

Ministry of Tribal Affairs

Revised Memoranda for the Fourteenth Finance Commission.

1. Introduction

The Ministry of Tribal Affairs had submitted its Memorandum to the Fourteenth Finance Commission (FFC) in November, 2013. The issues have been re-examined in the Ministry and a revised Memorandum, raising some new issues and also incorporating some of those raised in the earlier Memorandum are placed for the consideration of the FFC.

1.1 Constitutional Provisions

The mandate of the Union Finance Commission extends to areas outside Part IX of the Constitution which includes Tribal areas. The first proviso to Article 275 (1) includes the welfare of STs in any state as one of the mandates to be examined while recommending the transfer of funds from Union Government to the State Governments. The first proviso also supports the raising of levels of Administration in Fifth Schedule areas. The Second proviso to Art 275 (1) supports payment of funds from the Consolidated Fund of India to Sixth Schedule Areas. Art 275(1A) covers transfer of funds to the autonomous states formed under Article 244 A. The proviso to Article 275 (2) states clearly that after a Finance Commission has been constituted, the provision made by the Parliament for transfer of funds to the States shall be based on recommendations of the Union Finance Commission. A combined reading of Art 275 (1), Art 275 (1A) and Art 275 (2) establishes that it is the mandate of FFC to make recommendations relating to Fifth Schedule and Sixth Schedule areas and other areas with large tribal population.

1.2 Twelfth Five Year Plan

1.2.1 The 12th Five year Plan focuses on faster, sustainable and more inclusive growth. It emphasises the following elements for addressing socio-economic conditions of STs:

- Administrative strengthening
- Emphasis on education and health
- Livelihood support and employment, imparting of skills & creating of employment opportunities near ST habitations,
- Improved infrastructure and governance
- Addressing issues of land acquisition
- Resettlement and rehabilitation of displaced tribal populations
- Better connectivity in LWE and tribal areas
- Better implementation of provisions of PESA and FRA.

1.2.2 All of the above cannot be achieved unless there are in place, at the field level, robust institutions for delivery of goods and services created under the various plan schemes. It has been seen in the past that despite significant resource transfer to states under Centrally Sponsored Schemes (CSS), the outreach /delivery to STs remained weak.

1.2.3 Census 2011 has brought into sharp relief the large infrastructure deficit in areas with high concentration of tribal people. Any attempt at inclusive growth implies that necessary resources – financial, human and managerial- have to be deployed to bridge the gap between the STs and the general population.

1.2.4 In view of the above, to achieve the vision of the 12th FYP it will be necessary to focus on the strengthening of delivery and knowledge

institutions and to provide a substantial infusion of resources to achieve the same.

2. Revised proposals of the Ministry

In the above backdrop, the Ministry would like to place the following revised proposals for consideration of the FFC:

- (i) Strengthening of all institutions – institutions that are repositories of knowledge and can function as capacity building institutions as well as those that are responsible for delivery of goods and services to tribals.
- (ii) Grants for meeting recurring costs and expenditure on maintenance of infrastructure created for education.
- (iii) Grants for development of PVTGs.
- (iv) Consideration of ST population as a criteria for distribution of resources between States.
- (v) Imposing a condition to ensure non-divertability of TSP funds.

2.1 Strengthening of Institutions:

2.1.1. One area of major concern has been the weakening of delivery institutions in tribal areas over the last two and a half decades. In the 70s and 80s, the ITDAs/ITDPs as well as TRIs were strong institutions capable of delivery of services to tribal areas, including remote, inaccessible tribal habitations, with due regard to language and cultural context. Some States, like Odisha, developed the institution of micro projects for intensive care and development of PVTGs. Over time, however, States have allowed these institutions to become weak. They have not invested enough resources and thought in keeping them strong. ITDAs/ITDPs have not been able to grow institutionally to the desired level primarily due to lack of supporting manpower and modern infrastructure. As a result it has become difficult for States to translate benefits available under the Centrally Sponsored Schemes, funds under which have increased, into actual delivery and outreach to

tribal populations and habitations. Moreover, in case of dispersed population of tribals outside the geographical limit of existing ITDAs/ITDPs, there is no robust agency dedicated to deliver the programs meant for Schedule Tribes in an effective manner to ensure smooth percolation of benefits to such tribals.

