WERE DISTRICT CHOICES FOR NFFWP APPROPRIATE?

Santanu Gupta

The National Food for Work Programme (NFFWP), launched in 2004, identified 150 backward districts, where employment guarantee scheme was to get started. The 150 districts were identified by the Planning Commission on the basis of three criteria, Scheduled Castes/ Scheduled Tribes (SC/ST) population, agricultural productivity per worker, and agricultural wage rate in the district. We find that the final choice for the NFFWP was not consistent with the methodology mentioned, nor can it be defended by using other measures of backwardness. We investigate whether political factors have determined the choice of these districts.

Preceding the actual implementation of the Employment Guarantee Act, the government has already launched a National Food for Work Programme (NFFWP) in 150 most backward districts of the country in 2004. The main document of the NFFWP[1] states that the districts have been identified by the Planning Commission (PC) on the basis of prevalence of poverty indicated by SC/ST population, agricultural productivity per worker, and agricultural wage rate.[2] The *Annual Report of the Ministry of Rural Development for 2004-05* gives more details on the criteria of selection of these 150 most backward districts.[3] For states (other than special category states and states of the North Eastern Region except Assam), the most backward districts were chosen on the basis of the three parameters mentioned in the NFFWP document. The same criterion was followed for Assam. For special category states and states in the North Eastern Region, except Assam, districts were identified from the list selected under the *Rashtriya Sam Vikas Yojana* (RSVY) [2004]. At least one district was selected from each state, other than Goa. While selecting these districts suggestions received from the State Governments were also considered.

Whatever the methodology used, we expect that it was done in right earnest, with the best of intentions. However, evidence seems to prove otherwise. In a document of the Planning Commission titled, *Report of the Task Force: Identification of Districts for Wage and Self Employment Programmes* (TF), published in May 2003, 447 districts, from 482 districts from 17 states, for which the relevant data was available, but excluding districts with urban agglomerates of over one million population, as per the 2001 Census, and also excluding all the state capitals, were ranked on the basis of percentage of total SC/ST population in the district (1991 Census), Agricultural Wages (Rs/day) 1996-97, and Output per Agricultural Worker (1990-93), the very same variables mentioned in the NFFWP. An index was computed for each variable. For agricultural productivity per worker and agricultural wages, the index was computed as thus: (Actual Value - Minimum Value)/ (Maximum Value - Minimum Value). The lower the index value, the more backward would be the district. In case of SC/ST population, it is presumed, *a priori,* that districts with a higher proportion of SC/ST population would be more backward. To ensure that the index values in the three values moved in the same direction, the index for SC/ ST population was calculated as thus: (Maximum Value - Actual Value)/(Maximum Value - Minimum Value). The districts with a higher percentage of SC/ST population would have a lower index value. The three indexes were *added* to work out a composite

index and rank the districts. The Task Force was of the view that one third of the 447 districts should be considered for wage employment. As such, the first 150 districts from 447 districts were identified for taking up intensive wage employment programmes. The only reason for differences in the NFFWP list and that of the TF may be due to the effort in the former to include the 11 states, left out from the latter, namely, Jammu and Kashmir, Himachal Pradesh, Uttaranchal, Arunachal Pradesh, Goa, Sikkim, Tripura, Meghalaya, Mizoram, Manipur and Nagaland, on which data on these variables were not available. It is apparent from the final lists of states, included in both the documents, that Goa was left out from both the lists. However, differences between the two lists go beyond this. Table 1 gives the profile of the distribution of

Table 1. Distribution of Backward Districts Identified by TF and NFFWP

(by states)

