

Directives by the Governor of Maharashtra under Rule 7 of the Development Boards for Vidarbha, Marathwada and the rest of Maharashtra Order, 1994, the region-wise distribution of the Annual Plan outlays, time frame for its removal and region-wise allocation for the removal of backlog of Irrigation sector in the Annual Plan FY 2009-10.

I Introduction

1. The State of Maharashtra (Special Responsibility of Governor for Vidarbha, Marathwada and the rest of Maharashtra) Order, 1994 made by the President of India under Article 371(2) of the Constitution of India has assigned the Governor of Maharashtra special responsibility for matters specified in sub Clauses (b) and (c) of Clause (2) of Article 371 of the Constitution in respect of the areas of Development Boards for Vidarbha, Marathwada and the rest of Maharashtra. On 30 April 1994, the Governor of Maharashtra issued the "Development Boards for Vidarbha, Marathwada and the rest of Maharashtra Order, 1994" (hereinafter referred to as the Order) constituting separate Development Boards for the said three regions.

2. According to Rule 7 of the said Order, the Governor of Maharashtra has the special responsibility of ensuring equitable allocation of funds for development expenditure over the areas of Development Boards, subject to the requirements of the State as a whole.

3. According to Rule 8 of the said Order, the allocation of funds or outlays made by the Governor shall be reflected in the Annual Financial Statement to be placed before the State Legislature and the development activities with regard to the outlays as aforesaid, shall be carried out or caused to be carried out by the State Government and the funds so allocated shall be non-divertible from the area of one Board to that of another Board.

4. These Directives are issued in continuation of the Governor's Directives dated 6 March 2006, 1 March 2007 and 6 March 2008.

II Present status of irrigation backlog

5. Backlog in irrigation sector is being liquidated since it was identified by the Indicators and Backlog Committee in 1994 and the

Governor has been issuing Directives to the state government since 2001 for this purpose. In the first set of Directives of the Governor dated 15 December 2001, it was envisaged that the backlog assessed in 1994 by the Indicators and Backlog Committee would be liquidated in a time frame of 5 years i.e. by end of FY 2005-06. After review of the backlog removal at the end of this 5-year period, the time frame for removal of backlog was further extended by 4 years for the reasons elaborated in the Governor's directives of 6 March 2006. The Directives of 6 March 2006 aimed at liquidating the remaining backlog by end of FY 2009-10.

6. The backlog in the Irrigation sector was assessed in 1994 by the Indicators & Backlog Committee by using the then prevailing cost-norm of Rs. 50,000 per hectare. However, while finalising the region-wise backlog at the end of FY 1999-00 the Irrigation Department took into consideration the remaining cost of projects identified for backlog removal instead of uniform cost of Rs. 50,000 per hectare. This financial backlog has been taken as base while removing of backlog in subsequent years. The financial backlog in the subsequent years therefore has been calculated by deducting the expenditure incurred on backlog removal from the financial backlog as on 1 April 2000. Since the artificial distinction between backlog and non backlog funds was removed in the directives of 15 December 2001 and the funds for irrigation sector as a whole were distributed among the three regions, the expenditure for backlog removal in subsequent years has been estimated by multiplying the assigned weightage attached to backlog removal in the respective year to the expenditure incurred in the districts having backlog in irrigation. After deducting this estimated expenditure for removal of backlog, the remaining backlog has been worked out at the end of the respective years. This practice has since been followed while working out remaining backlog in the three regions at the end of each financial year. It may however be observed that actual expenditure on backlog removal in districts may not necessarily be in the same proportion of assigned weightage to backlog in the respective years. In some of the backlog districts, there has been more expenditure on backlog removal than that would have been by taking into consideration allocation on account of weightage to backlog factor in overall allocation. The reason for this is that the district's share in state's backlog is one of the factors to determine the weightage for allocation, therefore, higher the district's backlog means it has higher weightage in allocation and consequently it gets more funds than a similarly placed non-backlog district. More funds to a backlog district mean more backlog removal and hence the backlog factor of each backlog district is different. Moreover, some corrections have been applied for the allocation during 2007-08 on account of excess / shortfall in expenditure by the three regions during previous years. After applying these corrections to

various districts, it has been noted that their final allocations are not exactly in the same proportion as in the original outlay. Hence it is necessary to adjust the estimated expenditure on backlog removal in each district taking into account actual expenditure in that district. The methodology for the calculations of the backlog factors and estimated backlog expenditure for the backlog districts for the FY 2007-8 and FY 2008-9 are shown in the footnotes in statements at Annexure IA and IB. These statements show the actual backlog factors based on the actual expenditures in the backlog districts. By adopting this methodology the remaining backlog over the years till 2009 is shown in the statement at Annexure I.

7. While considering allocation for the backlog removal for the FY 2009-10, the entire remaining backlog as on 1 April 2009 needs to be removed in the FY 2009-10 as the time frame for removal of backlog as envisaged in the directives of 6 March 2006 stipulates that all the financial backlog will be removed by the end of FY 2009-10. The backlog as on 1 April 2009 as given in the statement at Annexure I has been taken as base for earmarking funds for backlog removal in the districts having financial backlog. In order to estimate the remaining backlog as on 1 April 2009, the expenditure figures provided by the Water Resources Department have been used. If there are any discrepancies in actual expenditure figures, the same shall be corrected while making allocations in the subsequent financial year.

8. It may be clarified that there is certain anomaly in using this methodology for calculation of the present quantum of financial backlog. While the basic cost norms as on 1st April 2000 have been taken into consideration for assessing the backlog, the financial backlog removed over the years have not been adjusted for inflation to arrive at quantum of the remaining backlog in the subsequent years. However, this is being done for the sake of expediency and with the expectation that this adjustment will be carried out at some later date. The primary focus, however, has been removal of the financial backlog.

9. The mismatch between the financial and physical backlog in the Irrigation sector might obviously occur as a result of the aforesaid anomaly, which has been dealt with in detail at Clause 7.12 of the Directives dated 15 December 2001. While giving emphasis on removal of financial backlog, it was then presumed that the entire financial backlog would be wiped out in the time frame of 5 years, i.e. by the end of FY 2005-6 and the fresh assessment of backlog by giving emphasis on physical backlog would be carried out subsequently. Since, the entire financial backlog was not liquidated within the stipulated time frame and the same was extended to FY 2009-10 in the Directives of 6 March 2006,

the above mentioned exercise is required to be carried out at later date or perhaps the whole concept of backlog estimation and approach towards balanced regional development itself may require serious review. **The Governor therefore contemplates constitution of committee of experts soon to review the approach to regional balanced development, concept of backlog and principles of allocation of state resources among the three regions.** More details on this are given in the section XI of these directives.

III Mismatch between allocations & expenditure and diversion of funds

10. Earlier there had been significant shortfalls and excess expenditures compared to allocations prescribed by the directives among the regions during the FY 2004-05 and FY 2005-06. The corrections on account of these distortions are being made in a phased manner over the period of 3 years as per the directives of 1 March 2007. These corrections were made with the view of compensating the regions having incurred shortfalls in expenditure vis-à-vis their allocated share from the allocations in the subsequent years of those regions having incurred excess expenditure, and also with a view that such distortions would not recur in future. However, the Governor has noted that these trends of excess expenditures in rest of Maharashtra region has continued even in the FY 2007-08 and FY 2008-09 with significant shortfalls in Vidarbha region during this period. Similar trends are also observed within the regions as well. It therefore appears that the funds from backlog districts have been used in non backlog districts resulting in a situation where there have been expenditure in excess of their due share in non-backlog districts at the cost of some of the backlog districts and backlog could not be removed despite the fact that adequate funds were indeed made available for liquidation of backlog. This trend of shortfalls and excess expenditures in certain regions amounts to diversion of funds from one region to the other. If such diversion of funds from one region to the other and from backlog district to non backlog district within the region had not happened, the entire remaining financial backlog in Vidarbha and Marathwada would have been fully wiped out by now.

