released, funds available, expenditure incurred and physical achievements. Since the data on this are dynamic and the position of available funds and their utilisation changes from month-to-month, we have included data for the last three financial years. The main programmes for which district level information could be obtained from the secondary sources are listed below. All these are Central Sector Schemes.

    1. Swaranjayanti Gram Swarozgar Yojana (SGSY)
    2. Indira Avas Yojna (IAY)
    3. Jawahar Gram Smridhi Yojana (JGSY)
    4. National Family Benefits Scheme (NFBS)
    5. National Maternity Benefits Scheme (NMBS)
    6. National Old Age Pension Scheme (NOAPS)

5.1.4 While the SGSY is essentially a programme aiming as self-employment initiatives and creating employment opportunities in rural areas; the IAY and JGSY are the programmes which focus on asset and infrastructure building in the target areas. In the process the job creation (in terms of man-days) also emerges as one of the objectives of JGSY. The NFBS, the NMBS and NOAPS are the welfare/assistance-oriented schemes.

5.2   Allocation and Release of Funds

5.2.1 Table 5.1 provides the information for the three years i.e. 1999-2000, 2000-2001 and 2001-2002. Analysis of the figures given in the Table reveals that substantial amount has been allocated for asset / infrastructure building programme in North Bengal as compared to the rest of Bengal. Allocation for welfare-oriented programmes is more or less proportional to the population of these areas. It is the least in the case of employment generation related programmes. This trend is more or less the same in all the three years under study i.e. 1999-2000, 2000-2001 and 2001-02.

5.2.2 The release of fund was only 45percent in the case of SGSY in the year 1999-2000 for North Bengal, which further reduced to 8.16 percent in 2000-2001. While for other programmes the release of funds varied largely between 60 to 90 percent with the exception of release 100 percent in case of NOAPS in the year 1999-2000. The funds released under this scheme went down to 78 percent in 2000-2001 and 86 percent in 2001-2002.

Table 5.1: Allocation and Release of Funds by Schemes (1999-2000 to 2001-2002)

Scheme/ Fund allocated/Released	1999-2000		2000-2001		2001-2002	
	North Bengal	Rest of Bengal	North Bengal	Rest of Bengal	North Bengal	Rest of Bengal
Amount Allocated (In lakh of Rs)						
• **S.G.SY.**	1956.85	8584.04	1668.48	7319.05	1040.01	4160.14
• **I.A.Y.**	8711.93	7373.40	8711.93	7373.40	N.A	N.A
• **J.G.S.Y.**	6686.27	9108.44	6261.57	8529.87	7118.16	9696.83
• **N.F.B.S**	172.42	740.26	92.61	414.71	135.82	583.19
• **N.M.B.S**	92.61	414.71	172.42	740.26	N.A	N.A
• **N.O.A.P.S**	585.32	8513.18	585.32	2513.18	525.73	2257.29
Amount Released (In percentages)						
• **S.G.SY.**	45.16	42.44	8.16	9.27	Nil	Nil
• **I.A.Y.**	77.50	56.88	83.16	80.89	N.A	N.A
• **J.G.S.Y.**	88.47	93.16	83.84	86.47	99.65	100.26
• **N.F.B.S**	89.05	86.63	72.26	80.46	80.95	87.65
• **N.M.B.S**	82.98	66.70	77.50	72.62	N.A	N.A
• **N.O.A.P.S**	100.00	100.00	78.54	77.89	86.17	90.60

Source: Ministry of Rural Development, Government of India

5.3   District wise Allocation of Funds

5.3.1   The exercise of allocating amount at the district level is undertaken at the State
        headquarters. Besides population size there would be other criteria for such allocations.
        Table 5.2 provides the relevant information.

Table 5.2: District wise Allocation of Funds For Different Schemes, 2001-2002

Districts	Schemes						Percent Population (2001)
	SGSY	IAY*	JGSY	NFBS	NMBS*	NOAPS	
Coochbehar	17.65	34.19	30.55	18.06	18.05	18.05	16.83
Darjeeling	19.12	12.89	11.11	10.80	10.81	10.82	10.91
Jalpaiguri	17.65	30.18	33.71	23.27	23.26	23.26	23.12
Malda	23.53	7.54	8.84	21.90	21.91	21.90	22.35
Dinajpur	22.06	15.20	15.79	25.97	25.97	25.98	26.79
Sub Total N.Bengal	100.00 (1040.01)	100.00 (8711.93)	100.00 (7118.16)	100.00 (109.94)	100.00 (172.42)	100.00 (525.73)	100.00 (14722015)
As percent to Total W.Bengal	19.69	54.16	42.33	18.89	18.89	18.89	19.46

Source: Ministry of Rural Development, Government of India; * Relates to the Year 2000-2001;
Figures with in brackets are the absolute allocation in Rs. Lakh

5.3.2   About 54 percent of the State's share under I.A.Y. has been earmarked for the districts in
        North Bengal. District-wise allocation reveals large allocation to Coochbehar and
        Jalpaiguri, which are characterized by heavy concentration of Scheduled Caste
        population. As regards district-wise allocation on employment generation schemes,
        Daerjeeling and Coochbehar districts have received relatively higher priority. With respect
        to the welfare oriented schemes, this allocation seems to be related to population size.