2.1.2. It is vital, therefore, that States be encouraged to strengthen the tribal development institutions,, i.e. TRIs, ITDP/ITDA (including creation of new ITDAs where the Census data suggest a tribal concentration), creation of micro project agencies for addressing development of specific tribal groups in both ITDA and non-ITDA areas, as well as administrative structures in urban areas to facilitate tribals in these areas in establishing their tribal identity and accessing various benefits to which they are entitled. New ITDPs would need to be created in the areas/blocks where ST population is 25% or higher.

2.1.3. Similarly, the knowledge institutions, i.e., Tribal Research Institutes (TRIs) also need to be strengthened to address not just anthropological studies but also capacity building of the tribal people and functionaries in livelihoods, training of Tribal Welfare Service officials, training of officials and elected tribal leaders on laws relating to tribals as well as research, documentation and dissemination of Tribal issues.

2.1.4. This would require a two pronged strategy-

- (i) To recommend that the funds available to the Ministry of Tribal Affairs for giving grants to States under Article 275 (1) of the Constitution be substantially enhanced so as to enable the Ministry to provide larger support to the States for strengthening of institutions and up gradation of administration in tribal areas.
- (ii) The FFC itself to make Grants to the State Governments for strengthening of these institutions i.e. TRIs, ITDAs and creation

of new ones including micro-project agencies and support structure in urban areas.

The above two points are elaborated in Sections 2.2 and 2.3 respectively.

2.2 Recommendation for increase in Art 275 (1) budgetary outlay for Ministry :

2.2.1 Grants under Article 275(1) of the Constitution of India are provided from the Consolidated Fund of India each year to the State Governments for promoting the welfare of Scheduled tribes and raising the level of administration in Scheduled Areas to bring them at par with the rest of the States of the administration. The grants are provided on the basis of the percentage of ST population in the State. The Ministry is proposing revision of the 'Operational guidelines for formulation, implementation and monitoring of Tribal Sub-Plan and Article 275 (1) grants' to, inter-alia, specify an order of priority for expenditure under these grants. For better delivery of goods and services, the priority for expenditure of TSP and Article 275 (1) grants has to shift towards creation of an administrative base in the remote and tribal pockets. Accordingly, the Ministry shall try and establish an order of priority comprising strengthening of ITDAs, creation of new ITDAs, creation of dedicated micro-projects, support for additional manpower in livelihood and engineering wings within ITDAs, strengthening of TRIs, residential schools and support to government hospitals, support to linkage with livelihood projects and any other project relating well-being of tribals.

2.2.2 In view of the above an increase in the Ministry's budgetary outlay for grants under Art 275(1) is specially important. Funds allocated to the Ministry under Article 275(1) at the BE stage have stagnated in recent years and have been drastically reduced at the RE stage, adversely affecting flow of funds to the States. For the past few years, instead of

augmenting the budgetary allocations under this programme given the inflation and inclusion of special activities, funds allocated at BE stage are, more often than not, cut drastically at RE stage. Allocation of funds at BE and RE stage during the last five years is given in Table 1.

Table 1: Funds allocated to the Ministry under Article 275(1)

Rupees Crores			
Year	Allocation (BE)	Allocation (RE)	Release
2008-09	416.00	392.00	339.78
2009-10	1000.00	399.10	399.10
2010-11	1046.00	1030.00	999.88
2011-12	1197.00	1111.28	1084.83
2012-13	1317.00	820.00	819.99
2013-14	1317.00	1097.14	1097.14

2.2.3 It is pertinent to mention that in small states, grants under Art 275(1) of the Constitution are not enough for construction of Eklavya Model Residential Schools (EMRS)

2.2.4 From enhanced grants under Article 275 (1), the Ministry would consider grants to States for –

- i. Strengthening of institutions – ITDAs and TRIs
- ii. Creation of new ITDAs
- iii. Creation of micro project agencies in rural areas
- iv. Creation of micro projects in urban areas
- v. Capital and recurring grants for EMRS
- vi. Performance grants on parameters to be developed by the Ministry

2.2.5 FFC may recommend to the Government to increase the budgetary allocation under Article 275(1) of the Constitution upto the level of at least

Rs. 2500.00 Crore (Rupees twenty five hundred crore) from the current year onwards.