11. The original allocations, expected and actual expenditures, extent of backlog removal and the remaining backlog of districts for the FY 2007-8 and FY 2008-9 have been shown in the statement at Annexure IA and IB respectively. While analysing the district wise expenditure during the financial years 2007-08 and 2008-09 and region wise unspent balances of the last 3 financial years (please refer to Annexure VI), it is noted that

- a) The backlog as on 01/04/2009 is concentrated only in Buldhana, Akola (including Washim) and Gadchiroli districts of Vidarbha and Jalna and Osmanabad districts in Marathwada.
- b) While Vidarbha has spent less than its allocation, rest of Maharashtra and Marathwada regions have spent substantially more than their respective allocations during FY 2007-08. Thus there has been significant excess expenditure in rest of Maharashtra region while there has been substantial shortfall in expenditure in Vidarbha region resulting in inequity in investments in irrigation among the three regions. The similar trend is seen within the region as well i.e. some of the districts have spent more than their due share at the cost of other districts particularly some of the backlog districts. Thus non-backlog districts have spent more at the cost of backlog districts. Similar situation is observed during FY 2008-09.
- c) Thus there have been significant continued deviations from the Governor's directives over the years. The Governor has noted with serious concern that in spite of the well-settled principles of allocation of funds to the regions, the actual expenditure does not comply with these directives. The Governor has further observed that this is a result of the lack of adequate control and monitoring mechanism for the distribution and expenditure of funds. This is also one of the major reasons for the delay in removal of backlog in spite of sufficient funds being made available year after year. **The Governor has, therefore, directed that the Planning Department should investigate into this to fix responsibility for the same as well as make recommendations to avoid such situations in future and submit the report to the Governor.**
- d) **The Governor has further directed that a committee under Principal Secretary, Planning Department with Principal Secretary, Finance Department and Secretary, Water Resources Department as its members should monitor the outlays, disbursement and expenditure in and within the three regions and establish an effective control mechanism to see that the directives are duly complied with. The Governor has further directed that the committee shall also ensure that due priority is given to the projects nearing completion as explained in para 46 for ensuring optimal utilization of resources.** The committee shall submit quarterly reports for information of the Governor.
- e) Since both Vidarbha and Marathwada have unspent balances with them all along the past 3 years and yet their

backlog remained to be liquidated, it implies that had these regions been able to use the funds available with them at the end of the respective years, their backlog would have significantly reduced or in some districts fully liquidated.

IV Equitable distribution of allocation in irrigation sector

12. The directives of 6 March 2006 stipulated a working calendar for the region-wise allocation of outlay with respective weightage to backlog, population, net sown area and on-going projects as given below. Although, the weightage to these factors are assigned in a phased manner in order to stagger the impact of high weightage to backlog over a period of four years, the weightages to these factors averages at 40, 25, 20, and 15 percent respectively.

Year	Weightage to:			
	Backlog	Population	Net sown area	On-going Projects
2006-07	25	40	20	15
2007-08	35	30	20	15
2008-09	45	20	20	15
2009-10	55	10	20	15

13. Considering that the backlog has significantly reduced from Rs. 6618.37 crore as on 1/4/2000 to Rs. 947.96 crore as on 1/4/2009 and the fact that the backlog is now concentrated only in 5 districts of Vidarbha and Marathwada, the Governor thought it appropriate to give concentrated attention to removal of backlog in those 5 districts. The Governor has also observed that Vidarbha and Marathwada regions have unspent balance of Rs. 264.46 crore and Rs. 322.03 crore (please refer to Annexure VI) respectively at the end of FY 2008-09 and had this unspent balance been utilized in these regions then the backlog at least to the extent of backlog factor would have been reduced. Now since the same unspent funds are available in the respective regions, the Governor, therefore, has directed that the unspent balance available in Vidarbha and Marathwada regions should be earmarked to the backlog districts of the respective regions. This would ensure that the remaining backlog is reduced in proportion to the backlog factor as explained in Annexure VIB. Thereafter, an amount equal to the remaining backlog of Rs. 659.37 crore shall be earmarked to these 5 districts as the first charge from the current year's allocation. These funds shall be earmarked exclusively for these districts having backlog and the Government shall ensure that neither would these be diverted to any other district nor allowed to lapse. This approach would,

therefore, ensure that the entire backlog is liquidated on priority, preferably during the current financial year itself.

14. After earmarking requisite funds for the backlog removal as explained above, the Governor has directed that the remaining allocations shall be distributed as per the average weightage assigned to remaining factors (other than backlog) viz. population, net sown area and cost of on going projects. The weighted average of these factors for the three regions have been worked out and explained in the statements at Annexure III A and Annexure III B.

15. Now, the Planning Department by its communication dated 25-05-09 has indicated that the overall allocation available for the Irrigation sector in the Annual Plan of FY 2009-10 is **Rs. 8170.71 crore**. However, the divisible outlay allocated to Water Resources Department is **Rs. 6777.83 crore**, which includes **Rs. 177.83 crore** for TSP. Since allocation for TSP has been excluded from the allocation principles prescribed in these directives as explained in para 18, the divisible outlay allocated to the Water Resources Department is **Rs. 6600 crore**. Out of this, an outlay of **Rs. 659.37 crore** has to be kept aside and earmarked for the backlog districts exclusively as explained in para 13 which is in addition to the unspent balances available as on 31/03/2009 with the regions. The remaining funds would be available for distribution among three regions as per the average weightage of three factors i.e. population, net sown area and cost of ongoing projects as given in Annexure IIIB.

16. The distortions in expenditure in FY 2004-05 & FY 2005-06 and allocation to make up excess outlay under Marathwada package is however required to be made good as explained in Directives of 6 March 2008. These shortfalls/excess expenditures were planned to be made good in a phased manner in three years from FY 2007-8 to FY 2009-10. The details of the corrections to be made to the allocations to the three regions have been explained in the statements at Annexure IVA, IVB and IVC. Further, the shortfalls/excess expenditures during FY 2006-07, FY 2007-08 and FY 2008-09 are also required to be made good. There have been no significant aberrations in the expenditure during FY 2006-07 as seen from the statement at Annexure VA and hence no correction would be required. However, there have been significant excess/shortfalls in the expenditures for the FY 2007-08 and FY 2008-09 as seen in the statements at Annexure VB and Annexure VC. In addition to this all the three regions have unspent balances as shown in Annexure VI. These balances have to be treated as deemed expenditure for the purpose of calculating shortfalls and excess expenditure since these funds are physically available with these regions. The details of the shortfalls and excess expenditures during the FY 2007-08 & 2008-09 and the necessary corrections required on account of these

shortfalls and excess expenditures for the three regions have been explained in the Annexure VD. The Governor has, however, noted that it may not be desirable to make all these corrections at one go in the current financial year itself because this would adversely affect the ongoing projects in the rest of Maharashtra region and it would also be difficult for the state to safeguard its interests before the Krishna Water Disputes Tribunal. The Governor has therefore directed that the corrections on account of excess expenditure of the financial year 2007-08 and 2008-09 and unspent balances as on 31/03/09 should be deferred and adjusted in the next 2 years equally. These adjustments have been shown in the Annexure VD.

17. The region wise allocation in the annual plan 2009-10 taking into account the allocations kept aside for the removal of backlog and the balance funds being allocated as per the weightages of three factors i.e. population, net sown area and balance cost of projects and after making good the shortfalls and excess expenditures during the plan years from FY 2004-05 & FY 2005-06 and Marathwada package have been given in the statement at Annexure VIII. These allocations are over and above the unspent balances as on 31/03/09 available with the three regions.

V Allocation of outlay under Tribal Sub-Plan

18. The distribution of the funds in the Irrigation sector among the three regions is primarily based on the formula prescribed in the directives and explained above namely; backlog, population, net sown area and balance cost of ongoing irrigation projects. The Tribal Development Department has however submitted that the funds under Tribal Sub-Plan (TSP/OTSP) are distributed on the basis of tribal population and area under the TSP and therefore the distribution of funds under Tribal Sub-Plan should be treated on different footing not linked to removal of backlog and therefore excluded from the Governor's directives. The Planning Department after examining this issue has suggested that the irrigation funds in the Tribal Sub-Plan may be distributed on the basis of tribal population and area under Tribal Sub-Plan in the respective region with 50% weightage each. After taking into account the recommendations of the Planning Department as well as submission by the Tribal Development Department the Governor has however directed that the funds under TSP/OTSP should be distributed on the basis of population and area under TSP in accordance with the policies of the Tribal Development Department in this regard and the allocation for irrigation sector under TSP/OTSP may be excluded from the formula prescribed in this Directives as well as any other restrictions in this Directives linked to backlog removal. Further, sectoral distribution of funds under TSP/OTSP among the regions should also be excluded from any restrictions under these Directives

and should be done in accordance with the policies in this regard of the Tribal Development Department.

VI Requirements of inter-state projects

19. Rule 7(5) (vii) of the Development Boards for Vidarbha, Marathwada and rest of Maharashtra Order 1994 provides that while working out the likely amount for development expenditure and its subsequent distribution amongst the three regions by the Governor, due consideration shall be given to the amounts required for expenditure related to implementation of Inter-State Agreements or Inter-State Awards and court decisions. The State Government had earlier while issuing directives for FY 2008-9, informally approached the Governor and indicated that the storage of 52 TMC water out of Maharashtra's total share of 560 TMC water in Krishna river basin is yet to be created for which an outlay of Rs.1750 crore is required to be provided over a period of three years to the Maharashtra Krishna Valley Development Corporation and failure to do so is likely to jeopardize Maharashtra's interests before the second Krishna Water Disputes Tribunal. The state government had therefore requested the Governor to provide an increased allocation for Krishna valley projects over 2-3 years under Rule 7(5) (vii) for safeguarding state's interests before the Tribunal.