State	No. of Districts by TF	No. of Districts by NFFWP	Difference: (Column 3 - Column 2)
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Bihar	6	15	9
Uttar Pradesh	7	15	8
Andhra Pradesh	6	8	2
Jammu & Kashmir	0	2	2
Tamil Nadu	2	4	2
Uttaranchal	0	2	2
Arunachal Pradesh	0	1	1
Haryana	0	1	1
Himachal Pradesh	0	1	1
Kerala	0	1	1
Manipur	0	1	1
Meghalaya	0	1	1
Mizoram	0	1	1
Nagaland	0	1	1
Punjab	0	1	1
Sikkim	0	1	1
Tripura	0	1	1
Karnataka	4	3	-1
West Bengal	7	6	-1
Assam	7	5	-2
Gujarat	8	6	-2
Rajasthan	7	5	-2
Maharashtra	15	11	-4
Chattisgarh	15	10	-5
Jharkhand	19	14	-5
Madhya Pradesh	20	15	-5
Orissa	27	18	-9
TOTAL	150	150	

districts by states in the TF list and that in the NFFWP. It is clear from the table that Bihar and Uttar Pradesh were the largest gainers in the NFFWP list relative to TF, while the largest losers were Orissa, Madhya Pradesh, Jharkhand and Chattisgarh.

Even when choosing districts amongst states, there have been glaring instances of districts less backward, as computed by the Planning Commission's own index, being selected as the most backward. Table 2 gives information on backward districts within states excluded while non-backward districts included in the NFFWP. The most glaring example is in Gujarat, where the very backward districts of Valsad, Bharuch and Navasari were excluded in favour of Banaskantha. In West Bengal, East/South Dinajpur and Birbhum were excluded in favour of Midnapur West and Murshidabad. In Andhra Pradesh, Chittur was excluded in favour of Cuddapah, Nalgonda and Anantapur.

Table 2. Backward Districts Excluded and Non-Backward Districts Included in NFFWP (Backwardness by TF Index)

State	District in TF but not in NFFWP	Backwardness Rank* of District in TF, not in NFFWP	District in NFFWP, not in TF	Backwardness Rank* of District in NFFWP, not in TF
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Andhra Pradesh			Cuddapah	287
			Nalgonda	170
	Chittur	145	Anantapur	198
Gujarat	Valsad	36		
	Bharuch	37		
	Navasari	54	Banaskantha	317
West Bengal	East / South Dinajpur	98	Maldah	283
	Birbhum	108	Midnapur West	199
			Murshidabad	339

* Note: In case of rank, a higher number indicates less backwardness.

Table 3 and Table 4 give information on the choice of candidates made by these districts, especially where misallocation seems to have occurred within the same state, as mentioned in Table 2. It is clear that of the seven Non-Backward districts included in the NFFWP, five had Congress Members of Parliament, which form the ruling coalition, and two were from the Communist Party of India (CPI), the party supporting the government from outside. For the six backward districts excluded in the NFFWP (see Table 4), 2 are from the Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP), one from the Telgu Desam Party (TDP), which form part of the opposition. Of the rest three, two are from the Communist Party

(Marxist) (CPM) and Revolutionary Socialist Party (RSP), which are supporting the government from outside. The only district, which had elected the ruling party and deserved to be included yet left out, is Valsad in Gujarat, which falls in the Bulsar constituency. It should be noted that Bulsar is also a declared ST constituency, where only ST candidates can contest. Therefore there is strong evidence that whenever there have been mis-targeting within states, it can be argued that the non-deserving yet included were incorporated, due to political connections, but the same cannot be said for districts deserving yet left out.

Table 3. Electoral Choice of Seven Non-Backward Districts in NFFWP (Backwardness by TF Index)

No.	State	District in NFFWP not in TF	Lok Sabha Constituency	Candidate	Party*
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
1.	Andhra Pradesh	Cuddapah	Cuddapah	Y. S. Vivekananda Reddy	INC
2.	Andhra Pradesh	Nalgonda	Nalgonda	Suravaram Sudhakar Reddy	CPI
3.	Andhra Pradesh	Anantapur	Anantapur	Anantha Venkata Rami Reddy	INC
4.	Gujarat	Banaskantha	Banaskantha	Chavda Harisinhaji Pratapsinhaji	INC
5.	West Bengal	Maldah	Malda	A. B. A Ghani Khan Choudhury	INC
6.	West Bengal	Midnapur West	Midnapore	Prabodh Panda	CPI
7.	West Bengal	Murshidabad	Murshidabad	Abdul Mannan Hossain	INC

