

Annexure 5: Chapter-Wise Annexures

Annexures to Chapter 1

Table 1.A1: Population: Share by Age Group, 2001

State	Age Groups (Years)			
	0-14	15-29	15-65	65+
Arunachal	39.8	26.37	57.8	2.4
Assam	36.6	27.17	59.6	3.8
Manipur	31.8	30.20	63.6	4.6
Meghalaya	41.6	27.13	55.5	2.9
Mizoram	34.6	30.56	61.6	3.8
Nagaland	35.1	32.13	61.8	3.1
Sikkim	33.6	30.72	62.9	3.5
Tripura	31.7	27.90	63.2	5.1
India	34.3	26.58	60.9	4.8

Source: Census of India, 2001

Table 1.A2: Meghalaya Districts: Rural-Urban Population, Ratios

District	As a % to State		(A) Rural - Urban % within District	
	Rural	Urban	Rural	Urban
East Khasi Hills	0.21	0.61	0.58	0.42
Ri - Bhoi	0.10	0.03	0.93	0.07
West Khasi Hills	0.14	0.08	0.88	0.12
Jaintia Hills	0.15	0.06	0.92	0.08
East Garo Hills	0.12	0.08	0.86	0.14
West Garo Hills	0.25	0.13	0.89	0.11
South Garo Hills	0.05	0.02	0.91	0.09

Table 1.A3: District-wise Indicators

	Literacy Rate	Density of population (people per sq. km.)	BPL Households (%)	Infant Mortality Rate	Per Capita Income (Rs) (Ad. Est)	Villages Electrified (%)
	2001	2001	2002	2007	2007-08	2001
Jaintia Hills	52.79	78	39.51	77.34	26,015	62.31
East Khasi Hills	74.74	241	46.74	34.51	31,202	74.13
Ri Bhoi	55.21	79	49.94	60.63	19,866	66.11
West Khasi Hills	65.50	56	47.66	86.17	12,592	35.38
East Garo Hills	61.57	96	55.94	90.60	15,365	33.22
West Garo Hills	50.78	141	53.71	18.13	17,566	36.49
South Garo Hills	63.67	54	45.33	102.01	28,749	19.66
Meghalaya	63.31	103	48.90	52.28	22,352	44.93
India	65.38	324		34.61	31,29,717	

Sources: *Meghalaya Human Development Report and State Development Report*; infant mortality rates from the Birth & Mortality Survey, 2007; literacy rates and electrification of villages from the Census 2001; per capita income is based on GSDP at constant 1999-2000 prices from the Directorate of Economics & Statistics, Government of Meghalaya (Table 5.2.4 (3) from the SDR).

Table 1.A4: Per Capita NSDP and Growth Rates, India and Meghalaya

(1999-2000 to 2007-08 at constant 1999-2000 prices)

Year	Meghalaya		India	
	Per Capita NSDP (Rs)	Increase over Previous Year (%)	Per Capita NSDP (Rs)	Increase over Previous Year (%)
1999-2000	14,355		15,886	
2000-01	14,910	3.87	16,223	2.12
2001-02	15,518	4.08	16,910	4.23
2002-03	15,882	2.35	17,281	2.19
2003-04	16,658	4.89	18,517	7.15
2004-05	17,595	5.62	19,649	6.11
2005-06	18,501	5.15	20,813	5.92
2006-07	19,292	4.28	22,553	8.36
2007-08	20,094	4.16	24,256	7.55

Source: Central Statistical Organisation & Directorate of Economics & Statistics, Meghalaya. Table 5.2.7 (1) from the SDR

Table 1.A5: Sectoral Composition of GSDP: Meghalaya and India
(Percentage of GSDP at constant (1999-2000) prices)

	1999-2000	2003-04	2007-08*
India			
Primary	25.00	21.70	17.47
Secondary	25.30	25.60	26.79
Tertiary	49.70	52.70	55.74
Meghalaya			
Primary	22.93	21.73	21.13
Secondary	23.31	25.69	26.13
Tertiary	53.76	52.58	52.74
NER			
Primary	32.35		27.25#
Secondary	18.40		22.28#
Tertiary	49.26		50.47#

Notes: *Advanced estimates; #Data for 2005-06

Table 1.A6: India: Projected Trajectory of Growth

(at 2009-10 prices)

Plan Period	Years	Assumed Average Annual Growth Rate (%)	Projected GDP (Rs crore)	Assumed Popn Growth	Derived Per Capita (end year)	Implied Per Capita GDP Growth (%)
11 th Plan	2007-08 to 2011-12	7.84	29,390,920	1.39	56,968	6.63
12 th Plan	2012-13 to 2016-17	9.00	44,678,592	1.24	82,082	7.58
13 th Plan	2017-18 to 2021-22	9.00	86,417,000	1.11	1,18,645	7.65
14 th Plan	2022-23 to 2026-27	9.00	105,770,475	1.00	1,72,017	7.71
15 th Plan	2026-27 to 2029-30	9.00	89,140,690	0.90	2,15,266	7.76
Average Annual Growth Rate (%)		8.79		1.27		7.74

Source: NIPFP estimates

Table 1.A7: Meghalaya: Projected Trajectory of Growth

(at 2009-10 prices)

Plan Period	Years	Required GSDP CAGR (%)	Projected GSDP (Crores)	Derived Per Capita GSDP (end year)	Implied Per Capita GSDP Growth (%)
11 th	2010-11 to 2011-12	7.85	54950	48039	6.59
12 th	2012-13 to 2016-17	9.45	83154	71265	8.21
13 th	2017-18 to 2021-22	10.25	134713	109955	9.06
14 th	2022-23 to 2026-27	10.25	219433	170100	9.12
15 th	2026-27 to 2029-30	10.25	193294	223453	9.52
Average Annual Growth Rate (%)		9.92			8.80

Source: NIPFP computations.

Data Source: Population estimates: Registrar General of India; GDP and GSDP Estimates: Central Statistical Organisation, Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation, Government of India.

Table 1.A8: Projected Requirement of Investment

(at 2009-10 prices)

Plan Period	Years	Investment Required in Rs. crore		Investment Required as Per Cent of GSDP	
		Assumption I ICOR constant at 4.0	Assumption II ICOR declines from 4.0 to 3.6	ICOR I	ICOR II
11 th	2010-11 to 2011-12	7,034	7,014	28.8	28.7
12 th	2012-13 to 2016-17	28,937	28,287	34.8	34.0
13 th	2017-18 to 2021-22	50,097	47,673	37.2	35.4
14 th	2022-23 to 2026-27	81,603	75,507	37.2	34.4
15 th	2026-27 to 2029-30	71,882	65,048	37.2	33.7

Source: NIPFP estimates.

Annexure to Chapter 2: Participatory Governance

Annexure 2.1: Role of the Governor of the State in Respect of District and Regional Councils

Description of the power entrusted to the Governor	Details of the provision in the Sixth Schedule	
	Para	Brief content
Powers to constitute district and regional councils	19	To constitute district councils for each autonomous district as soon as possible and until constitution of district council, to be the head of the administration of the district
	1(2)	Divide areas of district council into autonomous regions
	1(3)	Issue notification for inclusion, exclusion, creation, increase, decrease unite or define areas of district council or alter the name of any district council
	2(6)	Frame rules for the first constitution of district council or regional council
	14(3)	Place one of the Ministers in charge of the welfare of the autonomous district region
Powers to dissolve and supersede councils	16(1)	Dissolve a district or regional council and assume to himself all or any of the functions or powers of the district or the regional council on the recommendation of the commission appointed under Paragraph 14
	16(2)	Dissolve a district or regional council and assume to himself all or any of the functions or powers of the district or the regional council if satisfied that the administration of the autonomous district or region cannot be carried out in accordance with the provisions of the sixth schedule of the constitution
Powers affecting electoral representation in the council area	2(1) & 2(6A)	Nominate four members in each district council who hold office at his pleasure
	17	For the purposes of elections to the legislative assembly of the state, declare that any area within an autonomous district shall not for part of any constituency to fill a seat or seats in the assembly reserved for any such district, but shall form part of a constituency to fill a seat or seats I the assembly not so reserved to be specified in the order
Powers to enlarge, diminish powers or review decisions of District and Regional Councils	4(3)	Extent of jurisdiction of the High Court over suits and cases tried by District Council Courts
	5	Confer power under CPC and CrPC on district council courts for trial of specified nature of cases and withdraw or modify the same
	6(2)	Entrust conditionally or unconditionally all or any of the executive powers available to the state to the District Council or its officers with the consent of the District Council
	15(1)	Annual or suspend acts and resolutions of the district and regional council if such act or resolution is likely to endanger the safety of India or is prejudicial to the public order
Governor	3(3)	Assent to laws made by the District and Regional councils,

		without which they have no force of law
	2(7)	Approve the rules made by the District and Regional councils for composition and delimitation of the Councils, qualification terms of office etc., of its members and generally for all matters regulating the transaction of business pertaining to the administration of the district
	6(1)	Give prior approval for the framing of regulations by the District Council for the regulation and control of primary schools, dispensaries, markets road transport, waterways etc.
	4(4)	Approve rules regarding constitution procedure et. of village council and district council courts, made by the district and regional councils
	7(2)	Make rules for the management of district and regional fund
	8(4)	Give prior assent for regulations framed by District and Regional Council for levy and collection of taxes, without which they do not have the force of law
	10(3)	Give prior assent to regulations framed by the district council for the control of money lending, without which they do not have the force of law
Powers of arbitration	9(2)	Give the final decisions in respect of disputes between district council and regional council in cases of royalty for extraction of minerals, which shall be referred to the governor for resolution
Powers to appoint a Commission	14(1)	Appoint a commission to inquire into the administration of autonomous district regions
	14(2)	Report of commission appointed under paragraph 14 is required to be laid before the state legislature with the recommendations (except in the case of state of Assam) with respect thereto

Source: Report of the Expert Committee on Planning for the Sixth Schedule Areas, Ministry of Panchayati Raj, Government of India, September 2006, New Delhi.