20. While considering the request of the state government for increased allocation for Krishna valley projects, the Governor had found that there were certain discrepancies in the data on storages created in the Krishna river basin submitted by the Water Resources Department and the Annual reports of the Maharashtra Krishna Valley Irrigation Development Corporation. These discrepancies made it difficult to assess correct quantum of funds required for Krishna valley projects in order to safeguard the interests of the state. As per para 7.6 of the Directives, of 6 March 2008, Maharashtra Water Resources Regulatory Authority (MWRRA) was therefore directed to validate the data on reporting of storages created in Krishna valley. The MWRRA has since submitted its report to the Governor in July 2008. The MWRRA has now reported that the factual position communicated by MKVDC that there was balance storage of 52 TMC yet to be created as on 1 June 2007 in Krishna Valley to fulfil state's commitments is correct. The MWRRA has further mentioned in its report that the scaling down of achievement as reported in the 9th and 10th Annual Reports of MKVDC may be accepted as technical error of misreporting. The MWRRA has therefore recommended in its report that the Water Resources Department may develop guidelines for correct reporting of storage creation every year by June 30 on the lines of minor irrigation projects vide GR dated 4 October 1969 by the concerned Executive Engineer to avoid such misreporting in future. The Governor has

desired that the state government should implement this recommendation of the MWRRA.

21. The MWRRA was also asked to work out the funds required for completing the required balance storages to fulfil state's commitment before the Tribunal and also identify the list of projects for the same. The MWRRA in its report has identified the list of projects for creation of balance storages to fulfil state's commitment as well as estimated the requirement of the funds for the same at **Rs. 1717 crore**. While emphasising in its report that MKVDC may be provided Rs. 1717 crore over 3 years to create the balance 52.384 TMC storages, the MWRRA has also submitted the year-wise programme for utilisation of Rs.1717 crore for creation of 52.384 TMC storage which is given at Annexure VII.

22. Pending reconciliation of the data on storages by the MWRRA, the Governor had in his directives of 6 March 2008 allocated **Rs. 375 crore** in the FY 2008-9 for the MKVDC towards fulfilling the State's commitment before the Tribunal. Further, in the supplementaries during FY 2008-09, the Governor had further allocated **Rs. 375 crore** to MKVDC for the same purpose. Therefore, a major share of the commitment has already been provided. **The Governor has therefore observed that out of the funds allocated to the rest of Maharashtra region during the current year, the state government would be able to take care of the its commitment before the Tribunal and safeguard the interests of the state. The Governor has however directed that the Government should prioritise its requirements keeping in view the projects identified by MWRRA as mentioned in para 21 and utilise this allocations properly so that the state's interests are safeguarded.**

23. The Governor has, therefore, observed that similar to the requirements of Krishna valley projects, other river basins viz. Godavari and Tapi which are governed by inter-state Awards or bilateral Agreements also require due consideration. In case of Godavari river basin, the total water available for the state is yet to be fully planned especially in Vidarbha region. Further, the river basins in Konkan, although not covered under inter-sate Award, also require due consideration. It is also necessary to give due consideration to the requirement of the barrages in Marathwada region. The Governor has, therefore, observed that out of the funds available to the three regions (other than the funds earmarked for backlog removal) the state government should be able to spend as per the priority to fulfil the requirements of implementing the inter-state Award for Godavari, bilateral agreement for Tapi river basins, irrigation projects in Konkan and barrages in Marathwada region.

VII Irrigation Backlog in Amravati Division

24. The backlog in irrigation sector is mainly concentrated in Vidarbha particularly in three districts of Amravati revenue division. These districts in Amravati division are also affected by farmers' suicides and rural distress. The Governor has been giving very high priority for removal of irrigation backlog in Amravati division. The Governor has observed that although funds is not a constraint in Amravati division, but the lack of capacity to absorb the funds on irrigation projects for various reasons has been a cause for concern. It was in this background the Governor in his earlier Directives had asked the state government to address some of the issues of governance, which come in the way for removal of backlog.

25. The Governor had identified various bottlenecks which hamper removal of backlog in Amravati division that mainly include-lack of sufficient number of project at hand especially in the districts of Akola and Washim for removal of backlog; delays in implementation of projects on account of environmental and forests clearances as major portion of the area is under the forests; governance related issues such as giving timely approvals, expediting land acquisition process, strengthening of the investigation circle, creating dedicated wing for monitoring and implementation of projects, follow up with the central agencies for speedy approvals from the government of India, filling up of large number of vacancies on the field, etc. The Governor also prescribed the time bound programme prepared by the Water Resources Department for completing on going projects and taking up new projects so that the backlog in Amravati division is liquidated by 2010.

26. The Governor has noted with satisfaction some of the measures taken by the state government to address the above-mentioned bottlenecks. The Irrigation Projects Investigation Circle of Water Resources Department (WRD) in Amravati division, which was closed sometime 2 years back, has now been re-established. Further, 4 divisions and 14 sub-divisions have also been shifted to Amravati from other various places. Besides, an additional regular division of the WRD has also been set up in Amravati. The responsibility of reviewing the progress of works under backlog in Amravati division has been entrusted to an independent Chief Engineer (Chief Engineer, Special Projects Amravati). The state government has also delegated powers of according administrative approvals to Vidarbha Irrigation Development Corporation to facilitate timely approvals to the projects. Further, the state government has delegated authority of giving water availability certificates for 6 districts both the Nagpur and Amravati divisions to the Chief Engineers to avoid delays in giving these certificates for irrigation projects in Vidarbha. The state government has also taken

steps to fill up the posts of land acquisition officers in Amravati division. These measures would certainly help to expedite implementation of projects there in Amravati division. The state government has also appointed Technical Advisor and Coordinator for coordinating between state government and the central agencies. The state government has also constituted state level Impact Assessment Authority for expediting environmental clearances process.

27. In order to put backlog removal in Amravati division on mission mode the Governor has also given MWRRRA the responsibility to monitor implementation of projects in Amravati division. MWRRRA has since been monitoring the project implementation and taking periodic reviews of Water Resources and Rural Development Departments. The Governor's office has also been taking quarterly review of the MWRRRA, WRD, Finance and Planning Departments on the progress of implementation of projects in Amravati division. Although as result of some of these measures by the Governor's office and the state government, quantum of expenditure in the irrigation sector in the Amravati division has increased from Rs. 212 crore in the FY 2002-3 to Rs. 1051 crore in FY 2007-8 and Rs. 1851 crore in FY 2008-9 there are still some significant measures that are necessary to be taken up by the state government.

28. The state government should follow up on top priority approvals for diversion of forests lands with the central agencies for projects in Vidarbha particularly major projects in that region for removal of backlog. It is also necessary for the state government to take up issue of minor irrigation projects having culturable command area up to 2000 ha. for exemption from environmental clearances and clearance for medium projects having culturable command area less than 10000 ha. at state level Environmental Impact Assessment Authority. This would help in many minor and medium projects to take off expeditiously in Amravati division.

29. The Governor has observed that the most of the irrigation projects in Amravati are under Accelerated Irrigation Benefit Programme (AIBP). However, there are problems in timely release of central funds under the scheme. As most of the irrigation projects in Vidarbha in irrigation sector as well as under prime Minister's special package for Amravati are under AIBP, these delays adversely affect implementation of these projects. Therefore the state government should make appropriate arrangements to bridge the gap between central and state share pending release of central grants under AIBP and claim the share from the central government in due course of time. Non- disbursement of outlays to projects in Vidarbha on account of delay in release of central grants under AIBP would

result in a situation where the allocation made by the Governor in the Directives would remain only on paper.

30. The Governor has also observed that although priority to committed expenditure in projects in Vidarbha is not diluted, it is necessary to take up new projects in Godavari river basin in Vidarbha at least to the extent that the projects are given administrative approvals for the purpose of obtaining statutory clearances so that adequate projects are there on shelf in order to ensure long term planning for full utilisation of available water in Vidarbha. Having a shelf of projects is essential as many projects in Vidarbha need environmental and forests clearances and this process takes a long time. The state government should take all necessary steps to create a shelf of projects, which can be taken up in future. Further, the state government shall make adequate provision for meeting out the expenditure towards seeking the statutory clearances while making work wise budget as explained in para 46. This is essential for ensuring continuity in long term planning in development of irrigation in Vidarbha especially in Godavari river basin where there is balance water available and planning of storages creation is yet to be made so that these projects would be available for implementation in due course. These projects, of course, can be started after receipt of statutory clearance subject to availability of funds without diluting the priority to ongoing projects for removal of backlog. The Planning Department however in consultation with WRD and MWRRA should devise an appropriate policy to ensure that optimal number of projects is there on shelf. Further the shelf of projects need not be too large to put strain on the existing limited resources.