Table 4. Electoral Choice of Six Backward Districts Excluded in NFFWP (Backwardness by TF Index)

No.	State	District in TF not in NFFWP	Lok Sabha Constituency	Candidate Won	Party
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
1	Andhra Pradesh	Chittur	Chittoor	D. K. Audikesavulu	TDP
2	Gujarat	Valsad *	Bulsar	Kishanbhai Vestabhai Patel	INC
3	Gujarat	Bharuch	Broach	Vasava Mansukhabhai Bhanjibhai	BJP
4	Gujarat	Navasari	Surat	Kashiram Rana	BJP
5	West Bengal	East / South Dinajpur	Balurghat	Ranen Barman	RSP
6	West Bengal	Birbhum	Birbhum	Ram Chandra Dome	CPM

* Note: We are unable to map Valsad district to the appropriate Lok Sabha constituency.

It might be that the Planning Commission had other aspects of backwardness in mind, though not explicitly stated, while selecting the districts. It is interesting to see how these selected districts fare in backwardness by some other criteria. A study on districts by Debroy and Bhandari (DB) [2003] identified backward districts of the country on the basis of six criteria, namely, poverty by the head count ratio (HCR), food sufficiency (FS), infant mortality rate, percentage of children fully immunized, literacy rate, and enrolment ratio.[4] If a district happened to be in the bottom 25 per cent in four or more of these criteria, the district was classified as backward.

Table 5. Profile of Deprived Districts in NFFWP

(1)	Total (2)	HCR and FS (3)	HCR or FS (4)	Neither HCR nor FS (5)
NFFWP	150	36	90	60
All India	596	67	232	364
% of similar districts covered by NFFWP	25.16	53.73	38.79	16.48

Notes: HCR indicates districts that are backward by poverty by the head count ratio in DB [2003].

FS indicates districts that are backward by the food sufficiency criterion of DB [2003].

Table 5 gives the profile of districts in NFFWP and the profile of districts in the country, as a whole. If a district happens to be backward by both, HCR and FS criteria, it must be having acute food security problem. There are 67 such districts all over India, and 36 of them or 53.73 per cent figure in the NFFWP list, whereas ideally all these 67 districts should have been covered.[5] If we relax the criterion slightly and consider districts that are backward by either the HCR or the FS, one finds that there are 231 districts with some level of food security problem, of which 90 (or 38.79 per cent) are covered by the NFFWP, when the potential coverage could have been as high as 64.65 per cent (150/232*100).

Table 6 gives a profile of the 60 districts, which meet neither HCR nor FS criterion, and are included in the NFFWP. Of these, 31 districts appear in the TF list and may have been included in the NFFWP because they need wage employment through public works programme; for, providing such employment is stated to be a major objective of the NFFWP. Focussing on the remaining districts, if we remove from these the districts from the 11 states, left out from the TF study, namely, Jammu and Kashmir, Himachal Pradesh, Uttaranchal, Arunachal Pradesh, Goa, Sikkim, Tripura, Meghalaya, Mizoram, Manipur and Nagaland, what remains can be considered as examples of miss-targeting, and there are 20 such districts.

Table 6. Profile of 60 Non-Backward Districts in NFFWP (Backwardness by DB Criterion)

No. of Districts in NFFWP not backward either by HCR or FS criterion		
In TF	Districts from states left out in TF	Remaining Districts
31	9	20

Table 7. Profile of Candidates Elected by 20 Non-Backward Districts in NFFWP (Backwardness by Both, DB and TF Criteria)