5.4 Amount Utilized vis-à-vis Fund Available

5.4.1   Amount utilized vis-à-vis funds available is yet another indicator of the status of implementation of a programme. Table 5.3 gives scheme-wise expenditure as percentage of total fund during the year 1999-2000, 2000-2001 and 2001-2002. The amount of funds available is noted to be higher than the funds allocated for that year, in some cases since the former includes unspent amount from the previous year.

5.4.2   The proportion of expenditure incurred vis-à-vis funds available is noted to be high in North Bengal as compared to that in rest of the Bengal in each of the schemes for every year with the exception of one instance in the year 1999-2000 and three cases for the year 2000-2001. These are NMBS for the year 1999-2000 and (i) I.A.Y; (ii) JGSY;   (iii) NOAPS for 2000-2001 where the proportion of expenditure was less in North Bengal. The amount spent was noted to be more than 100 percent in both the parts of Bengal for NFBS in the 2000-2001 but it was more than 100 percent in rest of Bengal for JGSY too.

5.4.3   Scheme-wise, the relative proportion of the amount spent to the funds available shows a declining trend through all the three years. This is noted to be from 45 percent in 1999-2000 to 15 percent in 2001-2002 in case of SGSY; from 70 percent to 43 percent in case of JGSY during the same period. It is noted to be sharper in case of NFBS being 43 percent during 2001-2002 in comparison to that of 79 percent in 1999-2000; this decline in case of NOAPS was from 80 percent to 60 percent during this period. There has also been a significant decline in the expenditure level of programmes dealing with social welfare.

Table: 5.3: Scheme wise Expenditure as Percent of Total funds Available (1999-2000, 2000-2001 and 2001-2002)

	1999-2000		2000-2001		2001-2002	
Scheme	Total Fund Available*	Percent Expenditure	Total Fund Available *	Percent Expenditure	Total Fund Available*	Percent Expenditure
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
SGSY						
N- Bengal	3380.09	31.18	2331.91	15.20	1981.11	15.47
R-Bengal	12912.11	35.61	9182.11	13.14	8119.34	14.05
IAY						
N- Bengal	7786.66	70.84	9003.26	84.81	NA	NA
R-Bengal	8207.95	67.64	8078.20	88.62		
JGSY						
N- Bengal	7810.69	69.92	6760.22	91.06	8621.34	43.29
R-Bengal	13429.73	56.69	10565.93	108.58	11353.11	37.68
NFBS						
N- Bengal	258.82	79.169	93.82	105.68	138.24	42.92
R-Bengal	1009.38	67.59	449.51	103.84	658.40	34.29
NMBS						
N- Bengal	130.81	54.25	160.8	95.60	NA	NA
R-Bengal	559.89	62.66	813.1	95.97		
NOAPS						
N- Bengal	857.59	79.87	870.02	78.26	6161.52	60.14
R-Bengal	3782.17	72.33	3391.13	87.31	2860.98	54.84

* Information relates to the year 2000-01; funds available In lakh of Rupees; *** percent expenditure

5.4.4   It is to be noted that the allocation of funds by the Centre for SGSY, SGRY, IAY, and NSAP are based on fixed criteria and the allocated amounts are released based on

unspent balances available. Under the SGSY and SGRY, the Central assistance is allocated to the States/Union Territories on the basis of proportion of rural poor in a State to total rural poor in the country as per criteria decided by the Government from time to time. At the district level, the allocation is made on the basis of the index of backwardness formulated using equal weightage to the proportion of rural SC/ST population in a district to the total SC/ST population in the State and inverse of per capita production of agricultural workers in the district. In the case of IAY, poverty ratio as well as housing shortage are used as criteria for allocation. Under NSAP allocation of funds is made to the States and Union Territories on the basis of the parameters as that consider total population, poverty ratio, ratio of population above the age of 65 years, mortality rate in the age group 18-6, crude birth rate, etc. The district-wise allocation is made by the State Government keeping view the requirements of the districts with a consideration of the parameters referred to above. The Central release to the State under the rural development programmes depends upon the utilization of the available funds and the release of State share wherever such sharing arrangement has been prescribed.

5.4.5   The Central release vis-à-vis Central allocation under major poverty alleviation programmes (IRDP/SGSY, SGSY/JGSY, EAS and IAY to West Bengal during the first four years of the Ninth Plan is given in Table 5.4 which reveals that the State had lost Rs. 594.34 crore on account of less Central release vis-à-vis Central allocation under four poverty alleviation programme during the first four years of the Ninth Plan period. The low releases of funds have a direct impact on physical progress. The inability of the State Government to fully absorb the Central allocation would obviously have an impact on anti poverty programmes in the state. The reasons for low utilization of funds resulting in large opening balances and poor physical performance needs to be discussed with the officials at the district and state level.

5.4.6   The States have to make budgetary provision for the particular CSS. However, in some States, budget preparation is not given the attention it deserves and is left to Section Officers of the Department and Finance Department. The latter would attempt to peg the outlay at the previous year's level. It is at this stage that the senior officials concerned in consultation with Finance and Planning, should intervene and ensure that adequate provisions are made in the budget, at least in respect of schemes for which funds can be obtained as additionality.