31. For removal of backlog in Akola (including Washim) district, which comes under Tapi river basin, it is necessary for the state government to take appropriate steps to make sufficient water available in Tapi river basin of Amravati division and those projects implemented in mission mode. MWRRA has advised the Water Resources Department to take up the issue of additional share of water in Tapi basin to Maharashtra State with Central Water Commission and co-basin states of Madhya Pradesh & Gujarat. The Governor is also of the view that the State Government should approach CWC & Madhya Pradesh Government and try to get increased share of water in Tapi for the State so that adequate water is made available in Tapi river basin for projects in Amravati division. The additional share in the water of Tapi river basin so obtained would go a long way in liquidating the Irrigation backlog in Amravati Division.

32. The time bound programme for the liquidation of physical & financial backlog of Amravati division for the years 2008-09 to 2010-

11 as submitted by the Water Resources Department by letter dated 4 February 2008, which was made part of the Directives of 6 March 2008, shall be strictly adhered to by the Water Resources Department. The utilization of funds on the irrigation projects for liquidation of backlog as proposed in the said action plan for Amravati division shall be closely monitored by the Water Resources Department and all attempts should be made to achieve the desired results. Further, the Water Resources Department should adequately strengthen the project implementation mechanism in Amravati Division so that the outlays allocated for projects in Amravati Division are fully utilized.

33. The Governor has observed that in the action plan prepared by the WRD to liquidate backlog in Amravati division, there is significant role for the Water Conservation Department particularly minor irrigation projects. The Water Conservation Department (WCD) should ensure that adequate projects are undertaken in Amravati division for liquidating the backlog. For this, WCD should prepare a time bound programme of undertaking survey, ascertaining availability of water, issuing water certificates, assessing overall available potential for taking up projects, and developing schemes for approvals. This should be done in mission mode and the department should submit to the Governor such comprehensive programme in Amravati division and strictly monitor its implementation. The Governor has also directed that all the vacancies of the field officers such as deputy engineers, section engineer etc. in the backlog districts shall be filled up on priority. The Governor has further observed that the WCD should also ensure proper scientific mix of various components of water conservation viz. flow irrigation, land development and soil conservation in order to ensure sustainability of the programme under backlog removal. The Governor has further directed that the government should take measures to delegate powers of according administrative approvals and revised administrative approvals, to the extent of backlog removal, to the concerned administrative department (WCD) in Mantralaya on similar lines as has been done by the WRD in respect of projects under its jurisdiction. The joint efforts of WRD and Water Conservation Department would help in achieving the target of removal of backlog as envisaged by the action plan.

VIII Irrigation backlog in Marathwada region

34. The backlog in Marathwada region is concentrated in the districts of Jalna and Osmanabad. This would be largely taken care of by earmarking the unspent balance of the region as on 31/03/09 only in these two districts.

35. The Water Resources Department should prepare an action plan for liquidation of physical & financial backlog in these 2 districts of Marathwada on the lines of the time bound action plan prepared for Amravati division and submit the same to the Governor. The Governor has directed that the State Government should strictly implement the programme so prepared by the Water Resources Department. The Governor has further directed that Maharashtra Water Resources Regulatory Authority should monitor implementation of the financial & physical programme prepared by the Water Resources Department for liquidation of backlog in these districts of Marathwada Region within the stipulated time-frame and submit periodic reports to the Governor.

IX Allocation for Irrigation Sector in the Annual Plan 2009-10

36. In the background of what has been stated and to ensure that no further backlog is created while the existing backlog is being liquidated, the Governor has directed that the Annual Plan outlays in the Annual Plan 2009-10 for Irrigation Sector shall be made in the following manner: -

(1) From the divisible outlay in the overall allocation in the Irrigation sector as a whole, which includes both the budgetable and non-budgetable outlay an allocation of Rs. **659.37** crore shall first be earmarked to the 5 backlog districts i.e. Jalna, Osmanabad, Buldhana, Akola (including Washim) and Gadchiroli for the removal of backlog.

(2) Thereafter the remaining allocation (after earmarking funds for backlog removal) and after adjusting the corrections as explained in Annexure IVB and Annexure IVC, should be distributed on the basis of weighted average as specified in Annexure IIIB.

37. Therefore, the region wise final allocation (Rs. Crore) is given in a table below. The unspent balance available with the three regions as shown in Annexure VI would also be available over and above these allocations.

Region	Allocation (Rs. In crore)
Vidarbha	2791.82
Marathwada	1201.03
Rest of Maharashtra	2607.15
Total	6600.00

38. Further, should the State Government, resort to market borrowings, outside the budget, for the irrigation sector, money so raised should be for the State Government as a whole and

distributed amongst the three Development Boards equitably as indicated above.

39. After deducting allocation for the Irrigation Sector, funds for removal of backlog in other backlog sectors, and the allocations under the TSP/OTSP, the divisible portion of the remaining Plan outlays should be distributed amongst the three regions in proportion to the overall population of the respective regions. Within this region wise allocation of remaining plan outlays, there would however be flexibility to have sector wise distribution among the three regions depending upon the needs and development opportunities of respective regions in those sectors. It thus means that region wise allocation of a sector and schemes under the sector need not necessarily be strictly based on population proportion of respective regions and there would be flexibility in distributing the sectoral outlays among the three regions and schemes under the sectors among the three regions keeping in view the special needs of the regions and opportunities for developments for the regions in various sectors. However, the sum total of all the sectoral outlays for a region taken together should be within the overall ceiling of the share of respective regions in the remaining plan outlays which are distributed in proportion of overall population of respective regions.

40. The Governor has further directed that the priority to committed expenditure in irrigation sector should not be diluted by taking up new projects. An exception can be made where new projects may be taken up if they are absolutely necessary for removal of financial backlog. However as explained in para 30, this condition is relaxed for irrigation projects in Godavari river basin in Vidarbha and new projects in Godavari river basin of Vidarbha are allowed only to the extent that the projects are given administrative approval along with necessary budget provision, for the purpose of obtaining statutory clearances so that adequate projects are there on shelf in order to ensure long term planning for full utilization of available water in the region. These projects, however, may not be implemented to avoid thinning of resources, as the requirement of funds for the already on-going projects is quite huge. The emphasis should be on checking the "spreading thin" approach and ensuring completion of projects with optimum utilization of resources. This restriction on taking up new projects except for removal of backlog is however not applicable to irrigation projects undertaken under Tribal Sub-Plan.

41. Further, the Governor has observed that there is a need to check the "spreading thin" approach and set the priorities of the projects especially keeping in view the huge cost of ongoing projects in all the regions and limited available resources. This

thinning of resources over a large number of projects has implicit cost of time overruns as well as the opportunity cost to the end users due to delay in completion of many projects running into years. **The Governor has, therefore, directed that the Planning Department shall commission a detailed study of the cost and time overrun of the ongoing irrigation projects in the state and submit the report to the Governor within 6 months.**

42. While reporting the expenditure figures at the end of the financial year, the Planning Department shall separately indicate region wise expenditure under each category viz. funds for irrigation sector, funds for backlog removal for all sectors other than irrigation sector, funds under the TSP/OTSP, and the remaining plan allocation (i.e. after deducting irrigation funds, funds for backlog removal, and funds under the TSP/OTSP from the overall divisible plan funds available for distribution among the three regions explained in para 36). This will help to know as to what is the extent of shortfalls and excess expenditure vis-à-vis the allocations for each of the above categories viz. irrigation funds, funds for backlog removal and remaining plan outlays which are distributed in proportion of the population of respective regions.

43. There shall be no diversion of funds from backlog districts to non-backlog districts and from the area of one Development Board to another without prior approval of the Governor.

44. The allocations indicated in these Directives are on the basis of what has been indicated by the State Government. Should the allocation for irrigation sector over and above the allocations covered in these Directives increase subsequently, the additional funds shall be distributed among the regions in accordance to the same proportion specified in Annexure IIIB.

45. The disbursement of outlay in the Irrigation sector in the Annual Plan 2009-10 should be strictly in accordance with the region-wise percentages stipulated at Annexure VIII in the directives. Further, release of funds to the three regions shall be in proportion to their respective allocations.

46. It is also noticed that in absence of work-wise allocation at the time of budget sanctioning and the subsequent delays in doing so, the expenditure is not incurred in desired proportion and manner. Therefore in order to ensure effective utilization of funds and timely completion of projects, the Governor has directed that, the allocation for Irrigation sector should be budgeted work-wise at the beginning of the financial year itself and it should be made part of the budget documents. While making work-wise allocations, the Governor has directed that priority shall be accorded to the

projects nearing completion so that their benefits reach the farmers in immediate future. Further, the Governor has directed that due priority should also be accorded to the utilisation of the storages so that the benefits actually reach the end-user.

47. As per the provisions of Section 11 (f) and Section 21 (1) & (2) of Maharashtra Water Resources Regulatory Authority Act, 2005, the Maharashtra Water Resources Regulatory Authority has been entrusted with the responsibility of monitoring the implementation of the Governor's directives. In consonance with the aforesaid provisions of the Maharashtra Water Resources Regulatory Authority Act, 2005, MWRA should continue to take a periodic review of the implementation of these Directives and submit quarterly report for information of the Governor.