2.3 Grants to State Governments for strengthening of institutions

A brief on the nature and purpose of funding requirements of the various institutions is given in the following paragraphs:

2.3.1 Knowledge institutions – Tribal Research Institutions :

The Government of India has always recognized the need for continued research on cultural, anthropological, socio-economic and related issues concerning tribals. The outcome of this research and documentation work is expected to feed into the policy and programmes for tribal development so as to make them more effective. With this in view, the Ministry of Tribal Affairs has been supporting Tribal Research Institutes (TRIs) in 18 States on 50:50 sharing basis between States and the Centre and one TRI in the Andaman Nicobar Island UT with 100% grant. These institutions are required to undertake studies, research & documentation so as to provide planning inputs to the State Governments and also conduct training, seminars and workshops, documentation of customary laws; setting up of tribal museum for exhibiting tribal artifacts, and other related activities. However, most of the TRIs are facing financial and manpower constraints and are finding it difficult to perform their functions effectively. There is an urgent need for strengthening and broadening research and training activities by these institutions.

2.3.1.1 The main functions/ responsibilities of the TRIs would be:

- a. To develop a body of knowledge and research
- b. To support evidence based policy, planning and legislations
- c. To build capacity of tribals and of persons and institutions associated with tribal affairs

- d. To provide basic training, post- recruitment, to Tribal Welfare Service officials
- e. To undertake training of tribal people, personnel engaged in tribal welfare programs/ schemes, SHGs and elected representatives on matters relating to livelihood as well as laws such as Forest Rights Act (FRA), PESA Act and Regulations in Scheduled Areas
- f. To disseminate information and create awareness on tribal issues and programmes of concern to them

2.3.1.2 To achieve these goals the TRIs would need:

- a. Capacity to coordinate and network with related research institutes and organisations as well as academic bodies;
- b. Basic minimum infrastructure with a research wing, conference hall, library, training hostel and museum as part of the TRI structure.
- c. Involvement/ recruitment of a core group of professionals which shall comprise of one anthropologist, a tribal studies expert, a development expert, a culture specialist, an ethnographer or statistician-cum-MIS specialist. Director of TRIs should be a full time officer.

2.3.1.3 If they have the necessary infrastructure and expertise, the TRIs can play an extremely important role as a knowledge hub on tribal life and culture, as a capacity building institute for the tribals themselves as well as for the people working for their development and also in the delivery of services to tribals. Odisha has a good model for a TRI and this can be replicated in other States. Even though the Ministry provides for grant assistance to TRIs for their identified activities, there is no provision for capital grants and, moreover, a far larger infusion of resources is required if the TRIs are to function as effective knowledge hubs.

2.3.1.4 The Ministry requests the FFC to provide liberal grants to the 17 States and one UT (**Annexure-I**), for strengthening of State TRIs in terms of both human and physical capital. The FFC grant may go towards

financing both a core complement of human resources and a defined institutional cost for the organization. FFC may also support the remaining states for the creation of TRIs.

2.3.1.5 The Ministry would be able to support TRIs if an annual outlay of Rs 2500 crores at current prices is provided under Art 275(1).

2.3.2 Delivery institutions – ITDA, Micro projects in rural areas, Micro projects for STs in urban areas

2.3.2.1 **Integrated Tribal Development Agency (ITDA) or Integrated Tribal Development Project (ITDPs)** - ITDAs/ ITDPs are administrative model adopted by a number of States for the purpose of delivery of programmes and services to tribal individuals, households and habitations. The ITDPs are generally contiguous areas of the size of a Tehsil or Block or more in which the ST population is 50% or more of the total. So far 194 ITDPs/ITDAs have been delineated in the country in the states of Andhra Pradesh, Assam, Bihar, Gujarat, Himachal Pradesh, Karnataka, Kerala, Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra, Manipur, Odisha, Rajasthan, Sikkim, Tamil Nadu, Tripura, Uttar Pradesh, West Bengal and Union Territories of Andaman & Nicobar Island and Daman & Diu. The ITDP/ITDAs are expected to undertake planning and implementation of various programmes and projects of the State Governments as well as of the Government of India in their respective areas. They are responsible for infrastructural development, income generation activities, health and education related service delivery as well as implementation of Forest Rights Act within their area.