Annexure to Chapter 3: The Rural Sector

Table: 3.A1: NER and India: Resource Endowments and Land Occupational Patterns

States	forest/land	net area sown/ land	area sown more than once/ net area sown	net area sown/ total cropped area	area sown more than once/ total cropped area	not available for cultivation/ Net area sown	forests/ Net area sown	permanent pastures & other grazing lands/ land under misc. trees & groves not included in net area sown/ net area sown	culturable waste land/ net area sown	fallow lands other than current fallows/ net area sown	current fallows/ net area sown	
Arunachal Pradesh	0.94	0.03	0.60	0.62	0.38	0.16	31.43	0.00	0.22	0.23	0.29	0.18
Assam	0.25	0.35	0.49	0.67	0.33	0.93	0.71	0.02	0.09	0.03	0.02	0.04
Manipur	0.27	0.06	0.49	0.67	0.33	10.32	4.30	-	0.17	-	-	-
Meghalaya	0.42	0.09	0.20	0.83	0.17	0.97	4.13	-	0.67	1.92	0.70	0.28
Mizoram	0.77	0.04	-	1.00	-	0.17	17.30	0.01	0.33	1.35	1.66	0.38
Nagaland	0.54	0.19	0.05	0.96	0.04	0.22	2.88	-	0.42	0.22	0.26	0.30
Sikkim	0.36	0.13	0.33	0.75	0.25	2.84	2.71	0.10	0.05	0.01	0.09	0.04
Tripura	0.58	0.27	0.53	0.65	0.35	0.48	2.16	-	0.10	0.00	0.00	0.00
North-East	0.52	0.17	0.43	0.70	0.30	1.17	2.97	0.01	0.16	0.19	0.13	0.08
India	0.23	0.46	0.33	0.75	0.25	0.30	0.49	0.04	0.02	0.10	0.07	0.10

Source: *Statistical Abstract Meghalaya 2004-05*

Note: Fallow land is permanent fallow land, whether the current fallow land is the land which had been under cultivation for reasons like flood and drought it remains fallow temporarily. Therefore, it cannot be added over time but can be added at a given point in time.

Table 3.A2: Value of Agricultural Product Per Agricultural Worker

istricts	Value of agricultural output (Rs. lakh)**	Agricultural Workers (no.) *	Value of output per agricultural worker (Rs)	Proportion of agricultural labourers to total workers
East Garo Hills	9,718	89,519	10,855	12.1
East Khasi Hills	28,470	76,748	37,095	13.3
Jaintia Hills	9,059	96,402	9,397	28.6
Ri-Bhoi	8,040	68,217	11,785	18.4
South Garo Hills	6,978	35,037	19,916	12.6
West Garo Hills	28,067	1,52,508	18,403	16.4
West Khasi Hills	8,935	1,11,739	7,996	23.3
Meghalaya			15,752	12.54

Source: *State Development Report*, Government of Meghalaya 2008-09

** At constant (1999-2000) prices

* Sum total of cultivator and agricultural workers (2001 census)

Table 3.A3: Sectoral Shares in NSDP (at constant base 1993-94)

(per cent)

State	Year	Agriculture	Primary	Manufacturing	Infrastructure	Services
Meghalaya	1993-94	28.62	3.38	2.57	12.64	52.78
	1998-99	26.77	6.99	1.99	13.23	51.02
	2002-03	25.96	6.86	2.73	16.77	47.67
NER	1993-94	36.14	1.46	4.53	13.99	43.89
	1998-99	31.34	1.98	3.72	16.26	46.53
	2002-03	29.53	1.70	3.61	19.83	45.17
India	1993-94	33.01	1.63	16.72	12.23	36.41
	1998-99	28.64	1.59	16.86	13.54	39.37
	2002-03	21.80	1.92	15.90	16.26	44.12

Source: Central Statistical Organisation (CSO) website as on 26-11-1999 for old series and as on 23-2-2006 for new series.

Note: Figures are calculated.

ANNEXURE 3.2: INDICES OF SPECIALISATION

3.1. The Regional Specialization Index (RSI)

This index is defined as the ratio of the net sown area devoted to a particular product as a percentage of the total net sown area in Meghalaya to the ratio of the total net sown area for the product in the entire northeast as a percentage of the total net sown area for the northeast as a whole. That is,

$$RSI = X_{ij}/X_j/X_{iNE}/X_{NE}$$

where X_{ij} is the net sown area of the product i in State j (j = Meghalaya), X_j = net sown area in State j , X_{iNE} = net sown area of the product i in the NE (NE = northeast) and X_{NE} = total net sown area in the NE. An RSI value of more than 1 indicates that the particular State has a revealed comparative advantage in that crop compared to NE.

Table 3.A4: Regional Specialisation Index (RSI) for Meghalaya, 2003-04

Crop	Regional Specialisation Index (RSI)
Rice	0.57
Maize	1.8
Small millet	1.42
Wheat	0.2
Total cereals	0.62
Total pulses	0.49
Total food grains	0.61
Sesamum	1.25
Rapeseed & mustard	0.39
Total oilseeds	0.43
Tea	-
Coffee	3.19
Natural rubber	2.93
Bananas	1.31
Sugarcane	-
Potatoes	2.61
Chillies	1.06
Ginger	5.27
Coconut	-
Turmeric	1.95
Pineapple	2.94

Source: Statistical Abstract of India, 2003-04

Note: Figures are computed.

3.1.1 District-wise Regional Specialisation Index (DRSI) for Meghalaya, 2004-05

This section constructs DRSI on two different ways: one, in terms of net sown area (NSA) and the other in terms of production in quantity (PQ). The district-level DRSI (NSA) is defined as:

$$\mathbf{DRSI}_{NSA} = X_{ij}/X_j/X_{iM}/X_M$$

where X_{ij} is the net sown area of the product i in district j , X_j = net sown area in district j , X_{iM} = net sown area of the product i in Meghalaya and X_M = total net sown area in the Meghalaya.

And the district-level DRSI (PQ) is defined as:

$$\mathbf{DRSI}_{PQ} = Q_{ij}/Q_j/Q_{iM}/Q_M$$

where Q_{ij} is the production in quantity of the product i in district j , Q_j = production in quantity in district j , Q_{iM} = production in quantity of the product i in Meghalaya and Q_M = total production in quantity in the Meghalaya.

3.1.1a: DRSI for Agricultural Crops

Table 3.A6: Meghalaya: District-wise DRSI for Agricultural Crops by Net Sown Area

Crop	District-level Regional Specialisation Index (DRSI) by NSA						
	East Khasi Hills	Ri - Bhoi	West Khasi Hills	Jaintia Hills	East Garo Hills	West Garo Hills	South Garo Hills
Rice	0.35	1.13	0.86	1.10	1.13	1.21	0.97
Wheat	-	-	0.02	-	0.51	2.91	-
Rabi & other pulses	0.73	0.28	0.09	0.37	0.68	1.95	1.22
Sugar cane	-	-	0.66	0.64	1.85	1.61	0.96
Jute	-	-	-	-	0.41	2.71	1.05
Rapeseed & mustard	0.06	0.26	0.04	0.07	0.71	2.60	0.39
Maize	0.81	1.05	2.66	1.24	0.45	0.81	0.65
Cotton	-	-	-	-	2.61	1.90	0.35
Ginger	0.35	1.19	0.39	0.19	3.55	0.82	0.22

Note: Figures are calculated

Table 3.A7: Meghalaya: District-wise DRSI for Agricultural Crops by Agricultural Production Quantity

Crop	District-level Regional Specialisation Index (DRSI) by Product Quantity						
	East Khasi Hills	Ri - Bhoi	West Khasi Hills	Jaintia Hills	East Garo Hills	West Garo Hills	South Garo Hills
Rice	0.19	1.79	0.42	1.69	1.64	1.35	1.62
Wheat	-	-	0.00	-	0.44	3.31	-
Rabi & other pulses	0.37	0.38	0.08	0.61	0.72	2.26	2.59
Sugar cane	-	-	0.33	0.31	2.64	2.02	2.52
Jute	-	-	-	-	0.74	3.04	1.44
Rapeseed & mustard	0.03	0.17	0.02	0.17	0.69	2.98	0.96
Maize	0.52	1.91	1.36	1.88	0.54	0.95	1.08
Cotton	-	-	-	-	4.41	1.84	0.69
Ginger	2.44	0.01	1.98	0.15	0.07	0.08	0.08

3.1.1b: DRSI for Horticultural Products

Table 3.A8: Meghalaya: District-wise DRSI for Horticultural Produce by Net Sown Area

RSI	District-level Regional Specialisation Index (DRSI) of Horticulture by NSA						
	East Khasi Hills	Ri - Bhoi	West Khasi Hills	Jaintia Hills	East Garo Hills	West Garo Hills	South Garo Hills
Pineapple	0.62	4.08	0.83	0.11	0.66	0.81	1.38
Citrus fruits	3.99	0.23	1.04	0.83	0.20	0.40	0.51
Banana	0.82	1.62	1.24	0.43	1.73	0.83	0.71
Papaya	1.00	2.97	0.53	0.17	1.80	0.62	0.88