48. In addition to this the guidelines laid down by earlier Directives in respect of allocation of non-budgetable outlay, decentralization of powers to give approvals and divisible and non-divisible plan outlays and the guidelines prescribed by the Directives dated 6 March 2006 in respect of committed expenditure, projects under NABARD and AIBP and DPAP areas stand as they are. It is also reiterated that the Development Boards should be involved in determining priority and identification of the projects for liquidation of backlog by the Irrigation Development Corporations and the Government to ensure meaningful participation of the Boards in the functioning of these corporations.

X. Governance issues

49. In the Directives of 1 March 2007, the Governor had expressed anxiety over issues of governance in backward areas and desired that the issues such as delegation of powers, adequacy of staff, flow of funds and logistic support and other issues of governance be addressed on top priority. The issues of governance wield more importance in view of the fact that the backlog, which is to be liquidated by FY 2009-10, is largely concentrated in three districts of Amravati Division where there is an obvious mismatch between the projects in hand and the projects actually required for the removal of backlog. For the process of timely completion of on-going projects and starting up of new projects to be effective, the governance issues such as providing adequate staff, expediting land acquisition and rehabilitation process and setting up an effective monitoring mechanism are adequately addressed on an urgent basis. Therefore, while appreciating measures taken by the government on these issues in the recent past, the Governor reiterates his concern and expectations in this regard as expressed in para 6.9 of the Directives of 1 March 2007.

XI. Principle of allocation of funds in future

50. After liquidation of the current financial backlog as estimated in 1994, there may be an option of assessing the backlog created after 1st April 1994 till date by using the same indicators suggested by the Indicators and Backlog Committee. The drawback of this arrangement is that the issue of backlog remains open-ended and dynamic. The reason being after liquidation of existing financial backlog the state average is bound to increase and some districts are bound to remain below the state average. Thus, the process of removal of backlog based on the concept of state average becomes a never ending process not necessarily need based.

51. Considering the fact that the backlog of 1994 is expected to be liquidated by the year 2010 i.e. almost after 16 years, it would be difficult to envisage a fixed time frame for liquidation of backlog created after 1994. The cost and time overruns involved in the process might complicate the matter further. Therefore, even after liquidating the financial backlog, the physical backlog of 1994 may be difficult to be liquidated without putting significant stain on financial planning of the state. Over the years a large share of the state funds has been allocated to irrigation perhaps by ignoring the legitimate claims of other social sectors thereby distorting the state planning. Too much emphasis on one sector at the cost of other sectors is not desirable.

52. The Indicators & Backlog committee had taken into account only the public investments ignoring the private sector from its analysis. But, under the emerging new economic scenario, the role of the private sector in sectors such as infrastructure (roads and irrigation) cannot be ignored. Now it is imperative to revisit issue of assessment of backlog in the light of the new developments in the socio economic fields.

53. The present methodology focusing on backlog estimation which stipulates that all the regions are to be brought to the same level of development does not take into account the needs and development opportunities of the regions in order to achieve balanced regional development. In the present system, for instance while some weightage has been given for the ongoing projects for allocation to irrigation sector, there is hardly any scope for harnessing the untapped irrigation potential of a particular region.

54. There has not been any impact assessment study of the efforts to liquidate the irrigation backlog in terms of better returns to the farmers, improved quality of life and inclusive growth. It is imperative to ensure that the efforts taken under the provisions of Article 371 (2), take the development initiatives to the logical conclusion. **The**

Governor has, therefore, directed that the Planning Department should commission an independent impact assessment study and submit the report to him.

55. In view of above discussion the Governor is of the view that it is imperative to revisit the issue of backlog and the issue of equitable distribution of developmental expenditure with fresh insight and explore alternate ways of ensuring equitable allocation of resources. The Governor therefore contemplates constitution of a committee of experts to look into these issues and review the issue of balanced regional development as per its recommendations and considering the views of other stakeholders as well. Till such time, the allocation principle followed in these directives may continue.

By order and in the name of the Governor of Maharashtra,


(Shrikant Deshpande)

**Raj Bhavan, Mumbai
Date: 27 May 2009.**

Secretary to the Governor

Annexure- I

Comparative position of financial backlog in the Irrigation sector as on 1 April 1994, 1 April 2000, 1 April 2002, 1 April 2007, 1 April 2008 and 1 April 2009.

(Rs. in crore)

Sr. No.	Region	Backlog as on 1/4/1994	Backlog as on 1/4/2000	Backlog as on 1/4/2002	Backlog as on 1/4/2007	Backlog as on 1/4/2008	Backlog as on 1/4/2009
1	Vidarbha	4083.00 (55.04%)	3956.50 (59.78%)	3422.11 (62.2%)	2490.09 (77.55%)	1874.19 (82.13%)	788.76 (83.21%)
2	Marathwada	2401.00 (32.37%)	2173.96 (32.85%)	1821.06 (33.10%)	720.65 (22.45%)	407.76 (17.87%)	159.20 (16.79%)
3	Rest of Maharashtra	934.0 (12.59%)	487.91 (7.37%)	258.50 (4.71%)	0.00 (0.00%)	0.00	0.00
	Total	7418.00 (100%)	6618.37 (100%)	5501.67 (100%)	3210.75 (100%)	2281.96 (100%)	947.96 (100%)

Footnote:

1. Backlog as on 1994 was assessed by Indicators and Backlog Committee 1994 by cost norm of Rs. 50,000 per hectare.
2. Irrigation Department had finalised the financial backlog as on 1 April 2000 in the Irrigation sector, and communicated by Planning Department by letter dated 11 October 2001, by taking into consideration the remaining cost of projects identified for backlog removal instead of uniform cost of Rs.50,000 per hectare.
3. The backlog as on 1 April 2002 has been obtained by deducting the expenditure on backlog removal in irrigation sector from the backlog as on 1 April 2000.
4. The backlog as on 1 April 2007 has been obtained by deducting the expenditure incurred on backlog removal (i.e. by multiplying the assigned weightage attached to backlog removal in the respective year to the expenditure incurred) from the backlog as on 1 April 2006.
5. The backlog as on 1 April 2008 has been obtained by deducting the estimated expenditure incurred on backlog removal from the backlog as on 1 April 2007. Further explanation is given in annexure IA.
6. The backlog as on 1 April 2009 has been obtained by deducting the estimated expenditure for backlog removal in the backlog districts in FY 2008-9 from the backlog as on 1 April 2008. Further explanation is given in annexure IB.

Annexure I-A

Statement showing district-wise backlog, expenditure, excess / shortfall in expenditure, backlog removed during financial year 2007-08 and remaining backlog as on 01/04/2008

(Rs. In core)

District	Remaining Backlog as on 1/4/07	Proposed outlay as per the Governor's directives	Expenditure in 2007-08	Expenditure after adjusting corrections	Share of District in total Expenditure (%)	Share of District in original Outlay (%)	Excess / Shortfall in expenditure	Backlog factor %	Backlog removed during the year	Remaining Backlog as on 1/4/08
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
		See Footnote 1		See Footnote 3	Col 5 / Total of Col 5 * 100	See Footnote 2	(Col6 -Col7) * Total of Col 4 / 100	Refer footnote 6	Col4 * Col9 / 100	Col2 - Col10
Thane	0.00	82.75	36.50	87.69	1.83	3.31	(-) 70.96	0.00	0.00	0.00
Raigad	0.00	25.87	27.92	43.92	0.92	1.03	(-) 5.67	0.00	0.00	0.00
Ratnagiri	0.00	26.68	116.66	133.16	2.78	1.07	82.02	0.00	0.00	0.00
Sindhudurg	0.00	26.80	150.27	166.85	3.48	1.07	115.47	0.00	0.00	0.00
Konkan	0.00	162.10	331.35	431.62	9.00	6.48	120.86	0.00	0.00	0.00
Nashik	0.00	75.85	135.27	182.19	3.80	3.03	36.77	0.00	0.00	0.00
Dhule (including Nandurbar)	0.00	69.06	200.98	243.70	5.08	2.76	111.31	0.00	0.00	0.00
Jalgaon	0.00	84.45	117.25	169.49	3.53	3.37	7.59	0.00	0.00	0.00
Ahmednagar	0.00	78.12	85.44	133.76	2.79	3.12	(-) 16.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Nashik Division	0.00	307.48	538.94	729.13	15.20	12.28	139.68	0.00	0.00	0.00
Pune	0.00	111.98	209.41	278.68	5.81	4.47	64.01	0.00	0.00	0.00
Satara	0.00	76.13	125.31	172.40	3.59	3.04	26.46	0.00	0.00	0.00
Sangali	0.00	75.53	64.71	111.42	2.32	3.02	(-) 33.37	0.00	0.00	0.00
Solapur	0.00	78.29	48.01	96.43	2.01	3.13	(-) 53.65	0.00	0.00	0.00
Kolhapur	0.00	59.99	100.51	137.62	2.87	2.40	22.61	0.00	0.00	0.00
Pune Division	0.00	401.92	547.94	796.55	16.60	16.06	26.06	0.00	0.00	0.00
Aurangabd	53.03	117.77	197.16	184.23	3.84	2.59	60.05	22.34	44.04	8.99
Jalana	532.74	329.54	285.35	249.18	5.19	7.24	(-) 98.29	80.20	228.84	303.90