Table 5.4: Central Allocation and Release under Major Poverty Alleviation Programme to West Bengal (Rs. Crore)

Year	Central Allocation	Central Release	Difference
1997-98	374.79	260.32	114.42
1998-99	431.48	188.67	232.81
1999-2000	448.94	324.46	124.48
2000-01	382.70	260.07	122.63
Total	1637.91	1032.52	594.34

5.5 District-wise utilization of funds

5.5.1   Table 5.5 gives the percentage of expenditure to funds available for the district of North Bengal in the year 2001-2002. District wise trends of amount utilized as observed from the above Table reveal that Coochbehar comes up as a most developed district wherein relatively higher available amounts have been utilized during the year 2001-2002. As against an average spending of 15 percent for the North Bengal as a whole 62 percent was spent under SGSY in Coochbehar. Similarly 98 percent of the amount was utilized under IAY as against the average of 85 percent spending for the district as a whole. The only scheme in which Coochbehar has not utilized the funds in NFBS, the relative proportion being 27 percent as against 43 percent for the district as a whole. Interestingly under NMBS and NOAPS 100 percent amount was spent in Coochbehar. Contrary to this, Jalpaiguri, Malda and Darjeeling spent only 5 percent, 9 percent and 10 percent of the funds available under SGSY. 100 percent of the amount was spent on NOAPS and NMBS in Jalpaiguri; and 88.5 percent under NFBS against an average of 43 percent spending for the district as a whole. Darjeeling has performed the best by spending 98.7 percent of the amount under NFBS. Dinajpur has spent 30 percent under SGSY, 84 percent under IAY, 45 percent under JGSY, 96 percent under NMBS. Its spending was less only under NFBS and NOAPS.

Table 5.5: District wise Percentage Expenditure on Different Scheme for the Year 2001-2002

Districts		Cooch behar	Darj-eeling	Jalpai-guri	Malda	Dinaj-pur	North Bengal	Rest Bengal
SGSY	A**	103.47	316.59	547.21	570.76	443.08	1981.11	8119.34
	E***	62.08	9.93	5.18	8.65	30.04	15.47	14.05
IAY*	A**	3184.35	810.02	2826.30	699.82	1482.77	9003.36	8078.20
	E***	98.10	43.77	88.47	59.09	83.88	84.81	88.62
JGSY	A**	2307.05	963.36	3074.39	777.69	1489.85	8621.34	11353.11
	E***	40.77	23.23	51.03	41.78	44.98	43.29	37.68
NFBS	A**	26.6	9.28	34.35	33.6	34.41	138.24	658.40
	E***	27.37	98.70*	88.50	34.70	29.03	42.92	34.29
NMBS*	A**	31.28	18.63	28.83	32.11	49.95	160.8	813.1
	E***	100.00	96.08	99.72	86.33	96.24	95.60	95.97
NOAPS*	A**	106.31	97.37	138.85	301.82	225.67	870.02	3391.13
	E***	99.58	68.62	99.96	77.66	59.82	78.26	87.31

Source: Ministry of Rural Development, Government of India; *Information relates to the Year 2000-2001; **Fund available (in Rs lakh) ; ***Percentage expenditure

5.6   Performance under different schemes

5.6.1   How the amount spent has been able to meet the targets is another issue for study in order to decide whether the programmes/schemes in operation are being implemented in an cost-effective manner. It would be interesting to note that as against the large proportions of amount spent the achievements have not been very encouraging. Under the SGSY programme the number of self-employed assisted under the programme declined from 13,408 in 1999-2000 to 5841 in 2000-2001 and further gone down to 2317 in 2001-2002. This trend of decline is visible in the entire Bengal. The number of such cases declined from 75418 in 1999-2000 to 15389 in 2000-2001 and further to 5071 in 2001-2002 for the rest of Bengal.

5.6.2   Similarly under JGSY, despite substantial spending in 2000-2001 the number of mandays employment generated have declined from 46.4 lakh in 2000-2001 to 29.2 lakh in 2001-2002 in North Bengal. Same is the case with respect to the rest of Bengal. In contrast to this the achievement under IAY has been more 92 percent in the year 1999-2000 and above 60 percent in 2000-2001. These achievements were relatively less when compared to that of rest of Bengal. The achievement in the case of welfare related/

assistance oriented programmes was of the order of nearly 100 percent in the case of NOAPS. The related information is given the Table 5.6.

Table 5.6: Year wise target and achievement of different schemes

Schemes	1999-2000		2000-01		2001-02	
	Target	Achievement	Target	Achievement	Target	Achievement
SGSY*	N.A	N.A	N.A	N.A	N.A	N.A
NB	N.A	13408	N.A	5841	N.A	2317
RB	N.A	75418	N.A	15389	N.A	5071
WB	N.A	88826	N.A	21230	N.A	7388
IAY**						
NB	52063	31136	51886	47490	N.A	N.A
RB	44240	31517	44240	43293	N.A	N.A
WB	96126	62653	96126	90783	N.A	N.A
JGSY*						
NB	N.A	48.9	N.A	46.4	N.A	29.2
RB	N.A	65.0	N.A	90.3	N.A	32.3
WB	N.A	113.9	N.A	136.7	N.A	61.5
NFBS**						
NB	N.A	2111	N.A	1460	1306	434
RB	N.A	7132	N.A	7878	5607	3593
WB	N.A	9243	N.A	9338	6913	4027
NMBS**						
NB	18367	14176	N.A	19107	N.A	N.A
RB	78826	73464	N.A	89658	N.A	N.A
WB	97193	87640	N.A	108765	N.A	N.A
NOAPS**						
NB	62557	62405	N.A	61950	43864	59708
RB	268477	265539	N.A	268273	253465	248769
WB	331034	327944	N.A	330223	297329	308477

Source: Ministry of Rural Development, Government of India; *Swarojgaries assisted, **Number of houses constructed, ***Lakh mandays employment generated, ****Number of beneficiaries.