Table 3.A9: Meghalaya: District-wise DRSI for Horticultural Produce by Production Quantity

RSI	District-level Regional Specialisation Index (DRSI) of Horticulture by PQ						
	East Khasi Hills	Ri - Bhoi	West Khasi Hills	Jaintia Hills	East Garo Hills	West Garo Hills	South Garo Hills
Pineapple	0.35	1.51	0.71	0.25	1.00	1.02	1.31
Citrus fruits	3.18	0.14	1.84	3.97	0.19	0.33	0.14
Banana	0.73	0.77	0.98	0.49	1.39	1.32	1.02
Papaya	0.76	0.90	0.47	0.19	1.67	1.08	1.20

3.2. National Specialisation Index (NSI)

To see where Meghalaya stands in comparison to the rest of the country, the National Specialisation Index (NSI) is constructed for the same 20 crops and is defined as a ratio of the net sown area of the product i in State j (J = Meghalaya) as a percentage of the net sown area of the product for the NE (NE= northeast region) to the net sown area of product i in India as a percentage of the net sown area in India. That is,

$$NSI = X_{ij}/X_{iNE}/X_{iI}/X_I$$

where X_{ij} is the net sown area of the product i in state j , X_{iNE} = net sown area of the product i in the NE, X_{iI} = net sown area of the product i in India and X_I = total net sown area in India.

Table 3.A10: National Specialisation Index (NSI) for Meghalaya, 2003-04

Crop	National Specialisation Index (NSI)
Rice	1.59
Maize	1.42
Small millet	1.53
Wheat	0.02
Total cereals	0.8
Total pulses	0.13
Total food grains	0.67
Sesamum	0.69
Rapeseed and mustard	0.8
Total oilseeds	0.26
Tea	-
Coffee	3.46
Natural rubber	4.3
Bananas	6.18
Sugarcane	-
Potatoes	8.59
Chillies	1.48
Ginger	60.67
Coconut	-
Turmeric	7.97
Pineapple	68.17

Source: *Statistical Abstracts of India, 2003-04*

Note: Figures are calculated.

3.3. The Demand Intensity Measure (DIM)

The Demand Intensity Measure (DIM) is used to indicate the intensity of the consumption of the product in the state or region. It is defined as the consumption share of the i^{th} product in State j

with respect to the all-India consumption share in that product. Table 3.A10 shows the outcome of calculations of the Demand Intensity Measure, Z, which is defined as:

$$Z = (c_{ij}/C_{iI}) \times 100,$$

where C_{ij} is the per capita consumption expenditure in state i for the jth commodity and C_{iI} = national average per capita consumption expenditure for the same commodity. This shows the intensity of demand relative to the country. Thus, a value of Z greater than 100 indicates high demand intensity relative to the all-India level.

Table 3.A11: Meghalaya and NER: Demand Intensity Measure (DIM) for Crops

Crop	Meghalaya	NER
Rice	101.38	259.79
Wheat	21.1	21.29
Maize	14.38	77.12
Cereal	69.14	166.46
Gram	1.32	21.19
Cereal substitutes	76.83	103.66
Pulses	30.93	73.29
Milk & milk products	28.91	47.56
Edible oil	55.71	86.61
Meat, fish and eggs	205.17	346.91
Vegetables	68.12	150.94
Fruits (fresh)	52.7	97.72
Fruits (dry)	8.12	20.11
Sugar	48.06	73.6
Salt	63.04	174.35
Spices	28.55	75.71
Beverages, etc.	125.38	87.6
Food total	71.14	125.74

Source: National Sample Survey, 2003.

Based on the DIM in Table 3.A11, Meghalaya's demand for meat, fish and eggs is far higher than the national demand, and so is its demand for beverages. Its demand for rice is marginally higher than that for the country. Similarly, the entire NER has a higher than national average demand for meat, fish and eggs, rice and for rice. Apart from having a higher overall DIM compared to the country as a whole, the region also has a high demand for vegetables, cereal and salt.

3.4. The Dependency Index (DI)

The Dependency Index (DI) is the ratio of per capita consumption to per capita production. Here an attempt is made to explain whether there is any matching between the consumption of the crop and its production in the state. A state can consume more of a product it produces or else it can

import former and specialise only in an export-oriented crop pattern which is driven by geography, climate, soil, rainfall, etc.

Calculation of the DI is somewhat risky as data is not available on the same products both for consumption as well as production for all NE states. Consumption data is obtained from NSS which has a different set of product classification in contrast to the *Statistical Abstract of India* where production data is listed. Despite these problems, a mapping has been prepared which approximately places similar products in the desired product category. Table 3.A12 shows the mapping of C_{ij} and P_{ij} for ease of calculation for all NE states, except Nagaland and Sikkim.

$$DI = (c_{ij}/C_{ii}) / (P_{ij}/P_{ii}) \times 100$$

P_{ij} and P_{ii} have been defined above. The results of these calculations are shown in Tables 3.A13a and A12b; thus, a DI greater than 100 indicates dependency. (Due to non-availability of data the DI cannot be calculated for all commodities.)

Table 3.A12: Mapping

Consumption	Production
Rice	Rice
Wheat	Wheat
Maize	Maize
Cereal	Total cereals
Pulses	Total pulses
Edible oil	Total oilseeds
Fruits (fresh)	Banana
Sugar	Sugarcane
Spices	Spices
Food total	Total foodgrains

Note: Consumption data is taken from NSSO and production data from Statistical Abstracts of India.

**Table 3.A13a: Meghalaya and NER: Dependency Index (DI)
for All Products, 2003-04**

Crop	Meghalaya	NER
Rice	100.37	165.96
Wheat	1,715.11	676.57
Maize	18.61	343.57
Total cereals	134.52	228.63
Total pulses	260.38	476.96
Total oilseeds	529.34	415.03
Fruits	44.65	95.69
Sugarcane	-	618.62

Spices	2.02	27.74
Total food grains	146.28	182.77
Milk	82.74	168.72
Meat	11.15	23.59
Egg	79.07	283.66
Fish	166.71	127.00

Source: Calculated from NSSO, 2003 and *Statistical Abstract of India, 2003-04*.

Table 3.13a clearly shows the dependency of the NER on outside regions for many agricultural commodities: it is dependent for all the products listed, except for fruits, spices and meat, while Meghalaya has a surplus situation in maize, fruits, milk, meat and eggs.

Table 3.A13b: Meghalaya and NER: Dependency Index for Milk, Meat, Eggs and Fish, 2003-04

	Meghalaya	NER
Milk	82.74	168.72
Meat	5.58	23.59
<i>Weights Assigned</i>	<i>0.05</i>	<i>0.10</i>
Eggs	108.72	141.83
<i>Weights Assigned</i>	<i>0.55</i>	<i>0.20</i>
Fish	133.37	177.80
<i>Weights Assigned</i>	<i>0.40</i>	<i>0.70</i>

Source: *Statistical Abstracts of India, 2003-04* and *NSS, 2003*

Note: Figures have been calculated.

3.4.1 District-level Dependency Indices:

Now we are interested to know the dependency situation across different districts of Meghalaya for which we need to prepare a correspondence between consumption data and the production data as these data read taken from different sources. Table 3.A14 provides a mapping between consumption and production at the district level.

Table 3.A14: Meghalaya Districts: Mapping – District-level Dependency Index

Consumption	Production
Rice	Rice
Wheat	Wheat
Pulses	Total Pulses
Sugar	Sugarcane
Edible oil	Rapeseed & mustard
Maize	Maize
Spices	Ginger
Fruits (fresh)	Banana

Note: Consumption data is taken from NSSO and production data from *Statistical Abstracts of India*.

**Table 3.A15a: District-level Dependency Index (DI) for All Products, 2004-05:
Meghalaya as Base**

Crops	Districts DI – Meghalaya as Base						
	East Khasi Hills	Ri-Bhoi	West Khasi Hills	Jaintia Hills	East Garo Hills	West Garo Hills	South Garo Hills
Rice	541.62	55.27	220.86	103.29	66.03	58.14	83.03
Wheat	-	-	521967.71	-	6402.96	611.77	-
Rabi & other pulses	10045.40	9224.78	42496.83	10169.04	5350.94	1234.50	1850.47
Sugar cane	-	-	118869.5	240195.5	17347.17	16389.27	22525.25
Rapeseed & mustard	87894.06	13196.30	86123.23	22823.11	3534.38	590.81	3154.47
Maize	229.33	59.15	78.75	105.99	231.02	94.81	143.38
Ginger	16.35	2985.71	18.20	445.85	637.13	365.78	656.23
Fruits	82.34	15.04	101.86	152.29	33.04	52.86	41.50

Dependency scores (Table 3.A14) are defined by taking Meghalaya as the base to show the relative situation of a district as compared to the state. It reveals some interesting information. For instance, only the East Khasii Hills and West Khasi Hills have surpluses in ginger while Ri-Bhoi and the entire Garo Hills show surpluses in rice, and Jaintia Hills is only very marginally dependent on rice. Since wheat is produced only in small quantities and is not a major consumable item, all the districts are highly dependent on wheat. A few districts have shown surpluses in maize and fruits. In general, all the districts are highly dependent on imports.