District	Remainin g Backlog as on 1/4/07	Proposed outlay as per the Governor's directives	Expenditure in 2007-08	Expenditure after adjusting corrections	Share of District in total Expenditure (%)	Share of District in original Outlay (%)	Excess / Shortfall in expenditure	Backlog factor %	Backlog removed during the year	Remaining Backlog as on 1/4/08
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
		See Footnote 1		See Footnote 3	Col 5 / Total of Col 5 * 100	See Footnote 2	(Col6 -Col7) * Total of Col 4 / 100	Refer footnote 6	Col4 * Col9 / 100	Col2 - Col10
Parbhani (including Hingoli)	0.00	83.43	157.58	148.42	3.09	1.83	60.46	0.00	0.00	0.00
Beed	0.00	83.15	75.38	66.26	1.38	1.83	(-) 21.41	0.00	0.00	0.00
Nanded	0.00	104.83	232.76	221.25	4.61	2.30	110.72	0.00	0.00	0.00
Osmanabad	123.42	125.11	58.34	44.61	0.93	2.75	(-) 87.30	48.94	28.55	94.87
Latur	11.45	69.43	212.47	204.85	4.27	1.53	131.64	8.18	17.38	0.00
Marathwada	720.65	913.25	1219.05	1118.79	23.32	20.07	155.88	39.15	318.81	407.76
Buldhana	867.11	610.29	287.57	169.40	3.53	12.15	(-) 413.47	77.81	223.76	643.35
Akola (including Washim)	693.38	478.27	73.04	-19.56	-0.41	9.52	(-) 476.35	79.40	57.99	635.39
Amravati	874.02	0.00	352.08	240.78	5.02	11.44	(-) 308.24	83.27	293.17	580.85
Yavatmal	36.30	574.84	338.61	305.69	6.37	3.38	143.32	11.69	39.59	0.00
Amravati Div	2470.80	1833.41	1051.30	696.32	14.51	36.49	(-) 1054.75	73.80	614.51	1859.59
Wardha	0.00	60.37	251.88	240.20	5.01	1.20	182.54	0.00	0.00	0.00
Nagpur	0.00	112.95	116.32	94.45	1.97	2.25	(-) 13.43	0.00	0.00	0.00
Bhandara (including Gondia)	0.00	97.42	354.10	335.23	6.99	1.94	242.19	0.00	0.00	0.00
Chandrapur	0.00	113.88	365.93	343.88	7.17	2.27	235.11	0.00	0.00	0.00
Gadchiroli	19.28	48.39	21.44	12.07	0.25	0.96	(-) 34.15	21.82	4.68	14.61
Nagpur Division	19.28	433.01	1109.66	1025.82	21.38	8.62	612.26	2.44	4.68	14.61
Vidarbha	2490.09	2266.42	2160.96	1722.14	35.89	43.97	(-) 387.64	60.17	619.19	1874.19
Marathwada	720.65	913.25	1219.05	1118.79	23.32	21.22	100.61	39.15	318.81	407.76
Rest of	0.00	871.49	1418.22	1957.30	40.79	34.81	287.04	0.00	0.00	0.00

District	Remaining Backlog as on 1/4/07	Proposed outlay as per the Governor's directives	Expenditure in 2007-08	Expenditure after adjusting corrections	Share of District in total Expenditure (%)	Share of District in original Outlay (%)	Excess / Shortfall in expenditure	Backlog factor %	Backlog removed during the year	Remaining Backlog as on 1/4/08
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
		See Footnote 1		See Footnote 3	Col 5 / Total of Col 5 * 100	See Footnote 2	(Col6 -Col7) * Total of Col 4 / 100	Refer footnote 6	Col4 * Col9 / 100	Col2 - Col10
Maharashtra										
Total	3210.74	4051.16	4798.23	4798.23	100.00	100.00	0.00	42.49	938.00	2281.96

Footnote:

- District-wise proposed outlay has been worked out as per the allocation principle laid down in the directives of 1 March 2007. However, the latest figures of remaining backlog (as on 01/04/07) have been used against the 01/04/06 figures used in the directives of 1 March 2007. Therefore, the district-wise weightages have been reworked and differ slightly from the earlier directives.
- Share of a district outlay has been calculated on the basis of its share in the state regarding backlog, net sown area, population and cost of ongoing projects.
- District-wise corrections have been calculated on the basis of district's share in the region and adjusted accordingly to arrive at the amount in column 5.
- During the year, the backlog factor of the state for the original outlay is 35%. Therefore, out of the original outlay (without making adjustment for the excess / shortfall in expenditure during previous years), the extent of backlog removed is 35%. However, on account of adjustment for the excess / shortfall in expenditure during previous years, the backlog districts have received higher allocation than their original weightage. The backlog factor for the state is therefore 42.49% instead of 35%.
- Backlog factor for the districts has been calculated on the basis of the district's proportion in the state's backlog and the actual funds allocated to the district after making adjustments.
- Backlog factor for a district = $0.35 * \text{original state outlay} * \text{share of the district's backlog in the state} * \text{final allocation of the district (after making corrections)} / \text{original allocation of the district (on the basis of weightage of the district)} * 100$

Annexure I-B

Statement showing district-wise backlog, expenditure, excess / shortfall in expenditure, backlog removed during financial year 2008-09 and remaining backlog as on 01/04/2009

(Rs. In core)

District	Remainin g Backlog as on 01/04/08	Proposed outlay as per directives	Special dispensati on	Expenditur e during 2008-09	Expenditur e after adjusting corrections, special dispensatio n and unspent balances	District share in expen diture (%)	District share in original outlay (%)	Excess expendit ure	Backlo g factor %	Backlog removed in 2008-09	Remaining Backlog as on 01/04/09
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
		See Footnote 1			See Footnote 3	Col6 / Total of Col 6 * 100	See Footno te 2	See Footnote 8	See Footno te 6	Col5 * Col10 / 100	Col2 - Col11
Thane	0.00	53.16	0.00	66.25	140.88	2.75	2.35	29.50	0.00	0.00	0.00
Raigad	0.00	17.51	11.72	30.21	43.08	0.84	0.77	4.97	0.00	0.00	0.00
Ratnagiri	0.00	19.60	89.00	207.96	146.48	2.86	0.87	145.76	0.00	0.00	0.00
Sindhudurg	0.00	21.92	53.00	151.70	129.48	2.53	0.97	114.01	0.00	0.00	0.00
Konkan	0.00	112.20	153.72	456.12	459.91	8.98	4.95	294.25	0.00	0.00	0.00
Nashik	0.00	55.29	33.00	141.57	186.19	3.64	2.44	87.29	0.00	0.00	0.00
Dhule (including Nandurbar)	0.00	54.41	138.67	185.72	128.41	2.51	2.40	7.69	0.00	0.00	0.00
Jalgaon	0.00	66.57	65.39	368.48	402.57	7.86	2.94	359.67	0.00	0.00	0.00
Ahmednagar	0.00	59.88	22.22	93.95	155.79	3.04	2.64	29.11	0.00	0.00	0.00
Nashik Division	0.00	236.15	259.28	789.74	872.96	17.05	10.43	483.76	0.00	0.00	0.00
Pune	0.00	82.00	162.69	165.47	117.89	2.30	3.62	-96.32	0.00	0.00	0.00
Satara	0.00	61.37	286.17	237.12	37.10	0.72	2.71	-145.04	0.00	0.00	0.00
Sangali	0.00	61.42	116.80	25.25	-5.32	-0.10	2.71	-205.75	0.00	0.00	0.00
Solapur	0.00	60.54	33.43	34.53	86.09	1.68	2.67	-72.48	0.00	0.00	0.00
Kolhapur	0.00	44.87	148.39	183.60	98.20	1.92	1.98	-4.64	0.00	0.00	0.00