5.7   Summing-up

5.7.1   Three broad categories of Centrally sponsored programmes are under implementation -
(i) Aiming at employment generation/creation of supplementary wages employment; (ii)
Creating assets and infrastructure; and (iii) social welfare/ assistance oriented. S.G.S.Y
comes under category (i) of the above-mentioned types of programmes and JGSY under
category (i) and (ii) both. IAY is under category (ii) and NFPS and NMBS; NOAPS are
essentially welfare/assistance oriented programmes i.e. category (iii).

5.7.2   While for welfare/assistance programmes, allocations are on the basis of populations
consideration, the allocations for the other set of programmes include other criteria such
as distribution of Scheduled Caste/Tribe population among others. Substantial amounts
have been allocated for assets/ infrastructure building programmes but the allocations
are lower in the case of employment generation related programmes. The amounts
allocated are released based on unspent balances available with the districts. Analysis of
the three consecutive years reveals that release proportion have steadily declined from
year to year.

5.7.3   As regards districts-wise allocation, Coochbehar has received relatively higher priority in
the case of both the programmes viz. infrastructure building and employment generation.
Malda and Dinajpur on the contrary have received lesser allocation as compared to other
districts.

5.7.4   The proportion of expenditure incurred vis-à-vis funds available is noted to be high in
North Bengal as compared to rest of the Bengal under each of the schemes for every
year with the exception of one instance in the year 1999-2000 and three cases for the
year 2000-2001. These are NMBS for the year 1999-2000 and (i) I.A.Y; (ii) JGSY;   (iii)
NOAPS for 2000-2001 where the proportion of expenditure was less in North Bengal.

5.7.5   Scheme wise, the relative proportion of the amount spent to the funds available shows a
declining trend through all the three years. As against an average spending of 15
percent for the North Bengal as a whole 62 percent was spent under SGSY in
Coochbehar. Similarly 98 percent of the amount was utilized under IAY as against the
average of 85 percent spending for the North Bengal as a whole. The only scheme in
which Coochbehar has not utilized the funds in NFBS, the relative proportion being 27
percent as against 43 percent for the region.

5.7.6   Jalpaiguri, Malda and Darjeeling spent only 5 percent, 9 percent and 10 percent of the funds available under SGSY. Under the SGSY programme the number of self-employed assisted under the programme declined from 10,441 in 1999-2000 to 5501 in 2000-2001 and further gone down to 2317 in 2001-2002. This trend of decline is visible in the entire Bengal. The number of such cases declined from 78385 in 1999-2000 to 15729 in 2000-2001 and further to 5071 in 2001-2002 for the rest of Bengal.

5.7.7   Under JGSY, the number of man-days employment generated have declined from 46.4 lakh in 2000-2001 to 29.2 lakh in 2001-2002 in North Bengal. Same is the case with respect to the rest of Bengal. In contrast to this the achievement under IAY has been more 92 percent in the year 1999-2000 and above 60 percent in 2000-2001. These achievements were relatively less when compared to that of rest of Bengal.

CHAPTER VI

Concluding Observations

6.1   Summing-up

6.1.1 That the districts of North Bengal have lagged behind with regard to a number of development dimensions for over two decades is clear from the preceding analysis. Darjeeling district is, however, better placed from among the districts of North Bengal region in almost all important indicators. Despite such poor ranking of districts, particularly on economic indicators, urban male migration and rate of growth of population in the districts of North Bengal have been higher than the rest of the State. However, this has to be seen in the backdrop of lower densities of population in the districts of North Bengal.

6.1.2 The proportions of both Scheduled Caste and Scheduled Tribe population are higher in the districts of North Bengal regions, with Scheduled Caste segment concentrated in Coochbehar and Jalpauguri districts and the Tribal population in Jalpaiguri and Darjeeling districts. It may be noted that at the macro level it has been repeatedly noted that, that there is a negative correlation between indicators of development and incidence of Scheduled Caste and Tribal population.

6.1.3 The region is not drought prone, but suffers from floods and soil erosion. From the agricultural point of view, the region is characterised by higher incidence of land-less labour as compared to landowning cultivators. Agricultural productivity is low and has not been growing rapidly except in the districts of Jalpaiguri and Coochbehar, where the growth rates in agricultural yield is comparable to the State averages.

6.1.4 The situation of institutional credit is also poor in North Bengal as compared to the rest of the State, particularly when we consider deposit credit ratio and per capita industrial credit.

6.1.5 While the disparity between the North Bengal districts and the rest of the State is sharp when we consider outcome variables such as SDP, the disparity in input variables such as social infrastructure are not that sharp. This would then call for better convergence between development agencies such as DRDA, financial institutions, Panchayat and institutions.

6.1.6 It is also clear from the preceding analysis within North Bengal, Darjeeling district scores better on many development indicators.

6.1.7 While for welfare/assistance programmes, allocations are largely on the basis of population consideration, the allocations for the other set of programmes include other criteria such as distribution of Scheduled Caste/Tribe population among others. Substantial amounts have been allocated for assets/ infrastructural building programmes but the allocations are lower in the case of employment generation related programmes. The amounts allocated are released based on unspent balances available with the districts. Analysis of the three consecutive years reveals that release proportion have steadily declined from year to year.