**Table 3.A15b: District-level Dependency Index (DI) for All Products, 2004-05
NER as Base**

Crops	Districts DI – NER as Base							
	East Khasi Hills	Ri - Bhoi	West Khasi Hills	Jaintia Hills	East Garo Hills	West Garo Hills	South Garo Hills	Meghalaya
Rice	908.84	92.74	370.59	173.32	110.81	97.55	139.32	170.11
Wheat	-	-	875856.24	-	10744.1	1026.54	-	4386.32
Rabi & other pulses	16856.08	15479.09	71309.23	17063.54	8978.82	2071.48	3105.07	6038.20
Sugar cane	-	-	199461.73	403045.4	29108.4	27501.0	37797.1	71664.9
Rapeseed & mustard	147485.3	22143.26	144513.86	38296.94	5930.64	991.37	5293.16	3818.39
Maize	384.81	99.26	132.14	177.85	387.64	159.09	240.60	194.75
Ginger	27.44	5010.00	30.54	748.14	1069.11	613.78	1101.14	65.53
Fruits	138.16	25.24	170.92	255.55	55.43	88.69	69.64	85.44

The dependency scores by taking NER as the base show that all the districts except East Khasi, West Khasi and Jaintia hills show scores less than 100 for fruits. In rice only Ri-Bhoi and West Garo; in maize only Ri-Bhoi; and in ginger only East Khasi, West Khasi and Meghalaya as a whole show less than 100 scores. As in the first case, on rest of the products in all the districts dependency scores have been exorbitantly high.

Table 3.A15c: District level Dependency Index (DI) for All Products, 2004-05: India as Base

Crops	Districts DI – India as Base								
	East Khasi Hills	Ri - Bhoi	West Khasi Hills	Jaintia Hills	East Garo Hills	West Garo Hills	South Garo Hills	Meghalaya	NE
Rice	556.38	56.78	226.88	106.10	67.83	59.72	85.29	104.14	159.1
Wheat	-	-	536193.1	-	6577.5	628.44	-	2685.3	665.8
Rabi & other pulses	10319.17	9476.19	43655.01	10446.2	5496.8	1268.2	1900.9	3696.6	2132
Sugar cane	-	-	122109.1	246741.6	17819.94	16835.94	23139.14	43872.79	219.28
Rapeseed & mustard	90289.47	13555.95	88470.38	23445.12	3630.70	606.91	3240.44	2337.59	1541.29
Maize	235.58	60.77	80.90	108.88	237.31	97.40	147.29	119.23	1088.73
Ginger	16.80	3067.08	18.70	458.00	654.50	375.75	674.11	40.11	1439.19
Fruits	84.58	15.45	104.64	156.45	33.94	54.30	42.63	52.31	387.35

When the entire country is used as a base (Table 3.A15c) all the districts except for West Khasi, Jaintia Hills and NER as a whole show scores less than 100 for fruits. In rice only Ri-Bhoi, East Garo, West Garo and South Garo are not dependent; in maize only Ri-Bhoi, West Khasi, and West Garo; and in ginger only East Khasi, West Khasi and Meghalaya as a whole show less than 100 scores. As in the other two cases (where the state and region are used as bases), for the rest of the products, the dependency scores have been exorbitantly high in all districts.

3.5. Relative Productivity of Principal Crops

Agricultural productivity, however, also depends on factors other than land utilisation, such as differing natural land requirements for different crops or the role played by trade in determining resource allocation. Further, land utilisation pattern in a relatively closed subsistence economy is crucially determined by the consumption needs of farmers, i.e., local demand patterns. Some of

these have been factored in the comparison of relative productivities across states in the top five commodities (as indicated by the RSI) to national productivity levels.¹

**Table 3.A16: Relative Productivity of Principal Crops
in Meghalaya, 2003-04**

(quintals per hectare)

Crop	Relative Productivity
Rice	0.88
Maize	0.75
Small millet	1.65
Wheat	0.61
Total cereals	0.89
Total pulses	1.16
Total foodgrains	1.00
Sesamum	1.11
Rapeseed & mustard	0.56
Total oilseeds	0.61
Tea	0.18
Coffee	-
Natural rubber	-
Banana	0.49
Sugarcane	0.03
Potatoes	0.46
Chillies	0.62
Ginger	1.49
Coconut	-
Turmeric	1.54
Pineapple	0.56

Source: *Statistical Abstracts of India, 2003-04*

Note: Figures are calculated.

The relative productivity figures as shown in Table 3.A16 show that Meghalaya has productivity advantages for the following products, namely, small millets, pulses, sesamum, ginger and turmeric.

¹ Yield per hectare has been used to indicate productivity. A relative productivity greater than one would indicate that the specialization given by the RSI has some economic basis.

Annexures to Chapter 5: Tourism

Table 5.1A: Tourists in North East India

(number)

States	Year	Tourists		
		Domestic	Foreign	Total
Arunachal Pradesh	2005-06	3,025	292	3,317
Assam	2006-07	34,79,870	13,657	34,93,527
Manipur	2006-07	1,20,572	263	1,20,835
Meghalaya	2005	3,75,911	5,099	3,81,010
Mizoram	2007-08	44,226	735	46,312
Nagaland	2006	15,030	1,002	16,032
Sikkim	2007	2,15,843	9,001	2,24,844
Tripura	2006-07	2,29,621	3,177	2,32,798

Source: *Arunachal Pradesh at a Glance 2006*, *Statistical Handbook of Assam 2007*, *Manipur 2006*, *Meghalaya 2007*, *Mizoram 2008*, *Nagaland 2006*, *Sikkim, A Statistical Profile 2006-07*, *Tripura 2007*

Annexure 5.2: North East Summit on Tourism <http://db.nedfi.com/content/tourism>

Gangtok Summit on the Tourism Sector – 27-28 April, 2008

<http://mdoner.gov.in/writereaddata/linkimages/fourth414626002.html>

S.No.	Actionable Points	Action Taken
1.	<p>A “Forum” consisting of representatives of Ministries of DoNER, Tourism and Civil Aviation, NEC, public and private stakeholders, tour operators, etc., would be established for the formulation of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -state tourism circuits -Inter-state tourism circuits -eco and village tourism -promotional events -advocacy 	<p>NEC has constituted the North Eastern States Tourism Forum (NEST) with the Secretary, NEC as its Chairman, Director (Tourism), NEC as its Member Secretary and include respective commissioners and secretaries (Tourism) of different states of the NER. The Forum will prepare plans to promote tourism in</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Intra and inter-state tourist circuit Eco-tourism Village tourism Promotional events Destination promotion for the northeast <p>The meeting of this Forum will be held quarterly either at Shillong or any other State.</p> <p>The first meeting was held on 30th April, 2008, at Shillong.</p> <p>M/s NEDFi have engaged a consultant to prepare a Regional Roadmap/ Action Plan for development of tourism in NER.</p>
2.	<p>In consultation with the NE States, the Ministry of DoNER/NEC in consultation with the Ministries of Tourism, Home Affairs, External Affairs, Defence, etc. will formulate and launch a professionally prepared publicity programme on security for tourists in the North-East.</p>	<p>A Committee was constituted to formulate a strategy for promotion of tourism in the NER comprising representatives from DoNER, MHA, DAVP and Indian Institute of Mass Communication. The campaign is expected to cost about Rs. 2.50 crore. Three T.V. spots (Mesmerizing NE) has already been telecast on popular channels and received appreciation. These spots based on the theme of North East as a safe destination for investors as well as tourists to an agency. MHA has also begun a campaign with emphasis on security aspects to allay apprehensions about travel restriction in consultation with DoNER.</p> <p>The Ministry organised a successful conclave on 16th January 2008 to educate government officials on the North East as a safe and attractive destination. The seminar had participation from NE states, tour operators, central ministries, etc. An exhibition will also be held on the sidelines of the seminar.</p> <p>The Ministry is also working with the MHA to highlight the potential of the North East through the NE Newsletter being published, and widely circulated, by the MHA primarily containing development news.</p>
3	<p>Ministry of DONER/NEC in consultation with Ministries of Tourism, Home Affairs, External Affairs, Defence, etc. will take up with the Commonwealth War Graves Commission, the possibility</p>	<p>Ministry of DoNER has written to the State Governments of Nagaland, Manipur to develop a proposal for the same. Plans from the State Governments are awaited.</p> <p>The Ministry of DoNER is also working on a media strategy to comprehensively focus on the North East Region. Firms have been short listed for the campaign.</p>

	of organizing major commemorative events to which descendents of those buried in the North-East war cemeteries will be invited. This will, incidentally project the security environment in NER more accurately to western tourists.	
4.	Ministry of DoNER/NEC will sponsor NE promotion films (cultural and touristic) aimed at schoolchildren and college students in other parts of India. SPICMACAY will be requested to screen these in universities.	The Ministry has produced some documentaries. More such programmes are likely to be awarded during the current year and a panel of agencies for undertaking the work has been formed.
5.	NEC to broaden its collaboration with ILFS for facilitating construction of star category hotels at identified locations. The scope of the North East Tourism Fund needs to be widened. Ministry of DONER also to be associated.	NEC has finalised an agreement with the Infrastructure Leasing and Finance Services (IL&FS) which has been signed on 17th October 2007. ILFS has initiated steps for supporting budget hotels in the North Eastern Region in twelve cities which are under various stages of funding/construction. These are at Agartala, Guwahati, Jorhat, Tezpur, Dibrugarh, Manas, Dimapur, Kohima, Aizawl, Shillong, Tawang & Bomdila and Gangtok. The Budget Hotel at Agartala has been commissioned.
6.	A “dedicated airline” for the NE region, particularly for establishing connectivity within the NE states is under consideration of NEC/DoNER. This arrangement could be widened subsequently to provide connectivity with Nepal, Bhutan, Dhaka, Yangon, Bangkok, Kunming, etc., for the promotion of regional tourism.	Bids were invited for this purpose by NEC. Only two bids were received by the last date. These were found invalid. as been decided to modify and redraft the bid document. NEC is finalizing the bid document for inviting fresh bids.
7.	NEC/Ministry of DoNER will organise promotional events at different locations	The Ministry initiated a COS Note for relaxation of LTC Rules for travel to the NER. DOPT has recently issued orders for allowing air travel to non-entitled officials and conversion of HTC to LTC for travel to the NER.