2.3.2.2 However, the actual structure of an ITDA/ ITDP, in terms of core manpower and control of the Project Manager, ITDA on personnel of related line Departments varies considerably from State to State. And so does the effectiveness of the delivery. A substantive amount of TSP

funds are still utilized for infrastructure creation. In the absence of dedicated engineering personnel with the ITDAs/ITDPs and/or the Tribal Welfare Department, they have to depend on engineering departments like PWD for whom Tribal development is not a priority. This leads to undue delay in execution of programmes and consequently poor absorption of funds. A good model of ITDA is when there is a core-strength available within the ITDA with engineers, health personnel, and education personnel accountable to the Project Manager of ITDA. Andhra Pradesh has developed a model of ITDA where each ITDA is equipped with their own engineering and other core staff thus allowing it to function effectively

2.3.2.3 Substantial strengthening of the ITDAs/ITDPs of different States is required if they are to meet the developmental aspirations of the tribals. It is not possible for States to do so through their own resources. It is imperative that the FFC provides grants to State Governments for strengthening of the ITDAs/ITDPs to improve the delivery of programmes for tribals. The organisational set up of the ITDA in Andhra Pradesh is at **Annexure-II**. The other ITDAs/ITDPs across the country can be strengthened on the same lines.

2.3.2.4 Moreover, in case of dispersed population of tribals outside the geographical limit of existing ITDAs/ITDPs, there is no agency dedicated to deliver the programs meant for Schedule Tribes in an effective manner. Thus new ITDPs need to be created in the areas/blocks where ST population is 25% or higher.

2.3.2.5 **Micro-project Agencies** - Apart from areas covered under the ITDAs / ITDPs smaller concentrations of tribals scattered both within and outside ITDA areas are particularly in need of being supported with an institutional mechanism to translate the programmes into actual benefits. The dispersed population of tribals is likely to have increased over time

as tribals migrated from their original place of residence for various reasons such as employment, displacement due to large 'development' projects, mining, industries, etc. It is thus strongly felt that agencies to execute micro-projects be created in areas with tribal concentration/ specific tribal groups.

2.3.2.6 Micro-projects which have a core administrative unit with core financial resources and the flexibility to address various issues in a defined geographical area and for a defined population have been found to be a successful model of delivery of much needed services to PVTGs. This model of micro projects is being effectively used in Odisha. The Ministry of Tribal Affairs is of the view that this model should be replicated across the States. A model set up of a Micro Project agency with financial implications is at **Annexure-III**.

2.3.2.7 The FFC is requested to make State specific grants for the creation and institutionalization of micro projects. The Finance Commission may support about 72 projects for existing PVTGs and another 18 groups who have not been included but should be included. The support to about 90 projects would imply that by the end of the award period of the FFC, a critical mass of micro-projects could be in operation.

2.3.2.8 **Micro Projects to support STs in Urban areas** - A number of people of the STs migrate to urban areas for various reasons –displacement owing to large development projects, mining projects etc, 'relocation' because of wild life sanctuaries and in search of work. STs who migrate from rural areas to urban areas suffer loss of identity, loss of land, loss of entitlements such ration cards, loss of socio-economic security provided by the community, common resources and also of the cultural and social ethos in which they lived earlier. People who live in urban areas have sold their lands many years earlier and have no records to prove they are STs, so it is difficult for them even to get ST certificates. There is no

organization/institution to turn to in urban areas to help them to navigate their day to day lives.