6.1.8 As regards districts-wise allocation, Coochbehar has received relatively higher priority in the case of both the programmes viz. infrastructure building and employment generation. Malda and Dinajpur on the contrary have received lesser allocation as compared to other districts.

6.2   **Towards Reducing Regional Disparities**

6.2.1 In the reduction of regional disparities within the State, it is the State government as well as panchayat at District level that needs to evolve a medium term development strategy. As observed earlier, it is necessary to recognize the fact that the economic reforms that accelerated in the early nineties is geared to accelerate growth in the economy - at best, it would fail to address concerns of equity and at worst, accentuate disparities. The concerns of equity will therefore, have to be addressed separately. It is also clear that given the large backlog in the provision of social and physical infrastructure, the probability of private investment in the crucial infrastructure sector hinges upon State level reforms. Meanwhile, development gravitates towards those pockets where a semblance of infrastructure is already available. Thus, regionally also there are 'gainers and losers'.

6.2.2 From the Plan documents of the State, we could identify two broad interventions in this context, efforts to develop Growth Centres in the North Bengal region and a beginning to address the problems of the region. The State government may like to consider strengthening such a regional development agency that could play a coordinating role for greater convergence of development efforts and to prepare a blueprint for regional development involving the district pnachayat of the districts in the region. The Growth Centre approach may also be reviewed particularly in the context of adequacy of resources, since under-provided Growth Centre strategy is unlikely to attract investments.

Annexure

Source for all Tables in the Annexure is Ministry of Rural Development, Government of India

National Social Assistance Programme
Statement Financial and Physical Progress
Name of the Scheme: NFBS
Name of the State-West Bengal (1999-2000)

									(Rupees in lakh)
S. No.	Districts	Allocation	Release	Total	Expenditure	Relative share to		Relative share	percent of exp.
			(Instalments)	Available	Reported	Total	Total	of release to	to total
			Total	funds		funds	exp.	allocation	funds avail.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1	Coochbehar	31.13	31.13	31.17	31.17	2.46	3.51	100.00	100
2	Jalpaiguri	40.11	40.11	76.16	48.35	6.01	5.45	100.00	63.48
3	Darjeeling	18.63	18.63	23.50	33.5	1.85	3.78	100.00	142.55
4	Dinajpur	44.78	44.78	77.19	61.3	6.09	6.91	100.00	79.41
5	Malda	37.77	18.89	50.8	30.55	4.01	3.44	50.01	60.14
	N. Bengal	172.42	153.54	258.82	204.87	20.41	23.09	89.05	79.16
	R. Bengal	740.26	641.3	1009.38	682.28	79.59	76.91	86.63	67.59
	W. Bengal	**912.68**	**794.84**	**1268.2**	**887.15**	**100.00**	**100.00**	**87.09**	**69.95**

**National Social Assistance
Programme
Statement Financial and Physical Progress
Name of the Scheme: NMBS
Name of the State-West Bengal (**1999-2000)

(Rupees in lakh)

S. No.	Districts	Alloca-tion	Release	Total Available Fund	Expenditure	Relative share to		Relative share	percent of exp.
			(Instalments)	Fund	Reported	Total	Total	of release to	to total
			Total			funds	exp.	allocation	funds avail.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1	Coochbehar	16.72	16.72	25.52	16.08	3.51	3.62	100.00	63.01
2	Jalpaiguri	21.53	10.77	11.32	0.52	1.56	0.12	50.02	4.59
3	Darjeeling	10.01	5.01	13.55	8.58	1.86	1.93	50.05	63.32
4	Dinajpur	24.07	24.07	44.61	35.03	6.14	7.88	100.00	78.52
5	Malda	20.28	20.28	35.81	10.76	4.93	2.42	100.00	30.05
	N. Bengal	92.61	76.85	130.81	70.97	18.00	15.97	82.98	54.25
	R. Bengal	414.71	276.6	595.89	373.41	82.00	84.03	66.70	62.66
	W. bengal	**507.32**	**353.45**	**726.7**	**444.38**	**100.00**	**100.00**	**69.67**	**61.15**

IAMR

Statement on Financial and Physical Progress

Name of the scheme: NOAPS

Name of the State: west Bengal (1999-2000)

									(Rupees in lakh)
S.No.	Districts	Allocation	Release	Total	Expenditure	Relative share to		Relative share	percent of exp.
			(Instalments)	Available	Reported	Total	Total	of release to	to total
			Total	Of funds		funds	exp.	allocation	funds avail.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1	Coochbehar	105.66	105.66	115.92	104	2.50	3.04	100	89.72
2	Jalpaiguri	136.14	136.14	204.22	204.19	4.40	5.97	100	99.99
3	Darjeeling	63.28	63.28	98.38	61.24	2.12	1.79	100	62.25
4	Dinajpur	152.04	152.04	244.03	192.5	5.26	5.63	100	78.88
5	Malda	128.20	128.20	195.04	122.99	4.20	3.60	100	63.06
	N. Bengal	585.32	585.32	857.59	684.92	18.48	20.02	100	79.87
	R. Bengal	2513.18	2513.18	3782.17	2735.76	81.52	79.98	100	72.33
	W. bengal	**3098.5**	**3098.5**	**4639.76**	**3420.68**	**100.00**	**100.00**	**100**	**73.73**