	In NFFWP not Backward by HCR nor FS, and not in TF			2004 Parliamentary Election	
No. (1)	State (2)	District (3)	Lok Sabha Constituency (4)	Winner (5)	Party (6)
1	Andhra Pradesh	Anantpur	Anantpur	Anantha Venkata Rami Reddy	INC
2	Andhra Pradesh	Cudappah	Cuddapah	Y. S. Vivekananda Reddy	INC
3	Andhra Pradesh	Nalgonda	Nalgonda	Suravaram Sudhakar Reddy	CPI
4	Bihar	Katihar	Katihar	Nikhil Kumar Choudhary	BJP
5	Bihar	Madhubani	Madhubani	Shakeel Ahmad	INC
6	Gujarat	Banaskantha	Banaskantha	Chavda Harisinhaji Pratapsinhaji	INC
7	Haryana	Mohindergarh	Mahendragarh	Inderjit Singh	INC
8	Kerala	Waynad	Calicut	M. P. Veerendra Kumar	JD(S)
			Cannanore	A. P. Abdullakutty	CPM
9	Madhya Pradesh	Seopur	Vidisha	Shivraj Singh	BJP
			Hoshangabad	Sartaj Singh	BJP
10	Madhya Pradesh	Shivpuri	Guna	Jyotiraditya Madhavrao Scindia	INC
11	Maharashtra	Hingoli	Hingoli	Suryakanta Patil	NCP
12	Punjab	Hoshiarpur	Hoshiarpur	Avinash Rai Khanna	BJP
13	Rajasthan	Karauli	Sawai Madhopur	Namo Narain	INC
14	Tamil Nadu	Nagapattinam	Nagapattinam	Vijayan, A. K. S	DMK
15	Uttar Pradesh	Banda	Banda	Shyama Charan Gupt	SP
16	Uttar Pradesh	Chitrakoot	Banda	Shyama Charan Gupt	SP
17	Uttar Pradesh	Hamirpur	Hamirpur	Rajnarain Alias Rajju Mahraj	SP
18	Uttar Pradesh	Lakhimpur Kheri	Kheri	Ravi Prakash Verma	SP
19	Uttar Pradesh	Mahoba	Hamirpur	Rajnarain Alias Rajju Mahraj	SP
20	Uttar Pradesh	Mirzapur	Mirzapur	Narendra Kumar Kushwaha	BSP

We have information on the choice of the 22 candidates made by these 20 districts in Table 7, and their party affiliations in Table 8. Of these 22 candidates, nine are from the ruling coalition, seven are from the parties giving outside support, and six are from the opposition. Given that 16 of these 22 candidates are from the ruling coalition or their supporters, it is enough evidence to say that the choice of these 20 non-backward districts was political.

Table 8. Party Affiliations of 22 Candidates Elected by 20 Non Backward Districts in NFFWP (Backwardness by Both, DB and TF Criteria)

	Coalition Parties in UPA Govt.	Coalition Parties Supporting Govt. from Outside	Coalition Parties in Opposition
Party Names	INC, DMK, NCP	CPI, CPM, SP	BJP, JD (S), BSP
Number	9	7	6

There are 67 districts in NFFWP that are backward by both the HCR and the FS criterion of DB. Of these 36 are included in NFFWP. Table 9 gives a profile of the remaining 31 districts, which are backward by both the HCR and FS criteria and yet not included in the NFFWP. Of these, 17 are not in the TF list of backward districts, so there may be a justification in their not being included but the remaining 14 districts can be taken as instances of mis-targeting.

Table 9. Profile of 32 Backward Districts not in NFFWP (Backwardness by DB Criterion)

Not in NFFWP but backward by HCR and FS criteria	
Not in TF	In TF
17	14

We have information in Table 10 on the choice of the candidates made by these 14 districts in the TF list and their party affiliations in Table 11. Of the 17 candidates chosen by these 14 districts, eight are from the ruling coalition, eight are from the opposition and one is from a party giving outside support. Therefore, it is difficult to come to a conclusion regarding these districts being deliberately left out for political reasons.