District	Remainin g Backlog as on 01/04/08	Proposed outlay as per directives	Special dispensati on	Expenditur e during 2008-09	Expenditur e after adjusting corrections, special dispensatio n and unspent balances	District share in expen diture (%)	District share in original outlay (%)	Excess expendit ure	Backlo g factor %	Backlog removed in 2008-09	Remaining Backlog as on 01/04/09
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
		See Footnote 1			See Footnote 3	Col6 / Total of Col 6 * 100	See Footno te 2	See Footnote 8	See Footno te 6	Col5 * Col10 / 100	Col2 - Col11
Pune Division	0.00	310.20	747.48	645.97	333.96	6.52	13.70	-524.23	0.00	0.00	0.00
Aurangabd	8.99	91.98	22.19	169.85	170.70	3.33	2.13	88.24	13.35	8.99	0.00
Jalana	303.90	350.31	142.47	233.69	178.98	3.50	8.10	-336.17	83.04	194.05	109.85
Parbhani (including Hingoli)	0.00	73.41	15.00	137.27	140.66	2.75	1.70	76.73	0.00	0.00	0.00
Beed	0.00	75.11	0.00	80.48	99.30	1.94	1.74	14.85	0.00	0.00	0.00
Nanded	0.00	93.84	68.00	326.88	282.39	5.52	2.17	244.46	0.00	0.00	0.00
Osmanabad	94.87	145.32	11.86	76.35	100.90	1.97	3.36	-101.43	59.62	45.52	49.35
Latur	0.00	55.21	50.00	209.85	173.68	3.39	1.28	154.59	0.00	0.00	0.00
Marathwada	407.76	885.18	309.52	1234.37	1146.62	22.39	20.46	141.28	40.17	248.56	159.20
Buldhana	643.35	716.34	7.52	531.17	443.31	8.66	14.59	-433.06	83.93	445.83	197.52
Akola (including Washim)	635.39	644.07	50.72	65.72	-57.44	-1.12	13.11	-1040.07	87.88	57.58	577.81
Amravati	580.85	634.35	5.52	911.99	835.32	16.31	12.92	248.25	88.01	580.85	0.00
Yavatmal	0.00	131.57	8.39	342.92	319.77	6.25	2.68	260.54	2.95	0.00	0.00
Amravati Division	1859.59	2126.34	77.80	1851.60	1540.96	30.10	43.29	-964.33	64.05	1084.26	775.33
Wardha	0.00	49.96	36.42	190.93	148.91	2.91	1.02	138.15	0.00	0.00	0.00
Nagpur	0.00	83.71	36.35	117.69	71.95	1.41	1.70	-21.85	0.00	0.00	0.00
Bhandara (including	0.00	78.73	198.09	474.97	268.05	5.23	1.60	265.35	0.00	0.00	0.00

District	Remaining Backlog as on 01/04/08	Proposed outlay as per directives	Special dispensation	Expenditure during 2008-09	Expenditure after adjusting corrections, special dispensation and unspent balances	District share in expenditure (%)	District share in original outlay (%)	Excess expenditure	Backlog factor %	Backlog removed in 2008-09	Remaining Backlog as on 01/04/09
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
		See Footnote 1			See Footnote 3	Col6 / Total of Col 6 * 100	See Footnote 2	See Footnote 8	See Footnote 6	Col5 * Col10 / 100	Col2 - Col11
Gondia)											
Chandrapur	0.00	95.71	181.34	486.78	294.70	5.76	1.95	278.12	0.00	0.00	0.00
Gadchiroli	14.61	43.81	0.00	3.80	-1.11	-0.02	0.89	-66.75	31.01	1.18	13.43
Nagpur Division	14.61	351.91	452.20	1274.17	782.50	15.28	7.17	593.02	3.86	1.18	13.43
Vidarbha	1874.19	2478.25	530.00	3125.76	2317.80	45.27	50.46	-379.38	55.50	1085.44	788.76
Marathwada	407.76	885.18	309.52	1234.37	1146.62	22.39	20.46	141.28	44.04	248.56	159.20
Rest of Maharashtra	0.00	658.55	1160.48	1891.83	1655.84	32.34	29.08	238.10	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total	2281.96	4021.98	2000.00	6251.96	5120.26	100.00	100.00	0.00	44.09	1334.00	947.96

Footnote:

- District-wise proposed outlay has been worked out as per the allocation principle laid down in the directives of 6 March 2008.
- Share of a district outlay has been calculated on the basis of its share in the state regarding backlog, net sown area, population and cost of ongoing projects.
- District-wise adjustments have been made for (i) Corrections - calculated on the basis of district's share in the region, (ii) Special dispensation – district wise figures have been taken from the WRD as per actual release and (iii) unspent balances – calculated in proportion to the share of the district in outlay of the respective region.
- During the year, the backlog factor of the state for the original outlay is 45%. Therefore, out of the original outlay (without making adjustment for the excess / shortfall in expenditure during previous years), the extent of backlog removed is 45%. However, on account of adjustment for the excess / shortfall in expenditure during previous years, the allocation to the backlog districts is not as per their original weightage. The backlog factor for the state is therefore 44.09% instead of 45%.
- Backlog factor for the districts has been calculated on the basis of the district's proportion in the state's backlog and the actual funds allocated to the district after making adjustments.
- Backlog factor for a district = $0.45 * \text{original state outlay} * \text{share of the district's backlog in the state} * \text{final allocation of the district (after making corrections)}/\text{original allocation of the district (on the basis of weightage of the district)} * 100$
- The unspent balance with Vidarbha, Marathwada and rest of Maharashtra region as on 31/03/09 are Rs. 264.46, 322.03 and 467.43 crore respectively. These unspent balances have been treated as expenditure for the purpose of calculating the excess / shortfall in expenditure by respective regions.
- Column 9 = $(\text{Col7}-\text{Col8}) * (\text{Total of Col5} + \text{unspent balances})/100$

Annexure- II
Statement showing basin-wise and region-wise balance cost of on-going major, medium and minor irrigation projects as on 1 April 2004

Sr. No.	Basin	No. of projects	Region-wise balance cost (Rs. in crore)					Total
			Vidarbha	Marathwada	Rest of Maharashtra			
					North Maha.	W.M.	Konkan	
1	Godavari	492	8933.06 (69.05%)	2770.62 (21.42%)	1232.64 (9.53%)			12936.31 (38.35%)
2	Tapi	185	2378.31 (33.87%)	10.86 (0.16%)	4632.37 (65.97%)			7021.54 (20.82%)
3	Krishna	340		424.94 (3.65%)	21.07 (0.18%)	11190.08 (96.17%)		11636.09 (34.49%)
4	West flowing rivers	59			31.66 (1.48%)		2108.28 (98.52%)	2139.94 (6.34%)
5	Total	1076	11311.36 (33.53%)	3206.42 (9.51%)	5917.74 (17.54%)	11190.08 (33.17%)	2108.28 (6.25%)	33733.88 (100%)
					19216.10 (56.96%)			
		1076	233	352	241	196	54	1076

Source: Information as communicated by letter dated 16th November 2005 of Planning Department.

Annexure- III A

Statement showing region-wise percentage of population, net sown area and cost of ongoing projects in the state

Region	Population*	% Of Population	Net Sown Area 1994 (000 Hector)#	% Of Net Sown area	Cost of Ongoing Projects (Rs Crore)@	% Of cost of ongoing projects
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Vidarbha	20630987	24.30	5106.80	28.27	11311.36	33.53
Marathwada	15629248	18.41	4755.90	26.33	3206.42	9.51
Rest of Maharashtra	48639942	57.29	8199.30	45.40	19216.10	56.96
Total	84900177	100.00	18062.00	100.00	33733.88	100.00

* Source -- Census 2001

Source -- I & B Committee report, Volume-I

@ Source -- Information as communicated by letter dated 16th November 2005 of Planning Department.

Annexure- III B

Statement showing region-wise allocation of outlay in the Irrigation sector in the annual plan 2009-10

Region	Share of Population	Share of Net sown area	Share of the cost of ongoing projects	Weighted average of population 25%, Net sown area 20% and cost of ongoing projects 15%	Percentage*
Vidarbha	24.30	28.27	33.53	16.76	27.93
Marathwada	18.41	26.33	9.51	11.30	18.83
Rest of Maharashtra	57.29	45.40	56.96	31.95	53.24
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	60.00	100.00

* The average backlog factor of 40% has been omitted, thus the remaining weightages have been scaled to a total of 100%

Annexure- IV A

Statement showing region-wise aberration in expenditure in 2004-05 and 2005-06

(Rs. in crore)

Region	Aberration 2004-05	Aberration 2005-06	Total Aberration	Total Aberration/3
Vidarbha	795.89	520.57	1316.46	438.82
Marathwada	161.79	139.00	300.79	100.26
Rest of Maharashtra	957.68* excess	659.57* excess	1617.25* excess	539.08* excess
Total	957.68	659.57	1617.25	539.08

Annexure- IV B

Statement showing the aberrations in expenditure to be made good in three years 2007-08, 2008-09 and 2009-10

(Rs. in crore)

Region	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10
Vidarbha	438.82	438.82	438.82
Marathwada	100.26	100.26	100.26
Rest of Maharashtra	539.08*excess	539.08* excess	539.08* excess
Total	539.08	539.08	539.08

Note - * excess expenditure is to be deducted

Source: Statement on expenditure incurred in the sector of Irrigation in the Annual Plan 2004-05 and 2005-06 as communicated by the Water Resources Department.