National Social Assistance Programme
Statement Financial and Physical Progress
Name of the Scheme: NFBS
Name of the State-West Bengal (1999-2000)

									(Rupees in lakh)
S. No.	Districts	Allocation	Release	Total	Expenditure	Relative share to		Relative share	percent of exp.
			(Instalments)	Available	Reported	Total	Total	of release to	to total
			Total	of funds		funds	exp.	allocation	funds avail.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1	Coochbehar	31.13	31.13	31.17	31.17	2.46	3.51	100.00	100
2	Jalpaiguri	40.11	40.11	76.16	48.35	6.01	5.45	100.00	63.48
3	Darjeeling	18.63	18.63	23.50	33.5	1.85	3.78	100.00	142.55
4	Dinajpur	44.78	44.78	77.19	61.3	6.09	6.91	100.00	79.41
5	Malda	37.77	18.89	50.8	30.55	4.01	3.44	50.01	60.14
	N. Bengal	172.42	153.54	258.82	204.87	20.41	23.09	89.05	79.16
	R. Bengal	740.26	641.3	1009.38	682.28	79.59	76.91	86.63	67.59
	W. Bengal	**912.68**	**794.84**	**1268.2**	**887.15**	**100.00**	**100.00**	**87.09**	**69.95**

**National Social Assistance
Programme
Statement Financial and Physical Progress
Name of the Scheme-NMBS
Name of the State-West Bengal (**1999-2000)

									(Rupees in lakh)
S. No.	Districts	Alloca-	Release	Total	Expenditure	Relative share to		Relative share	percent of exp.
		tion	(Instalments)	Available	Reported	Total	Total	of release to	to total
			Total	Of funds		funds	exp.	allocation	funds avail.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1	Coochbehar	16.72	16.72	25.52	16.08	3.51	3.62	100.00	63.01
2	Jalpaiguri	21.53	10.77	11.32	0.52	1.56	0.12	50.02	4.59
3	Darjeeling	10.01	5.01	13.55	8.58	1.86	1.93	50.05	63.32
4	Dinajpur	24.07	24.07	44.61	35.03	6.14	7.88	100.00	78.52
5	Malda	20.28	20.28	35.81	10.76	4.93	2.42	100.00	30.05
	N. Bengal	92.61	76.85	130.81	70.97	18.00	15.97	82.98	54.25
	R. Bengal	414.71	276.6	595.89	373.41	82.00	84.03	66.70	62.66
	W. Bengal	**507.32**	**353.45**	**726.7**	**444.38**	**100.00**	**100.00**	**69.67**	**61.15**

Statement on Financial and Physical Progress

Name of the scheme: NOAPS

Name of the State: west Bengal (1999-2000)

(Rupees in lakh)

S.No.	Districts	Allocation	Release	Total	Expenditure	Relative share to		Relative share	percent of exp.
			(Instalments) Total	Available Of funds	Reported	Total funds	Total exp.	of release to allocation	to total funds avail.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1	Coochbehar	105.66	105.66	115.92	104	2.50	3.04	100	89.72
2	Jalpaiguri	136.14	136.14	204.22	204.19	4.40	5.97	100	99.99
3	Darjeeling	63.28	63.28	98.38	61.24	2.12	1.79	100	62.25
4	Dinajpur	152.04	152.04	244.03	192.5	5.26	5.63	100	78.88
5	Malda	128.20	128.20	195.04	122.99	4.20	3.60	100	63.06
	N. Bengal	585.32	585.32	857.59	684.92	18.48	20.02	100	79.87
	R. Bengal	2513.18	2513.18	3782.17	2735.76	81.52	79.98	100	72.33
	W. Bengal	**3098.5**	**3098.5**	**4639.76**	**3420.68**	**100.00**	**100.00**	**100**	**73.73**

District-wise Financial Progress Under SGSY during 2001-2002* (Rupees in lakh)								
Districts	**Allocation**			**Total**	**Total**	**Relative share to**		**percent of exp.**
	Central	**State**	**Total**	**Funds Available**	**Exp.**	**Total funds**	**Total exp.**	**to total funds available**
1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**8**	**9**	**10**	**11**	**15**
Coochbehar	137.650	45.883	183.53	103.47	64.230	1.02	4.44	62.08
Jalpaiguri	149.130	49.710	198.84	547.21	28.360	5.42	1.96	5.18
Darjeeling	137.64	45.88	183.52	316.59	31.44	3.13	2.17	9.93
Dinajpur	183.52	61.173	244.69	443.08	133.11	4.39	9.20	30.04
Malda	172.070	57.357	229.43	570.76	49.370	5.65	3.41	8.65
N. Bengal	780.010	260.003	1040.01	1981.11	306.51	19.61	21.18	15.47
R. Bengal	3120.1	1040.034	4160.14	8119.34	1141	80.39	78.82	14.05
W. Bengal	**3900.11**	**1300.037**	**5200.15**	**10100.5**	**1447.5**	**100.00**	**100.00**	**14.33**
* No release of funds from Central and State								