	in the country aimed at government servants for LTC visits to tourism destinations in the NE.	A major event was organised in Vigyan Bhawan, New Delhi on 16th January 2008 for LTC holders inviting them to come to NE. Government of India employees from Ministries and Organizations, State Governments, Domestic tour operators and the Indian Association of Tour Operators attended. Presentations were made by the State Governments and Ministry of Tourism, Indian Railways Catering and Tourism Corporation (IRCTC) and Infrastructure Leasing and Financial Services (IL&FS). An exhibition on the tourism sector was organized at the venue. Over 1000 delegates participated in the event.
8.	The Thai Minister of Commerce will be visiting the NE with a business delegation between 21-24 June 2007. This visit will promote tourism and also Thai business investment in the NE.	The Thai Commerce Minister visited the North Eastern Region (Agartala, Guwahati and Shillong) in June 2007 with a delegation of 33 officials and businessmen. Ministry of DoNER held the North East India Trade and Investment Opportunities Week at Bangkok from 1-4 October, 2007 which was attended by more than 500 participants from both the countries. The Deputy Minister (Industry), Thailand along with a delegation of 17 Thai officials and businesspersons visited the North Eastern Region (Assam, Arunachal Pradesh and Sikkim) between 9 to 12 January, 2007 to discuss investment prospects in the North Eastern Region. They had extensive discussions with State Government representatives as well as businesspersons from the Region.
9.	The Union Minister of Tourism and Culture, Smt. Ambika Soni, announced the establishment of one Institute of Hotel Management (IHM) in each states of the NE that does not have such an institutions (Assam and Meghalaya already have one IHM each).	Ministry of Tourism has sanctioned an Institute for Hotel Management (IHM) at Aizawl for Rs. 10 crore for which Rs. 4 crore has already been released. The Institute for Nagaland will be approved shortly by Ministry of Tourism. Arunachal Pradesh, Manipur and Tripura have yet to forward their project proposals. Institutes are already available at Guwahati, Shillong and Gangtok.
10.	HRD and capacity-building of NE youths in the tourism, hotel and hospitality services are being undertaken by Ministry of DoNER/NEC/Ministry of Tourism. These efforts would be synergised for undertaking capacity-building in a planned way	Ministry of Tourism/ DoNER/ NEC can work out a strategy to impart training in tourism related skills to candidates from the NE States. The training could be funded from the Capacity Building schemes of the Ministry of DoNER. DoNER has approved a programme for the training of 125 youth from NE in Aviation Hospitality and Tourism Management. The programme is to be imparted by Ashok Institute, a unit of ITDC, at Bangalore from 1st July 2008.
11.	Ministry of DoNER will follow up issue of relevant Notifications by the DIPP under the North East Industrial & Investment	The necessary notifications have been issued by DIPP which includes the services sector.

	Promotion Policy (NEIIPP) 2007 within June, 2007.	
12.	<p>Ministry of Home Affairs will consider and expedite issue of appropriate orders for relaxation of PAP/RAP restrictions on the entry of foreign nationals into Mizoram, Nagaland, Arunachal Pradesh and Sikkim based on inputs given by the states. Mizoram, Nagaland and Arunachal Pradesh to consider simplification of procedures for issue of ILPs. For example, all central and state government employees and employees of central and State PSUs may be allowed to enter based on official identity proof.</p> <p>state governments to identify inter-state tourism circuits and share the details with the Ministries of Home Affairs, Tourism, DoNER and NEC both for relaxation of the PAP/RAP restrictions and extension of technical and financial assistance for development of these identified circuits.</p>	<p>MHA received proposals from State Governments. In the case of Arunachal Pradesh only, relaxation of PAP/RAP restrictions has been made and orders issued by MHA in May,2008. Proposals from the States of Mizoram, Nagaland, Manipur and Sikkim are still under examination by MHA.</p>
13.	<p>NEC jointly with Ministries of DoNER, Tourism and the state governments to take forward the suggestion of the Ministry of Tourism to take advantage of Meeting Incentive Convention Event (MICE) Tourism by setting up convention centres at suitable locations and with all required infrastructure with</p>	<p>Ministry of Tourism has sanctioned a Convention Centre at Hotel Brahmaputra Ashok at Guwahati.</p>

	assistance of the Ministry of Tourism.	
14.	NEC/Ministry of DoNER to organise a tourism promotional event at Bangkok jointly with the Ministry of Tourism and the Embassy of India at Bangkok after the Thai Commerce Minister's visit to the North East in June, 2007.	Ministry of DoNER organized the 'North East India Trade & Investment Opportunities Week' at Bangkok from 1-4 October 2007 with a session dedicated to Tourism.

Annexures to Chapter 6: Infrastructure

Table 6.A1: Growth Rates of Infrastructure, 1993-94 to 2006-07 (at constant base 1993-94)
(per cent)

States	Growth Rate of Infrastructure
Meghalaya	10.11
India	9.23

Note: 1 Owing to differences in methodology of compilation, data for different states/ UTs are not strictly comparable.

2. Figures are calculated.

Source: *Central Statistical Organisation (CSO) website as 26-11-1999 or old series and as on 23-2-2006 for new series.*

Tables from the Infrastructure Index for the Northeast, Tables 6.A1 to 6.A6

Table 6.A2: Meghalaya Districts: Electricity and Water Supply and Northeast Rank, 2009

District	Villages Electrified (%)	Rank	Households with Tap Water Connections (%)	Rank
East Khasi Hills	71.85	57	62.60	4
Ri-Bhoi	74.22	52	35.83	11
Jaintia Hills	74.73	51	16.54	43
West Khasi Hills	54.00	68	28.69	17
West Garo Hills	53.85	69	17.42	40
South Garo Hills	44.20	72	28.92	16
East Garo Hills	53.36	70	21.26	30
North East	68.41		15.04	

Source: "District Infrastructure Index for the North Eastern Region", Ministry of DONER, September 2009 <http://mdoner.gov.in/index2.asp?sid=265>

Table 6.A3: Meghalaya Districts: Education Infrastructure and Northeast Rank, 2009

District	Schools per 1,000 People	Rank	Schools per 100 sq km	Rank
East Khasi Hills	2.92	16	68.37	17
Ri-Bhoi	4.11	8	33.38	34
Jaintia Hills	3.59	10	28.15	36
West Khasi Hills	5.83	2	32.88	35

West Garo Hills	3.90	10	54.45	22
South Garo Hills	6.38	1	34.83	31
East Garo Hills	4.77	6	45.95	24
North East	1.84			

Source: "District Infrastructure Index for the North Eastern Region", Ministry of DONER, September 2009 <http://mdoner.gov.in/index2.asp?sid=265>

Table 6.A4: Meghalaya Districts: Communication Infrastructure and Northeast Rank, 2009

District	Post and Telegraph Offices per 10,000 people	Rank	Post and Telegraph Offices per 100 sq km	Rank	Telephone Exchanges per 10,000 people	Rank	Telephone Exchanges per 100 sq km	Rank
East Khasi Hills	2.04	37	4.79	21	0.51	28	1.21	9
Ri-Bhoi	2.28	33	1.85	39	0.78	18	0.63	31
Jaintia Hills	2.67	24	2.09	37	0.8	16	0.46	43
West Khasi Hills	2.50	25	1.41	49	0.44	31	0.25	51
West Garo Hills	1.99	40	2.77	32	0.35	40	0.48	41
South Garo Hills	1.39	55	0.76	62	0.20	62	0.11	67
East Garo Hills	1.52	51	1.46	48	0.48	29	0.46	43
North East	1.60		2.39		0.30		0.44	

Source: "District Infrastructure Index for the North Eastern Region", Ministry of DONER, September 2009 <http://mdoner.gov.in/index2.asp?sid=265>

Table 6.A5: Meghalaya Districts: Health Infrastructure and Northeast Rank, 2009

District	Hospital Beds per 10,00 People	Rank	Hospital Beds per 100 sq km	Rank
East Khasi Hills	23.71	6	55.57	5
Ri-Bhoi	14.00	23	11.36	33
Jaintia Hills	13.71	27	10.74	34
West Khasi Hills	12.84	30	7.24	47
West Garo Hills	10.22	35	14.27	19
South Garo Hills	12.87	29	7.03	48
East Garo Hills	13.17	28	12.68	25

North East			10.59	
-------------------	--	--	--------------	--

Source: "District Infrastructure Index for the North Eastern Region", Ministry of DONER, September 2009 <http://mdoner.gov.in/index2.asp?sid=265>

Table 6.A6: Meghalaya Districts: Banking Infrastructure and Northeast Rank, 2009

District	Bank Branches per 10,000 People	Rank	Bank Branches per 100 sq km	Rank
East Khasi Hills	1.5	6	3.51	5
Ri-Bhoi	0.99	17	0.8	36
Jaintia Hills	1.1	13	0.86	35
West Khasi Hills	0.74	27	0.42	50
West Garo Hills	0.73	28	1.02	34
South Garo Hills	0.59	42	0.32	54
East Garo Hills	0.72	31	0.69	41
North East	0.57		0.85	