Table 10. Profile of Candidates Elected by 14 Backward Districts Excluded in NFFWP (Backwardness by Both, DB and TF Criteria)

Not in NFFWP but Backward by HCR and FS and in TF			Lok Sabha Constituency	2004 Parliamentary Election	
No. (1)	State (2)	District (3)	(4)	Winner (5)	Party (6)
1	Assam	Bongaigaon	Barpeta	A.F. Golam Osmani	INC
			Kokrajhar	Sansuma Khunggur Bwiswmuthiary	IND
2	Assam	Goalpara	Dhubri	Anwar Hussain	INC
			Guahati	Kirip Chaliha	INC
3	Chhattisgarh	Janjgir-Champa	Janjgir	Karuna Shukla	BJP
4	Chhattisgarh	Korba	Janjgir	Karuna Shukla	BJP
5	Jharkhand	Bokaro	Giridih	Tek Lal Mahto	JMM
6	Jharkhand	Giridih	Giridih	Tek Lal Mahto	JMM
7	Jharkhand	Purbi Singhbhum	Jamshedpur	Sunil Kumar Mahato	JMM
8	Karnataka	Gulbarga	Gulbarga	Iqbal Ahmed Saradgi	INC
9	Madhya Pradesh	Harda	Betul	Khandelwal Vijay Kumar (Munna Bhaia)	BJP
10	Orissa	Anugul	Dhenkanal	Tathagata Satapathy	BJD
11	Orissa	Bargarh	Sambalpur	Prasanna Acharya	BJD
12	Orissa	Bhadrak	Bhadrak	Arjun Charan Sethi	BJD
13	Orissa	Gajapati	Berhampur	Chandra Sekhar Sahu	INC
14	West Bengal	Jalpaiguri	Jalpaiguri	Minati Sen	CPM

Table 11. Party Affiliations of 16 Candidates Elected by 14 Backward Districts Excluded in NFFWP
(Backwardness by Both, DB and TF criteria)

	Coalition Parties in UPA Govt.	Coalition Parties Supporting Govt. from Outside	Coalition Parties in Opposition
Party Names	INC, JMM	CPM	BJP, BJD, IND
Number	8	1	7

Note: The independent candidate is being considered as a member of the opposition in this table.

One may wonder as to whether these 14 districts happen to be neglected by both, the ruling coalition and the opposition parties, and if so, why. Or, have they been excluded from the NFFWP because they are covered by some other programme? One such important programme is the *Rashtriya Sam Vikas Yojana (RSVY)* [2004]. It may be noted that of the 14 backward districts not included in the NFFWP, enumerated in Table 10, four, namely, Giridih, Gulbarga, Gajapati and Jalpaiguri, also figure in the *Rashtriya Sam Vikas Yojana's (RSVY)* [2004] list of 100 backward districts. The remaining 10 backward districts that are not included either in the NFFWP or in the *RSVY* [2004] are Bongaigaon, Goalpara, Janjgir-Champa, Korba, Bokaro, Purbi-Singhbhum, Harda, Anugul, Bargarh, and Bhadrak. Of these 10 districts, four districts, namely, Bongaigaon, Goalpara, Korba, and Bokaro, find their way into the Backward Regions Grant Fund (BRGF) list of 250 backward districts started in 2006, while Janjgir-Champa, Purbi-Singhbhum, Harda, Anugul, Bargarh and Bhadrak are left out.

While the NFFWP sought to identify 150 most backward districts and to provide substantial resources in the form of cash and food grains 'to generate additional supplementary wage employment and to create productive assets in them, the *RSVY* [2004] identified 100 backward districts and 32 additional districts, 'which are affected by Left Wing Extremism', 'to address the problems of agricultural productivity, unemployment and to fill critical gaps in physical and social infrastructure'[6] and aimed at instituting focused development programmes with the co-operation of District Administration/ Panchayati Raj Institutions in preparing the district plans. 'The identification of backward districts within a State has been made on the basis of an index of backwardness comprising three parameters with equal weights to each: (i) value of output per agricultural worker; (ii) agriculture wage rate; and (iii) percentage of SC/ST population of the districts. The number of districts per State has been worked out on the basis of incidence of poverty'.[7]

Now, the parameters used here are exactly the ones on which the TF study is also based. If the methodology of constructing the index of backwardness (not clearly explained in the *RSVY* [2004] document) was the same as the one used in the TF, the two lists should be more or less similar if not identical. Since the *RSVY* [2004] contains less districts, all districts in the *RSVY* [2004] should appear in the TF, except that districts in states with relatively high incidence of poverty may get included in the *RSVY* [2004] but not in the TF. However, this is not the case. For example, though the *RSVY* [2004] list for Kerala consists of Palakkad and Waynad, the first two districts according to the TF ranking of backwardness should have been Palakkad and Idukki; and, surprisingly, only Waynad, which is much less backward even by the TF ranking of districts in Kerala, finally got selected for inclusion in the NFFWP.