Physical Progress under SGSY during 1999-2000

S.No	Districts	Number of Swarojgaries Assisted						
		TOTAL	SC	ST	WOMEN	percent of SC to Total	percent of ST to Total	percent of Women to Total
1	2	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1	Coochbehar	3333	2242	4	765	67.27	0.12	22.95
2	Jalpaiguri	1228	103	8	84	8.39	0.65	6.84
3	Darjeeling	863	602	50	196	69.76	5.79	22.71
4	Dinajpur	5017	1715	431	2487	34.18	8.59	49.57
5	Malda	2967	810	397	994	27.30	13.38	33.50
	North Bengal	10441	4662	493	3532	44.65	4.72	33.83
	Rest of Bengal	78385	21823	4515	33439	27.84	5.76	42.66
	W.Bengal	**88826**	**26485**	**5008**	**36971**	**29.82**	**5.64**	**41.62**

IAMR

Physical Progress Under SGSY During 2000-2001

S.No	Districts	Number of Swarojgaries Assisted						
		Physical Progress				Percentage		
		Total	SC	ST	Women	percent of sc	percent of St	percent of Women
1	2	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1	Coochbehar	2379	1269	0	2130	53.34	0.00	89.53
2	Jalpaiguri	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0
3	Darjeeling	1732	937	217	1354	54.10	12.53	78.18
4	Dinajpur	1390	528	104	1237	37.99	7.48	88.99
5	Malda	340	71	8	52	20.88	2.35	15.29
	N total	5501	2734	321	4721	49.70	5.84	85.82
	R total	15729	4881	740	10596	31.03	4.70	67.37
	Total	**21230**	**7615**	**1061**	**15317**	**35.87**	**5.00**	**72.15**

National Social Assistance Programme

Statement Physical Progress

Name of the Scheme: NMBS

Name of the State-West Bengal 2000-01

S.No	Districts	No. of Beneficiaries reported			percent of SC to	percent of ST to
		SC	ST	Total	total	total
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1	Coochbehar	1774	118	3282	54.05	3.60
2	Jalpaiguri	938	177	4320	21.71	4.10
3	Darjeeling	0	0	1936	0.00	0.00
4	Dinajpur	1397	341	4637	30.13	7.35
5	Malda	889	474	4932	18.03	9.61
	North Bengal	4998	1110	19107	26.16	5.81
	Rest of Bengal	17097	7356	89658	19.07	8.20
	West Bengal	**22095**	**8466**	**108765**	**20.31**	**7.78**

National Social Assistance Programme

Statement on Physical Progress

Name ot the scheme: NFBS

Name of the State : West Bengal

S.No	Districts	No. of Beneficiaries reported			percent of SC to	Year 2000-2001 percent of ST to
		SC	ST	Total	total	total
1	2	3	4	5	7	8
1	Coochbehar	151	10	301	50.17	3.32
2	Jalpaiguri	97	55	288	33.68	19.10
3	Darjeeling	0	0	179	0.00	0.00
4	Dinajpur	102	9	436	23.39	2.06
5	Malda	111	60	256	43.36	23.44
	North Bengal	461	134	1460	31.58	9.18
	Rest of Bengal	967	550	7878	12.27	6.98
	West Bengal	**1428**	**684**	**9338**	**15.29**	**7.32**

National Social Assistance Programme

Statement on Physical Progress

Name ot the scheme: NOAPS

Name of the State : West Bengal (2000-01)

S.No	Districts	Achievement Number of Beneficieries			percent of SC to	percent of ST to
		SC	ST	Total	total	total
1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**7**	**8**
1	Coochbehar	7576	496	11294	67.08	4.39
2	Jalpaiguri	8679	491	14549	59.65	3.37
3	Darjeeling	0	0	6708	0.00	0.00
4	Dinajpur	5731	1715	16251	35.27	10.55
5	Malda	1670	706	13148	12.70	5.37
	North Bengal	23656	3408	61950	38.19	5.50
	Rest of Bengal	57378	15398	268273	21.39	5.74
	West Bengal	**81034**	**18806**	**330223**	**24.54**	**5.69**

	Physical Performance under JGSY									
		2001-2002			2000-2001			1999-2000		
Sl.No.	District	Exp. (In lakh)	Man-days Generated (In lakh)	Man-days generated as percent of exp.	Exp. (In lakh)	Man-days Generated (In lakh)	Man-days generated as percent of exp.	Exp. (In lakh)	Man-days Generated (In lakh)	Man-days Generated as percent of exp.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1	Coochbehar	940.6	4.75	0.50	2359.25	12.47	0.53	2041.03	11.73	0.57
2	Jalpaiguri	1568.71	14.06	0.90	1631.60	14.22	0.87	1609.76	20.78	1.29
3	Darjeeling	223.77	1.35	0.60	421.3	4.23	1.00	505.12	5.4	1.07
4	DinajPur	674.16	6.2	0.92	1315.85	12	0.91	930.35	7.76	0.83
5	Malda	324.88	2.82	0.87	427.54	3.47	0.81	374.68	3.20	0.85
	North Bengal	3732.12	29.18	0.78	6155.54	46.39	0.75	5460.94	48.87	0.89
	Rest Bengal	4277.82	32.33	0.76	11472.88	90.26	0.79	7613.53	64.99	0.85
	West Bengal	**8009.94**	**61.51**	**0.77**	**17628.42**	**136.65**	**0.78**	**13074.47**	**113.86**	**0.87**