Source: "District Infrastructure Index for the North Eastern Region", Ministry of DONER, September 2009 <http://mdoner.gov.in/index2.asp?sid=265>

Table 6.A7: Ratios of Types of Vehicles to Total Number of Vehicles (2006-07)

(per cent)

Districts	Type	Trucks	Buses	Cars	Jeeps
East Khasi	Govt	0.176	0.147	0.039	0.321
	Private	0.824	0.853	0.961	0.679
Ri-Bhoi	Govt	0.002	0.055	0.003	0.057
	Private	0.998	0.945	0.997	0.943
West Khasi	Govt	0.000	0.000	0.005	0.102
	Private	1.000	1.000	0.995	0.898
Jaintia Hills	Govt	0.006	0.054	0.004	0.081
	Private	0.994	0.946	0.996	0.919
East Garo	Govt	0.011	0.007	0.009	0.122
	Private	0.989	0.993	0.991	0.878
West Garo	Govt	0.031	0.007	0.012	0.073
	Private	0.969	0.993	0.988	0.927
South Garo	Govt	0.011	0.000	0.007	0.250
	Private	0.989	1.000	0.993	0.750
Meghalaya	Govt	0.092	0.088	0.030	0.243
	Private	0.908	0.912	0.970	0.757

Source: Statistical Abstract Meghalaya 2006

Table 6.A8: Power: Installed Capacity in Meghalaya and NER

(MW)

States	1996-97	1999-00	2003-04	Aug. 2006**
--------	---------	---------	---------	-------------

Meghalaya	189 (98.94)	189 (98.94)	188 (98.93)	288.2 (90.00)
NER	983 (27.87)	1,035 (24.02)	1,115 (25.56)	2,404.2 (46.29)
India	87,595 (24.72)	97,884 (28.97)	1,12,684 (26.18)	1,26,994 (26.09)

Note: Figures in parenthesis show the percentage of hydel power in total.

Source: Statistical Abstract of India, various issues; **: NEC database

Table 6.A9: Power in the NER: Installed Capacity: State, Central and Private Sources, (2006)

(MW)

State	State	Central	Private	Total
Arunachal Pradesh	NA	NA	NA	60#
Assam*	597.3	509	24.6	1130.9
Manipur	50.9	107	0	157.9
Meghalaya	189.2	99	0	288.2
Mizoram	66.6	50	0.2	116.8
Nagaland	30.7	72	0	102.7
Sikkim	46.1	70	0	116.1
Tripura	148.4	95	1.1	244.5

Notes: * at the end of the Ninth Plan , # for 2005

Source: NER Databank

Table 6.A10: State-wise Storage Capacity with Different Storage Agencies, 2005

State	FCI*	CWC**	SWC**	Others****	Grand Total
Andhra Pradesh	33.68	14.40	22.82	12.85	83.75
Bihar	4.91	0.97	2.03	5.49	13.40
Gujarat	5.70	6.23	2.27	2.25	16.45
Haryana	22.95	4.40	16.07	15.90	59.32
Karnataka	6.30	4.54	8.98	4.31	24.13
Kerala	5.36	1.30	1.92	0.79	9.37
Madhya Pradesh	5.46	6.75	11.38	5.25	28.84
Maharashtra	15.71	15.64	12.20	13.69	57.24
Orissa	6.25	1.88	4.05	4.52	16.70
Punjab	77.81	7.74	60.12	60.67	206.34
Rajasthan	9.09	3.75	7.19	0.03	20.06
Tamil Nadu	7.67	8.02	6.36	24.33	46.38
Uttar Pradesh	25.60	11.56	28.88	14.95	80.99
West Bengal	10.62	6.86	2.27	1.31	21.06
Jammu & Kashmir	1.03	0.21	0.00	1.49	2.73

Himachal Pradesh	0.26	0.07	0.00	0.40	0.73
Goa	0.15	1.04	0.00	0.14	1.33
Assam	2.52	0.64	2.48	1.10	6.74
Arunachal Pradesh	0.18	0.00	0.00	0.05	0.23
Manipur	0.18	0.00	0.00	0.23	0.41
Meghalaya	0.19	0.00	0.11	0.01	0.31
Nagaland	0.27	0.13	0.00	0.11	0.51
Sikkim	0.11	0.00	0.00	0.07	0.18
Tripura	0.34	0.24	0.00	0.31	0.89
Mizoram	0.18	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.18
Jharkhand	1.11	0.36	0.00	0.35	1.82
Uttanchal	2.11	0.75	0.00	0.00	2.86
Chhatisgarh	9.27	2.37	6.07	0.00	17.71
Union Territories	5.30	2.05	0.00	0.00	7.35
Grand Total	260.31	101.90	195.20	170.60	728.01

Notes: * Storage capacity of FCI as on 01-04-2005

** Storage capacity of CWC and SWCs as on 01-04-2005

***This information have been taken from the State Profiles prepared on the basis of the information obtained from various states in 1998-99

Annexure 6.2: Reports

A number of new line and gauge conversion projects are in progress in the NE Region for development of rail infrastructure. (See NER Vision, 2020). The proposed new railway line between Dudhnoi to Depa in Meghalaya could not be started because land could not be made available.

The Ministry of Railways has sanctioned Rs. 1 crore for construction of the Azra-Byrnihat railway line during 2007-08, which would be ultimately linked to Shillong as part of the Centre's ambitious drive to link all state capitals in the Northeast with railhead.

The 30-km rail line was declared as national project and included in the current budget. The anticipated cost of the project would be about Rs. 200 crore rupees, but it would increase manifold if extended up to Shillong, a railways official said. "Preliminary arrangements have been made to take up the work," the official said. Besides Azra-Byrnihat, the Railways Ministry had sanctioned Dudhnoi-Depa railway line way back in 1992-93. At present only Guwahati has a railhead, and Agartala is going to be linked up with rail line from Kumarghat soon.

The 15.5 km Dudhnoi-Depa line was supposed to be completed at a cost of Rs.22.33 crore, but non-availability of land has forced the ministry to plan the railway line from Duhnoi to Mendhipathar and would ultimately pass through the West Garo Hills, East Khasi Hills and

Jaintiya Hills districts, the official said. The Ministry has taken up final location survey for this alignment. The ambitious project will start from Jogighopa in Asom.

Construction of railways in NE Region is costly due to terrain, and the operations are likely to be economically unviable. However, for the development of NER as well as from strategic considerations, it is necessary that a policy for expanding railway network in the NE Region is adopted through declaring the projects as National Projects where funds are provided as an additionally over and above the normal Gross Budgetary Support for Railways.

The study commissioned by North East Council had suggested the following rail links for major development of NER. The details of rail links with updated status are as follows:-

S. No.	Name of project	Remarks	Status
6	Dudhnoi-Depa-15.5 Kms	This will bring Meghalaya on railway map	The state government is unable to provide land due to stiff local resistance and has proposed an alternative route from Depa to Mendhipather. Railways have been advised to carry out a final location survey for this alignment.

Major Development / Modernization Works Planned / in Progress at Non-Metro Airports
(As on 1.2.2006)

S.N.	Airport / State	Scheme	Est. Cost (rupees crore)	Present status
5	SHILLONG Barapani	Construction of new terminal building complex for 150 passengers	30.00	Drawings have been finalized and estimated under preparation. Work likely to be taken up during 2006-07.

Annexures to Chapter 7: Trade and Regional Cooperation

Table 7.1A: Commodity Exports through LCS, 2005-06

Land Customs Station	Commodity	Quantity (Mt)	Value (Rs.)
Dawki	Coal	2,92,313.6	47,62,11,782.00
Borsora		4,61,026.0	82,89,59,408.00
Mahendraganj		5,176.0	99,79,032.00
Ghasuapara		1,18,080.8	23,36,16,121.00
Dalu		46,399.0	11,42,63,305.00
Dawki	Lime stone	552.0	1,40,637.00
Borsora		29,475.3	1,73,71,971.00
Shella Bazar		1,10,491.0	2,81,44,829.00
Bholaganj		2,21,643.5	7,46,20,658.00
Dalu		504.7	1,32,980.00
Shella Bazar	Boulder stone	8,200.0	20,60,455.20
Mahendraganj	Crushed stone	5,023.0	30,88,745.00
Mahendraganj	Ginger	617.0	41,45,566.00
Dawki	Orange (nos.)	22,46,980.0	21,45,691.00
Dalu		20.0	1,88,580.00

Source: Meghalaya State Development Report 2008-09

Table 7.2A: Commodity Exports through LCS, 2006-07

Land Customs Station	Commodity	Quantity (Mt)	Value (Rs.)
Dawki	Coal	2,39,138.6	47,18,34,816.00
Borsora		4,73,528.9	92,42,23,201.00
Mahenderaganj		3,309.0	68,22,234.00
Ghasuapara		2,31,499.4	47,26,83,846.00
Dalu		53,363.4	10,81,07,840.00
Baghmara		2,055.5	36,78,777.00
Dawki	Lime stone	6,322.4	16,35,279.00
Borsora		1,25,408.7	3,26,70,466.00
Shella Bazar		6,00,975.0	17,05,51,740.00
Bholaganj		4,02,961.0	11,29,58,849.00
Dalu		235.5	63,466.00
Dawki	Boulder stone	531.9	1,93,507.00
Bholaganj		530.0	1,13,585.00
Mahendraganj		2,000.0	8,67,583.00
Dalu		200.0	71,840.00
Mahendraganj	Crushed stone	1,472.0	10,02,849.00
Mahendraganj	Ginger	415.0	29,17,209.00
Gasuapara		21.2	1,58,202.00
Dawki	Tomato	600 kg.	78,000.00
Dawki	Raw hides and skins	57.0	10,29,360.00

Source: Meghalaya State Development Report 2008-09

Annexures to Chapter 9: Public Finances

Annexure 9.A1: Externally Aided Projects

1. International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD)

IFAD and the government of Meghalaya have been exploring options for reducing poverty in this state. Among these was a Sustainable Livelihoods Approach (SLA) analysis that IFAD organised to gain an understanding of the views of poor people regarding their own situation. The objective of the SLA analysis was to interact with rural poor people to help IFAD and the central and state governments to understand their strengths, the obstacles they face and the vision they have of their future.