Table 12. Summary of RSVY and NFFWP Districts from 11 states Excluded in TF

No. of Districts in RSVY	No. of Districts in RSVY and in NFFWP	No. of Districts not in RSVY and not in NFFWP
18	10	2

It is also interesting to note that the districts selected in the NFFWP from the 11 states, left out in the TF study, are from the 100 backward districts chosen by the RSVY, as claimed in government documents.[8] The 11 states left out in the TF study are Jammu and Kashmir, Himachal Pradesh, Uttaranchal, Arunachal Pradesh, Goa, Sikkim, Tripura, Meghalaya, Mizoram, Manipur and Nagaland. No district from Goa has been selected in the RSVY, and none appears either in the TF list or the NFFWP. From the other 10 states, 18 backward districts have been identified by the RSVY, of these 10 are included in the NFFWP as reported in Table 12. We have in this case too instances of mis-targeting in the sense of non RSVY districts making their way in the NFFWP, and RSVY districts not making it to the NFFWP, even from the same state. For instance, in Meghalaya, South Garo Hills was selected by the NFFWP, while the district identified by the RSVY was West Garo Hills. In Mizoram Saiha was included in the NFFWP, while the district identified by the RSVY was Lawngtlai.

The Backward Regions Grant Fund started since 2006 identified 250 backward districts to correct regional imbalances in development. The then existing *Rashtriya Sam Vikas Yojana* [2004] has been subsumed in the BRGF programme. Additional funds are being provided to these districts for overall development.[9] The districts were ranked on the basis of 17 parameters, relating to income deprivation, health and educational status, and infrastructural inadequacy.[10] It is to be noted that 125 of the 150 districts identified by the Task Force for wage and self employment schemes find their way into the BRGF. However, all the 150 districts of the NFFWP appear in the list of 250 backward districts of the BRGF. Attempts should, therefore, be made to ensure that whenever a new study of backward districts is conducted, it addresses why its methodology, if different, is different from the earlier one. If the list does not contain districts that were included in the earlier list, it must give adequate justifications to classify the same as non-backward or to drop the same.

The National Food for Work Programme was started with a new government coming into power, which wanted it to be identified with the programme and not to address the need for wage and self-employment programmes, as identified by the Task Force in 2003. The rationale of the selection of backward districts in the NFFWP was, therefore, not transparent even by its own selection process. It can be stated that to some extent political reasons played a part whenever there have been instances of inclusion of non-backward districts, but the same cannot be said for the exclusion of backward districts from the NFFWP. In order to ensure that the limited public resources are made available to the districts most needy, the Planning Commission should spell out clearly the criteria along with the appropriate weights used in the selection process. This may not now be so relevant given that the government is in the process of expanding the NFFWP to all districts in the country, but in situations in public policy, where similar selection has to be done, it must be done in a rational manner that is fair to one and all, and is transparently so.

ABBREVIATIONS

BJD	Biju Janata Dal
BJP	Bharatiya Janata Party
BSP	Bhahujan Samaj Party
CPI	Communist Party of India
CPM	Communist Party of India (Marxist)
DMK	Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam
INC	Indian National Congress
IND	Independent
JD(S)	Janata Dal
JMM	Jharkhand Mukti Morcha
NCP	National Communist Party
RSP	Revolutionary Socialist Party
SP	Samajwadi Party
TDP	Telugu Desam Party

NOTES

1. See http://rural.nic.in/nffwpguidelines.htm for the text of the document National Food for Work Programme (NFFWP).

2. Though the National Food for Work Programme Document mentions no reference about the source of the indicators or the data to arrive at the 150 districts, I believe, the appropriate reference is the *Report of the Task Force: Identification of Districts for Wage and Self Employment*

Programmes, Planning Commission, May 2003, Chapter IV of this document gives the exact methodology.