		2001-2002		Achievement as	2000-2001		Achievement as
S.No.	Districts	Employment Generated			Employment Generated		
		(Lakh Man-days)		percent of target	(Lakh Man-days)		percent of target
		Target	Achievement		Target	Achievement	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1	Coochbehar	11.4	0.98	8.59	4.85	3.11	64.12
2	Jalpaiguri	12.06	2.82	23.39	7.23	9.67	133.75
3	Darjeeling	9.04	0.16	1.77	3.46	1.99	57.51
4	Dinajpur	12.86	3.62	28.15	9.30	9.29	99.89
5	Malda	7.19	2.00	27.81	4.06	2.48	61.08
	North Bengal	52.55	9.58	18.23	28.9	26.54	91.83
	Rest Bengal	139.74	39.93	28.57	103.66	89.73	86.56
	West Bengal	**192.29**	**49.51**	**25.75**	**132.56**	**116.27**	**87.71**

Employment Assurance Scheme

		INDIRA AWAAS YOJANA					
		Physical Progress					
		2000-01			1999-2000		
Sl.No.	District	No. of Houses		Houses constructed	No. of Houses		Houses constructed
		Targeted	Achievement	as percent of target	Targeted	Achievement	as percent of target
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1	Coochbehar	17870	19531	109.29	17799	16014	89.97
2	Jalpaiguri	15775	15077	95.58	15711	6974	44.39
3	Darjeeling	6351	2877	45.30	6710	217	3.23
4	Dinajpur	7949	7370	92.72	7917	5537	69.94
5	Malda	3941	2635	66.86	3926	2394	60.98
	North Bengal	51886	47490	91.53	52063	31136	59.80
	Rest Bengal	44240	43293	97.86	44064	31517	71.53
	West Bengal	**96126**	**90783**	**94.44**	**96127**	**62653**	**65.18**

National Social Assistance Programme

Statement Physical Progress

Name of the Scheme: NMBS

Name of the State-West Bengal (2000-01)

S.No	Districts	No. of Beneficiaries reported			percent of SC to	percent of ST to	
		SC	ST	Total	total	total	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
1	Coochbehar	1774	118	3282	54.05	3.60	
2	Jalpaiguri	938	177	4320	21.71	4.10	
3	Darjeeling	0	0	1936	0.00	0.00	
4	Dinajpur	1397	341	4637	30.13	7.35	
5	Malda	889	474	4932	18.03	9.61	
	North Bengal	4998	1110	19107	26.16	5.81	
	Rest of Bengal	17097	7356	89658	19.07	8.20	
	West Bengal	**22095**	**8466**	**108765**	**20.31**	**7.78**	

IAMR

National Social Assistance Programme

Statement on Physical Progress

Name ot the scheme: NFBS

Name of the State : West Bengal 2000-01

S.No	Districts	No. of Beneficiaries reported			percent of SC to	percent of ST to
		SC	ST	Total	total	total
1	2	3	4	5	7	8
1	Coochbehar	151	10	301	50.17	3.32
2	Jalpaiguri	97	55	288	33.68	19.10
3	Darjeeling	0	0	179	0.00	0.00
4	Dinajpur	102	9	436	23.39	2.06
5	Malda	111	60	256	43.36	23.44
	North Bengal	461	134	1460	31.58	9.18
	Rest of Bengal	967	550	7878	12.27	6.98
	West Bengal	**1428**	**684**	**9338**	**15.29**	**7.32**

National Social Assistance Programme

Statement on Physical Progress

Name ot the scheme: NOAPS

Name of the State: West Bengal (2000-01)

S.No	Districts	Number of Beneficieries			percent of SC to total	percent of ST to total
		SC	ST	Total		
1	Coochbehar	7576	496	11294	67.08	4.39
2	Jalpaiguri	8679	491	14549	59.65	3.37
3	Darjeeling	-	-	6708	-	-
4	Dinajpur	5731	1715	16251	35.27	10.55
5	Malda	1670	706	13148	12.70	5.37
	North Bengal	23656	3408	61950	38.19	5.50
	Rest of Bengal	57378	15398	268273	21.39	5.74
	West Bengal	**81034**	**18806**	**330223**	**24.54**	**5.69**

Physical Progress under SGSY during 1999-2000

S.No	Districts	TOTAL	SC	ST	WOMEN	percent of SC to Total	percent of ST to Total	percent of Women to Total
		Number of Swarojgaries Assisted						
1	Coochbehar	3333	2242	4	765	67.27	0.12	22.95
2	Jalpaiguri	1228	103	8	84	8.39	0.65	6.84
3	Darjeeling	863	602	50	196	69.76	5.79	22.71
4	Dinajpur	5017	1715	431	2487	34.18	8.59	49.57
5	Malda	2967	810	397	994	27.30	13.38	33.50
	North Bengal	10441	4662	493	3532	44.65	4.72	33.83
	Rest of Bengal	78385	21823	4515	33439	27.84	5.76	42.66
	W.BTotal	**88826**	**26485**	**5008**	**36971**	**29.82**	**5.64**	**41.62**

References Cited

Banerjee Sarmila and S.Ray, (1998), On Construction of District Development Index in West Bengal, *Economic and Political Weekly*, XXXIII, November 21-27/December 4, pp.3019-3026.

Bhattacharya, Basabi (1998) Urbanisation and Human Development in West Bengal, A District Level Study and Comparison with Inter-state Variation, *Economic and Political Weekly*, XXXIII, November 21-27/December 4, pp.3027-3032