Relevant points for project design: The SLA analysis recommended two major actions for reducing poverty in Meghalaya:

- **Supporting the poor to use and improve existing village institutions in ways they choose.** Capacity-building of village institutions and individuals (such as the headman, durbar or village council) was recommended to address people's needs, especially access to resources. Capacity-building of government institutions outside the villages was also recommended so they would be more supportive and responsive to poor people's institutions. Capacity-building across these levels is essential to create bridges between those who make decisions and those whose lives are affected by the decisions made.
- **Promoting agricultural growth.** Agricultural growth needs to be promoted by helping poor people access new goods, knowledge, power and information. The idea is not to provide technical inputs directly but to ensure that the demand that develops as a result of the first action is supplied in a free and fair way. (Many interventions are needed on the supply side as well as on the market institutions themselves.)

The analysis highlighted that these actions would have a significant impact on reducing poverty and food insecurity. Moreover, they are easy to implement. The analysis also emphasized that these actions - whether at the village, state or national level -- would succeed only if they were steered by the poor people.

Impact of the SLA analysis on project design

The recommended actions in the SLA analysis were included as the first components of the project proposal in its Inception Report. These components are summarised below. The primary objective of this component is to facilitate community-level decision-making and to strengthen the capability of communities to take responsibility for managing their own development. The specific objectives include:

- establishing and strengthening village institutions to promote community self-reliance
- further integrating women into community decision-making
- reorienting the local power structure so that it reflects the interests of marginalized groups

- helping government service organizations and NGOs to focus their efforts on developing alternative livelihood activities for community members

Livelihood enhancement activities. The overarching goal of this component is to provide viable opportunities for the poorest people to increase their incomes. All of the activities will be based on the following criteria to ensure that they provide viable and realistic opportunities. The activities must:

- have an established market for goods and services they generate
- provide adequate remuneration to participants
- be substantially directed toward women and serve as substitutes for less remunerative and more labour-intensive work
- incorporate local knowledge
- make use of existing skills or provide training
- be environmentally sound

The SLA analysis, along with the other studies, workshops and field visits conducted with experts from many economic sectors and government departments, resulted in a much broader livelihood agenda. They clearly demonstrated that there are multiple opportunities for poor households in Meghalaya to improve their economic security. The sub-sectors go beyond the traditional paddy cultivation and include organic agriculture, horticulture, livestock, aquaculture and forestry-related activities (timber and non-timber forest products). At the same time, the actual selection of activities will be made by the poor households.

The SLA analysis brought to light the need to explore the issue of access to land. Any livelihood strategy would be compromised if some solutions to tenure security and access to land were not developed alongside the livelihood enhancement activities. The project proposes to include a Land Bank pilot initiative that promotes long-term tenure arrangements through purchase or long-term lease of productive land. The pilot will work with individual households, self-help groups and village and district institutions. The underlying objective is to increase the motivation of the cultivators for making greater investments of their time, labour and capital.

2. Asian Development Bank (ADB)

The proposed North-Eastern States Roads Investment Programme (NESRIP), a centrally sponsored scheme of the Ministry of Development of North-Eastern Region with assistance from the Asian Development Bank (ADB) is included in 2009-10 pipeline. The total cost of the project in the first investment programme is USD298.6 million and the target date for ADB approval for the tranche-1 loan (USD94.8 million) is February 2010.

A total length of 522.6 km of roads and bridges covering six northeast states, excluding Arunachal Pradesh and Nagaland, is proposed to be taken up for construction/upgradation during tranche 1 and tranche 2 over five years. The project also includes in Meghalaya construction of 93.4 km of road from Garobadha to Dalu (NH 51) costing Rs. 154.91 crore and expected to be completed by 2015.

3. The World Bank

In the northeastern states, which face significant capacity constraints, the World Bank engages in capacity building, analytical work, and possibly lending in selected priority sectors and dialogue on regional issues. The World Bank has contributed to the implementation of various schemes in sectors such as education and health, and Meghalaya should also take advantage of such contributions.

Annexures to Chapter 10: Building Capacities

Table 10.A1: Human Development Index of Indian States 2005

States	Rural		Urban		Combined	
	Value	Rank	Value	Rank	Value	Rank
Andhra Pradesh	0.513	X27	0.714	29	0.572	27
Arunachal Pradesh	0.557	23	0.877	1	0.617	22
Assam	0.505	28	0.74	25	0.534	29
Bihar	0.427	33	0.625	34	0.449	35
Chhatisgarh	0.47	30	0.69	31	0.516	30
Goa	0.753	3	0.818	9	0.779	6
Gujarat	0.534	25	0.758	21	0.621	20
Haryana	0.607	15	0.725	26	0.644	17
Himachal Pradesh	0.658	12	0.855	6	0.681	14
Jammu & Kashmir	0.569	20	0.716	27	0.601	24
Jharkhand	0.458	31	0.716	27	0.513	31
Karnataka	0.517	26	0.745	24	0.6	25
Kerala	0.799	1	0.856	5	0.814	2
Madhya Pradesh	0.427	34	0.663	32	0.488	33
Maharashtra	0.593	17	0.798	12	0.689	12
Manipur	0.693	10	0.761	17	0.707	11
Meghalaya	0.547	24	0.757	22	0.585	26
Mizoram	0.724	6	0.872	2	0.79	4
Nagaland	0.750	4	0.823	8	0.77	7
Orissa	0.417	35	0.639	33	0.452	34
Punjab	0.635	14	0.761	17	0.679	15
Rajasthan	0.485	29	0.691	30	0.537	28
Sikkim	0.661	11	0.816	10	0.684	13
Tamil Nadu	0.598	16	0.766	16	0.675	16
Tripura	0.575	19	0.76	20	0.608	23
Uttar Pradesh	0.454	32	0.618	35	0.49	32
Uttanchal	0.585	18	0.761	17	0.628	18
West Bengal	0.567	21	0.757	22	0.625	19
A & N Islands	0.707	9	0.864	4	0.766	8
Chandigarh	0.717	7	0.872	2	0.86	1
Dadra & Nagar Haveli	0.563	22	0.833	7	0.618	21
Daman & Diu	0.729	5	0.783	15	0.754	9
Delhi	0.712	8	0.796	13	0.789	5
Lakshadweep	0.783	2	0.805	11	0.796	3
Pondicherry	0.654	13	0.791	14	0.748	10
All India	0.509		0.73		0.575	

Source:

Table 10.A2: Population by Age Group, 2001 and Projected 2031

(per cent)

State	2001				2031 Projected		
	0-14	15-29	15-65	65+	0-14	15-65	65+
Arunachal	39.8	26.37	57.8	2.4	25.6	67.8	6.6
Assam	36.6	27.17	59.6	3.8	26.0	67.1	6.9
Manipur	31.8	30.20	63.6	4.6	21.5	67.9	10.6
Meghalaya	41.6	27.13	55.5	2.9	26.0	68.1	5.9
Mizoram	34.6	30.56	61.6	3.8	22.7	68.1	9.2
Nagaland	35.1	32.13	61.8	3.1	23.0	69.0	8.0
Sikkim	33.6	30.72	62.9	3.5	22.8	68.9	8.3
Tripura	31.7	27.90	63.2	5.1	21.9	68.7	9.4
India	34.3	26.58	60.9	4.8	25.7	66.4	7.9

Source: Census of India, and...