3. See http://rural.nic.in/annualrep0405/chapter2.pdf

4. The data sources for the six indicators are as follows:

1) 'Poverty by the Head Count Ratio: District level Estimates', by Amaresh Dubey and Laveesh Bhandari, 2003 (National Sample Survey Organisation (NSSO), 55th Round). The poverty line is the one specified by the Planning Commission, Government of India, in 1979 at 1973-74 prices. It is computed to be Rs 49.09 per person per day for the rural population and Rs 56.64 for the urban population.

2) Food Sufficiency: District level Estimates by Amaresh Dubey and Laveesh Bhandari, 2003 (NSSO, 55th Round).

3) Infant Mortality Rate: The infant mortality rates used in the Debroy and Bhandari data set are for 78 regions and from the Registrar General of India, 2001. Regions comprise districts having similar demographic characteristics. While district level estimates are not available, the regional level estimates provide a reasonable idea about the health status in a set of similar districts.

4) Percentage of children fully immunised: National Commission on Population's District wise Indicators, 2000. This data is reproduced in Debroy and Bhandari [2003].

5) Literacy Rate: Census, 2001

6) Enrolment Ratio: Selected Educational Statistics 2000-01

5. It should be mentioned that the names of the districts in Debroy and Bhandari [2003] are by the 2001 Census, whereas those of the NFFWP are by the Census before it. Therefore, both may not be strictly comparable, and some adjustments have to be made in the figures reported. In Jharkhand, Saraikela is part of the new West Singhbhum, Latehar of Palamu, Jamtara of Dumka, and Simdega of Gumla. In Tamil Nadu, South Arcot forms a part of Cuddalore and Villupuram. In Orissa, the district Phulbani is now Baudh and Khandamal. If one were to make for these adjustments, the number of districts covered by the NFFWP, which have both HCR and FS, would increase by 4, to 40.

6. Quote from p. 1 of the *Rashtriya Sam Vikas Yojana*

[2004] document.

7. Quote from p. 1 of the *Rashtriya Sam Vikas Yojana* [2004] document.

8. See http://rural.nic.in/annualrep0405/chapter2.pdf

9. See, http://brgf.gov.in/

10. See Chapter 2 of the *Report of the Inter-Ministry Task Group on Redressing Growing Regional Imbalances,* Planning Commission, Government of India, 2005.

REFERENCES

Government of India, 2004; *Backward Districts Initiative - Rashtriya Sam Vikas Yojana - The Scheme and Guidelines for Preparation of District Plans,* Planning Commission, MLP Division, Government of India, New Delhi.

Government of India, 1999a; 'Instruction to Field Staff Volume-I: NSS 55th Round (July 1999-June 2000)', *National Sample Survey Organisation,* Survey Design Research Division, May.

Government of India, 1999b; 'Note on Sample Design and Estimation Procedure: 55th Round (July 1999-June 2000)', *National Sample Survey Organisation,* Survey Design Research Division, November.

Bhandari, Laveesh and Amaresh Dubey, 2003; 'Incidence of Poverty and Hunger in Indian Districts', unpublished paper.

Debroy, Bibek and Laveesh Bhandari, 2003; *District-level Deprivation in the New Millennium,* Konark Publishers, New Delhi.

Government of India, 2004; *National food for Work Programme (NFFWP),* Planning Commission, Government of India, New Delhi.

Government of India, 2005; *Report of the Inter-Ministry Task Group on Redressing Growing Regional Imbalances,* Planning Commission, Government of India, New Delhi, January.

Government of India, 2003; *Report of the Task Force: Identification of Districts for Wage and Self Employment Programmes,* Planning Commission, Government of India, New Delhi, May.

Government of India, 2004; *Statistical Report on General Elections, 2004 to the 14th Lok Sabha, Volume I, (National and State Abstracts and Detailed Results).* Election Commission of India, New Delhi.