- 2.3.2.9 It is proposed that the Finance Commission may support the creation of micro projects' in urban areas which have substantial ST population. A list of the towns and cities with 10,000 or more STs and with at least 25 % ST population (Census-2011) is at **Annexure – IV**

3. Other Grants from FFC

Apart from grants to strengthen delivery and knowledge based institutions the FFC may also consider the following:

3.1 Grants for Education related Schemes

- 3.1.1 The educational status of ST children as compared to children of other social groups continues to remain precarious. It is, therefore, critical to improve educational outcomes of STs. In view of this, a large part of the Ministry's expenditure is on education related schemes. This covers development of infrastructure, both schools and hostels, scholarship schemes and schemes for vocational training. States have to undertake significant expenditure related to recurring costs, salaries of teaching and non-teaching staff and on repair and maintenance of infrastructure created under the schemes of the Ministry. States themselves have also created significant educational infrastructure but they do not have enough resources for their maintenance. States need resources for: (i) maintenance of educational infrastructure and meeting recurring costs, (ii) meeting RTE norms. (iii) additional requirements for Ashram Schools and Hostel components, and (iv) providing quality education through residential schools.

- 3.1.1.1 **Maintenance of educational infrastructure and recurring costs:**
States have to undertake significant expenditure related to recurring

costs, salaries of teaching and non-teaching staff and on repair and maintenance of infrastructure created under the education related schemes of the Ministry and also those of the States. FFC may support the States with grants for meeting expenditure for maintenance of infrastructure, for meeting recurring expenditure and also for creation of additional infrastructure such as staff quarters for Class-IV staff working in Ashram Schools in interior tribal areas.

3.1.1.2 It is in the interest of efficient utilization of scarce resources that the assets created with these funds- both permanent and consumable assets achieve optimum life and utilization. In this context, the FFC is requested to guide the Ministry of Tribal Affairs as to the best model for inculcating a sense of ownership amongst the users of these facilities so that they can be maintained and used for numerous batches of students without suffering undue wear and tear or damage in internal fixtures and furniture and undue waste of resources.

3.1.1.3 **Meeting RTE norms:** The RTE Act, 2009 which stipulates minimum standard for all elementary schools in the country, is also applicable to all Ashram Schools for ST Children. In order to make all Ashram Schools RTE compliant, the States would require greater resources. This will create an additional burden on the State. Funds are also required for residential quarters for staff. The FFC is requested to provide grants to States to help them in meeting the infrastructural and manpower norms of the RTE in schools meant for tribal students.

3.1.1.4 **Additional requirements for Ashram Schools and Hostel components under the proposed CSS:** During the 12th FYP period, the M/o Tribal Affairs has proposed an Umbrella Scheme for education of ST children, subsuming various education related schemes of the Ministry. This merger and reorientation of the existing schemes is being done so as to expand the scope and flexibility of interventions presently available. This will facilitate the States/UTs in choosing the education

related components as per their need. In addition many states have set up schools from their own resources. However, it will also entail some additional infrastructure costs on account of a change in the centre - state sharing pattern as well as additional recurring costs to the States on account of increase in the number of Ashram Schools. **The** FFC is requested to consider support to the States/ UTs, to meet their share of the construction cost as well as the recurring costs of projects under the CSS scheme as well as state governments' own tribal schools.

3.1.1.5 **Providing Quality Education through Residential Schools:** To provide quality middle and higher secondary level education to ST students in remote areas, part of the grant given by the Ministry under Article 275 (1) of the Constitution of India is used for setting up Residential Schools from Class VI to Class XII, called Eklavya Model Residential School (EMRS). Each of these schools has a capacity of 480 students. The schools are on the pattern of Jawahar Navodaya Vidyalayas, the Kasturba Gandhi Balika Vidyalayas and the Kendriya Vidyalayas.

3.1.1.6 As per EMRS Guidelines, 2010, capital cost for the school complex, including **hostels** and staff quarters has been earmarked as Rs. 12.00 crore with a provision to go up to Rs.16.00 crore in hill areas, deserts and islands. Recurring cost during the first year for schools would be @ Rs. 42000/- per child. This may be raised by 10% every second year to compensate for inflation etc. As on date, 164 EMRSs have been sanctioned by the Ministry across the country. Out of this, 120 EMRSs are fully functional and the remaining 44 EMRSs are under construction. Total recurring committed liability for running these 164 EMRSs per year is Rs.330,62,40,000 (164 x 480 x 42000). As many as 14 new EMRSs have already been sanctioned but the construction work is yet to be started due to want of fund.