Table 10.A3: Educational Institutions by Management

(per cent)

	Government	Local Bodies	Private Aided	Private Unaided	Total Number
	Pre-Degree/Junior College/Higher Secondary Schools				
Meghalaya	21.43	0.00	43.88	34.69	98
India	32.23	1.12	30.05	36.60	
	High/Post Basic Schools				
Meghalaya	2.07	0.00	67.75	30.18	676
India	30.62	8.70	27.15	33.53	
	Middle/Senior Basic Schools				
Meghalaya	2.48	0.00	43.38	54.14	2,259
India	44.83	25.71	6.75	22.72	
	Primary/Junior Basic Schools				
Meghalaya	39.98	0.00	38.97	21.05	6,351
India	46.01	43.39	3.19	7.42	

Source: DISE

Table 10.A4: Distribution of Schools in Meghalaya by Distance from Habitations

Districts	Primary Stage			Upper Primary Stage		
	Within The Habitation	Within one km. but not within the Habitation	Beyond one km. of Habitation	Within The Habitation	Within one km. but not within the Habitation	Beyond one km. of Habitation
Jaintia Hills	75.3	11.48	13.22	18.56	32.84	48.6
East Khasi Hills	69.55	19.96	10.49	21.45	43.45	35.1
West Khasi Hills	77.47	12.5	10.03	15.97	38.19	45.83
East Garo Hills	74.68	12.07	13.25	11.68	45.14	43.18
West Garo Hills	70.29	17.17	12.54	15.57	49.85	34.58
South Garo Hills	53.14	20.74	26.12	7.81	56.47	35.72
Ri Bhoi	52.38	22.92	24.7	14.43	38.99	46.58
Meghalaya	69.09	16.37	14.54	15.34	44.13	40.54

Source: MHDR, 2008, Government of Meghalaya

Table 10.A5a: District-wise Literacy Rates in Meghalaya, Urban-Rural

Districts	1981			1991			2001		
	Rural	Urban	Total	Rural	Urban	Total	Rural	Urban	Total
Jaintia Hills	20.77	66.01	24.51	30.35	81.37	35.32	48.97	91.14	52.79
East Khasi Hills	31.95	65.25	43.73	46.36	83.68	60.04	63.72	88.65	74.74
West Khasi Hills	31.47	52.35	31.97	49.06	71.82	50.52	63.13	83.83	65.50
East Garo Hills	33.05	47.41	33.51	46.99	68.79	48.38	57.97	82.15	61.57
West Garo Hills	21.69	61.25	25.91	34.34	78.29	39.32	46.09	85.17	50.78
South Garo Hills	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	62.66	77.10	63.67
Ri Bhoi	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	52.28	83.96	55.21
Meghalaya	27.45	64.12	34.08	41.05	81.74	49.10	57.00	87.12	63.31
All India	29.65	57.40	36.23	44.70	73.10	52.20	59.40	80.30	65.38

Source: Census of India, 1981, 1991, 2001 (the South Garo Hills and Ri Bhoi districts were only created in 1992, hence data is NA for prior census years).

Table 10.A5b: District-wise Literacy Rates in Meghalaya, Male-Female

Districts	1981			1991			2001		
	Male	Female	Persons	Male	Female	Persons	Male	Female	Persons
Jaintia Hills	24.63	24.38	24.51	34.37	36.31	35.32	50.52	55.54	53.00
East Khasi Hills	46.96	40.30	43.73	62.86	57.04	60.04	78.12	75.82	76.98
West Khasi Hills	34.08	29.75	31.97	52.98	47.94	50.52	67.02	64.21	65.64
East Garo Hills	39.01	27.66	33.51	54.70	41.70	48.38	67.39	55.74	61.70
West Garo Hills	32.04	19.55	25.91	46.93	31.32	39.32	57.51	44.51	51.03
South Garo Hills	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	62.60	48.61	55.82
Ri Bhoi	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	69.22	62.67	66.07
Meghalaya	37.89	30.08	34.08	53.12	44.88	49.10	66.14	60.41	63.31
All India	46.89	24.82	36.23	64.13	39.29	52.21	75.85	54.16	65.38

Source: Census of India, 1981, 1991 and 2001.

Table 10.A6a: Schools with Drinking Water, 2006-07

Districts	(per cent)				
	Primary only	Primary + UP	P+Sec/H.Sec	UP only	UP + Sec
East Khasi Hills	48.5	54.5	76.4	49.4	77.8
West Khasi Hills	34.3	48.5	81.5	40.5	48.6
Jaintia Hills	35.9	52.6	54.5	30.6	59.1
Ri Bhoi	46.1	63.5	85.4	52.2	83.3
East Garo Hills	43.6	58.1	78.6	53.2	72.7
West Garo Hills	26.5	50.0	78.1	37.9	37.1
South Garo Hills	81.2	57.1	100.0	81.0	100

Source : DISE, 2006-07

Table 10.A6b: Schools with Blackboards, 2006-07

Districts	(per cent)				
	Primary only	Primary + UP	P+Sec/H.Sec	UP only	UP + Sec
East Khasi Hills	84.6	79.8	83.1	84.1	83.8
West Khasi Hills	94.7	93.1	96.3	94.7	88.6
Jaintia Hills	82.8	88.2	86.4	86.4	63.6
Ri Bhoi	82.5	90.4	92.7	76.8	75.0
East Garo Hills	98.2	100.0	100.0	98.9	100.0
West Garo Hills	86.6	70.0	84.4	90.0	41.9
South Garo Hills	91.2	92.9	100.0	96.8	100

Source : DISE, 2006-07

Table 10.A7: Drop-out Rates - All Classes: Meghalaya and India

State	Classes I-V			Classes VI-VIII			Classes I-X		
	Boys	Girls	Total	Boys	Girls	Total	Boys	Girls	Total
Meghalaya	44.78	43.37	44.08	62.54	58.26	60.41	76.38	75.32	75.85
India	24.41	26.56	25.43	46.58	45.33	46.03	58.62	61.47	59.87

Source: Selected Educational Statistics 2006-07.

Table 10.A8: Meghalaya: Trained Teachers 2006-07

(per cent)

School Level	East Khasi Hills		West Khasi Hills		Jaintia Hills		Ri Bhoi		East Garo Hills		West Garo Hills		South Garo Hills	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
Primary only	20.8	14.6	4.4	3.0	23.5	17.4	20.7	11.1	6.1	3.5	2.0	1.7	10.5	7.6
UP only	14.3	13.9	2.1	0.9	24.6	14.2	19.4	6.8	3.5	4.4	1.0	1.3	7.3	12.9
Primary + UP	15.8	6.3	6.3	7.9	16.2	9.7	9.7	10.6	0.0	0.9	0.0	0.0	5.9	2.3
P+Sec/H.Sec	2.7	4.1	0.0	3.3	6.5	7.0	6.5	4.3	1.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
UP + Sec	6.6	3.9	0.0	0.0	12.9	11.8	0.0	4.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Source: DISE 2006-07

Table 10.A9: Use of Public Health Facilities in North-East States: 2005-06

(per cent)

States	Households that do not generally use government health facilities	Reasons for not generally using government health facilities among households that do not generally use government health facilities					
		No nearby facility	Facility timing not convenient	Health personnel often absent	Waiting time too long	Poor quality of care	Other reasons
Arumachal Pradesh	17.5	50.1	24.4	7.0	18.3	36.7	6.5
Assam	34.8	48.9	6.6	6.1	11.2	39.4	7.3
Manipur	21.0	29.8	20.2	11.2	19.4	46.4	10.6
Meghalaya	35.2	33.4	17.2	14.1	21.7	33.3	8.6
Mizoram	9.4	26.4	7.2	2.2	23.2	42.5	8.6
Nagaland	47.9	54.1	14.7	8.3	14.6	29.8	8.3
Sikkim	8.2	8.4	22.0	4.7	50.7	47.7	5.5
Tripura	20.1	29.4	20.4	6.6	23.8	47.1	9.0

Source: NFHS 3

Table 10.A10: Infant Mortality Rates, Meghalaya and India

(per cent)

	NFHS-3	NFHS-2	NFHS-1
Meghalaya	45	89	64
India	44	42	36

Source: NFHS-3

Note: NFHS-1 was conducted in 1992-93; NFHS-2 in 1998-99; and NFHS-3 in 2005-06

Table 10.A11: Trends in Vaccination Coverage*(% of children 12-23 months who have received all recommended vaccines)*

	Meghalaya	India
NFHS-1	10	36
NFHS-2	14	42
NFHS-3	33	44

Source: NFHS-3

Note: NFHS-1 was conducted in 1992-93; NFHS-2 in 1998-99; and NFHS-3 in 2005-06

Table 10.A12: Quality of Healthcare for Women

State	Women with any contact with a health worker (per cent)
India	17.3
<i>North</i>	
Delhi	2.9
Haryana	11.2
Himachal Pradesh	9.1
Jammu & Kashmir	4.1
Punjab	11.9
Rajasthan	11.7
Uttaranchal	18.7
<i>Central</i>	
Chhattisgarh	19.4
Madhya Pradesh	16.9
Uttar Pradesh	19.8
<i>East</i>	
Bihar	19.2
Jharkhand	14.7
Orissa	22.6
West Bengal	23.3
<i>Northeast</i>	
Arumachal Pradesh	9.6
Assam	8.9
Manipur	4.6
Meghalaya	7.6
Mizoram	6.2
Nagaland	4.5
Sikkim	13.2
Tripura	14.4
<i>West</i>	
Goa	14.5
Gujarat	27.3
Maharashtra	16.5

<i>South</i>	
Andhra Pradesh	9.0
Karnataka	19.9
Kerala	22.6
Tamil Nadu	15.2

Source: NFHS 3

Table 10.A13: Meghalaya: Anemia among Adults

(per cent)

	NFHS-3			NFHS-2
	Total	Urban	Rural	
Ever married women age 15-49 years who are anemic	45.4	36.1	47.9	63.3
Pregnant women age 15-49 years who are anemic	56.1	*	57.1	58.6
Ever-married men age 15-49 who are anemic (%)	34.2	25.8	36.3	

Source: NFHS-3

Note: * Not shown; based on fewer than 25 unweighted cases.

Table 10.A14: Shortfall in Health Personnel in PHCs and CHCs, 2008

(number)

Position	Shortfall
Radiographers (at CHCs)	1
Pharmacists	16
Laboratory Technicians	None
Nurse Midwives/Staff Nurses	111
Total Specialists	102
<i>Surgeons</i>	25
<i>Obstetricians & Gynecologists</i>	26
<i>Physicians</i>	25
<i>Pediatricians</i>	26

Source: RHS, 2008