Annexure IV C

Statement showing region-wise outlays to compensate an additional outlay of Rs. 100 crore provided to Marathwada during FY 2007-08 under Marathwada package as per the formula laid down in the Directives for FY 2007-08

(Rs. in crore)

Sr. No.	Region	Allocation as per the formula laid down in the Directives for FY 2007-08	Allocation given under Marathwada package	Allocation to make up excess outlay under Marathwada package	Outlay to be provided during FY 2008-09
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
1	Vidarbha	207.21 (43.97%)		207.21	103.60
2	Marathwada	100 (21.22%)	100		
3	Rest of Maharashtra	164.04 (34.81%)		164.04	82.02
4	Total	471.25 (100%)	100	371.25	185.62

Marathwada region was given an additional outlay of Rs.100 crore under Marathwada Package in FY 2007-08. While giving approval for the same, it was directed by the Governor that the other two regions will be duly compensated over next two years as per the formula laid down in the Directives for FY 2007-08. Accordingly figures in column (2) indicate the total outlay including amount of Marathwada Package and outlays to compensate the other two regions as per the formula. Figures in column (4) and column (5) are derived from the figures in column (2).

Annexure- V A

Expenditure incurred in Irrigation sector in 2006-07

(Rs. in crore)

Sr. No.	Region	Outlay	Expenditure
1)	Vidarbha	882.95 (38.67%)	1646.97 (37.60%)
2)	Marathwada	510.47 (22.35%)	1016.07 (23.20%)
3)	Rest of Maharashtra	890.37 (38.98%)	1716.21 (39.20%)
4)	Sub-total	2283.79 (100%)	4379.25 (100%)
5)	Common schemes	459.18	30.95
6)	Total	2742.96	4410.20

Note: No significant shortfalls and excesses expenditure

Annexure- V B

Statement showing region-wise excess / shortfall in expenditure in 2007-08 after adjusting the corrections

(Rs. in crore)

Region	Proposed outlay as per directives 07-08	Expenditure 2007-08	Expenditure after adjusting corrections	%Share in expenditure	% Share in original outlay	Excess / shortfall in expenditure
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
				Col 4/ Total of Col 4 * 100	As per directives 07-08	(Col 5 – Col 6) * Total of Col 3 / 100
Vidarbha	2220.11	2160.96	1722.14	35.89	43.97	-387.64
Marathwada	959.92	1219.05	1118.79	23.32	21.22	100.61
Rest of Maharashtra	871.13	1418.22	1957.30	40.79	34.81	287.04
Total	4051.16	4798.23	4798.23	100.00	100.00	0.00

Annexure- V C

Statement showing region-wise excess / shortfall in expenditure in 2008-09 after adjusting the corrections and funds allocated as special dispensation

(Rs. in crore)

Region	Proposed outlay as per directives 08-09	Special dispensation	Expenditure 2008-09	Expenditure considering that unspent balances have been spent	Expenditure after adjusting corrections, special dispensation and unspent balances	%Share in expenditure	% Share in original outlay	Excess / shortfall in expenditure
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
						Col 6 / Total of Col 6 *100	As per directives 08-09	(Col 7 – Col 8) * Total of Col 5 /100
Vidarbha	2478.25	530.00	3125.76	3390.22	2317.80	45.27	50.46	-379.38
Marathwada	885.18	309.52	1234.37	1556.40	1146.62	22.39	20.46	141.28
Rest of Maharashtra	658.55	1160.48	1891.83	2359.26	1655.84	32.34	29.08	238.10
Total	4021.98	2000.00	6251.96	7305.88	5120.26	100.00	100.00	0.00

Footnote:

1. Proposed outlay has been taken from the directives of 6 March 2008
2. Special dispensation, expenditure and unspent balances figures are provided by WRD
3. % Share in expenditure has been calculated assuming in proportion to total expenditure (including unspent balances)

Annexure- V D

Statement showing the amount of excess / shortfall in expenditure during 2007-08 and 2008-09 to be made good in a phased manner

(Rs. In crore)

Region	Allocation to make up for shortfall / excess Expenditure in 2007-08	Allocation to make up for shortfall / excess Expenditure in 2008-09	Deferred corrections	Deferred corrections /2	Corrections to be made in FY 2010-11	Corrections to be made in FY 2011-12
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	See Annexure VB	See Annexure VC	Col2+Col3	Col4/2	Col4/2	Col4/2
Vidarbha	387.64	379.38	767.02	383.51	383.51	383.51
Marathwada	-100.61	-141.28	-241.88	-120.94	-120.94	-120.94
Rest of Maharashtra	-287.04	-238.10	-525.13	-262.57	-262.57	-262.57
Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Footnote:

1. The unspent balances of all the three regions as on 31/03/09 have been treated as expenditure incurred for the respective regions during 2008-09
2. Negative (-) sign shows that the funds have to be taken out of the region
3. Positive (+) sign shows that the funds have to be given to the region

Annexure- VI
Statement showing region-wise unspent balances
(Rs. in Crore)

Region	Unspent balances as on		
	31/03/07	31/03/08	31/03/09
Vidarbha	366.73	494.14	264.46
Marathwada	345.68	356.15	322.03
Rest of Maharashtra	574.07	710.38	467.43
Total	1286.48	1560.67	1053.92

Annexure- VI A
Statement showing the backlog that would have reduced if all the funds available with Vidarbha and Marathwada region were fully utilized

(Rs. in crore)

Region	Remaining backlog as on 01/04/09	Unspent balances as on 31/03/09	Backlog factor (%)	Backlog that would have been removed if the funds were fully utilized within region	Remaining Backlog
1	2	3	4	5	6
	From Col 12 of Ann IB		Refer Annexure IB	Col3*Col4/100	Col2-Col5
Vidarbha	788.76	264.46	55.50	146.77	641.98
Marathwada	159.20	322.03	44.04	141.81	17.39
Rest of Maharashtra	0.00	467.43	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total	947.96	1053.92		288.59	659.37

Annexure- VI B

Statement showing district wise backlog as on 01/04/09 and the backlog that would remain if the unspent balances of Vidarbha and Marathwada are earmarked to the backlog district of the respective regions

(Rs. In crore)

Districts	Remaining backlog as on 1/4/09	Remaining backlog if the unspent balance is earmarked to the backlog districts of the region
Buldhana	197.52	160.77
Akola	577.81	470.29
Gadchiroli	13.43	10.93
Vidarbha	788.76	641.98
Jalna	109.85	12.00
Osmanabad	49.35	5.39
Marathwada	159.20	17.39
Total	947.96	659.37

Footnote:

The estimated backlog that would be removed by utilising the unspent balances (as indicated in Annexure VIA) has been distributed to the backlog districts in the region in proportion of their backlog

Annexure-VII

Year-wise programme for utilization of Rs.1717 crore for creation of 52.384 TMC storage

(Funds Rs. in crore/storage in TMC)

Sr. No.	Project	Balance storage	Balance Cost	Proposed Programme					
				2008-09		2009-10		2010-11	
				Funds	Storage	Funds	Storage	Funds	Storage
1.	Major (7)	25.41	420.72	200.33	6.35	157.36	9.71	63.03	9.35
2.	Medium (21)	19.05	899.92	280.03	8.79	471.96	7.14	147.94	3.12
3.	Minor (110)	7.82	396.96	173.94	2.84	188.88	4.73	34.15	0.25
4.	Grand Total	52.82	1717.60	654.29	17.98	818.19	21.58	245.12	12.72

Annexure- VIII

Statement showing the allocation of funds available assuming that the unspent balances with Vidarbha and Marathwada regions are earmarked to the backlog districts of the respective regions and the funds required for removal of balance backlog provided from the current year's available allocation as first charge, thereafter, remaining funds are distributed on the basis of respective weightages of regions in terms of population, net sown area and cost of ongoing projects

(Rs. In crore)

The divisible outlay for the irrigation sector = 6600.00

Outlay required to remove the remaining backlog = 659.37

Outlay required to adjust the corrections = 185.62

Outlay available for allocation as per allocation principle explained in Annexure IIIB = 5755.01

Region	Region-wise weightage of 3 factors (population, net sown area and cost of ongoing projects)	Corrections for 2004-05, 2005-06	Corrections for Marathwada package	Remaining Backlog after the unspent balances are earmarked for backlog districts	Distribution of balance funds	Total Allocation
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	Refer Annexure IIIB	Refer Annexure IVB	Refer Annexure IVC	Refer Annexure VIA	Outlay available for allocation * Col 2	Col 3 + Col 4 + Col 5 + Col 6
Vidarbha	27.93	438.82	103.60	641.98	1607.42 (27.93%)	2791.82 (42.30%)
Marathwada	18.83	100.26		17.39	1083.38 (18.93%)	1201.03 (18.20%)
Rest of Maharashtra	53.24	-539.08	82.02	0.00	3064.21 (53.24%)	2607.15 (39.50%)
Total	100.00	0.00	185.62	659.37	5755.01 (100%)	6600.00 (100%)