- 3.1.1.7 Apart from the above, during the next five years, the Ministry envisages setting up at least one EMRS in each ITDAs/ITDPs where ST population is 25% or more. This would require sanction of about 40 new schools per year. Assuming an average cost of Rs 14.00 crore per school, the total capital cost for construction of 40 new schools every year would be around Rs 560 crore. The recurring cost will be about Rs 2.00 crore per school (Rs. 80.00 crore for the first year for the proposed 40 schools) and will increase accordingly every year subject to the number of schools constructed and functioning.
- 3.1.1.8 At present a large part of the grant of Government of India under Art 275 (1) of the Constitution goes towards meeting the recurring cost of EMRS, thereby restricting the resources available for funding construction of new schools and other equally essential components of the Art 275 (1). It is suggested that the capital expenditure for setting up of EMRSs may be funded by the Ministry under enhanced budgetary allocations for Art 275(1).

3.2 Grants for development of PVTGs

- 3.2.1 Owing to their intense vulnerability, and being the most marginalized amongst the tribals, PVTGs require special attention through various schemes for their overall development. States will require resources for providing interventions in food security, housing, agricultural land, health, livelihood and other facilities to the PVTGs. To meet these requirements, the States prepare Conservation-cum-Development plans for PVTGs. Requirement of Rs. 2667.61 crores has been received from various States having PVTG populations. The Ministry of Tribal Affairs cannot fulfill these requirements due to budgetary constraints. If, additional resources for Conservation-cum-Development of PVTGs are not urgently provided, the PVTGs will be left behind in the process of development. Further, National Advisory Council (NAC) has recently given its

recommendations on development challenges of PVTGs. The States will require funds for implementation of these recommendations. Hence, in the interest of equity, the FFC is requested to support States with liberal State specific grants for development of PVTGs. The State-wise list of PVTGs and the requirements proposed by States for CCD plans during the 12th Five Year Plan are placed at **Annexure- V** and **Annexure-VI** respectively.

4. Horizontal Devolution Formula

4.1 The formula for sharing of resources between States must give a weight to the ST population. It is proposed that a weight of 8.6%, i.e. the proportion of ST population in total population as per Census 2011 may be accorded to ST population in the inter-State horizontal sharing criteria.

5. Non-divertability of TSP as a condition for release of State grants :

5.1 As per existing TSP guidelines, States are required a set aside plan funds in proportion to the ST population for the purpose of TSP. The TSP funds are to be placed in a separate minor head, under the functional major head. Most of the States have adopted this accounting classification. However, problems remain. Often these are only notional allocations without commensurate flow of actual benefits. Further, TSP allocations are often reduced at the RE stage thereby, effectively resulting in the diversion of the originally allocated TSP funds for non- TSP purposes. In the past, successive Finance Commissions have imposed conditions for release of State Specific Grants to propel States towards fiscal consolidation and reforms. In the interest of equity, it is imperative that the FFC undertake to impose a condition on States so that they are moved in the direction of reform and responsibility in the use of identified Tribal Sub-Plan funds. Ministry of Tribal Affairs requests the FFC to insist on non-divertability of TSP funds as a necessary condition for release of State specific grants other than those relating to tribal welfare and development.

5.2 In pursuit of the same discipline, at the central level also, the FFC may consider directing the Central Government to make a disclosure along with the annual central budget/MTFP that 'TSP allocation, not less than the proportion of STs to the total population of the country as per latest Census, has been made from the Gross Budgetary Support to the Annual plan'. Such a declaration, mandated by the FFC, would ensure that at least the minimum financial resources required for development of STs, flows to them. In this context, it is pertinent to mention that, notwithstanding the guidelines of the Planning Commission, the TSP outlay of the Central Government has fallen short of the required 8.2% of GBS (as per Census 2001), shown in Table 2. .

Table 2: Shortfall in Budgetary Support to TSP of Central Ministries

(Rs. Crore)

Year	Budget Support to Central Plan	GBS to TSP		Shortfall (against 8.2% (ST population – Census 2001)
		TSP	% to Total GBS	
2012-13	391027.00	21706.17	5.55	10358.04
2013-14	419068.00	24594.45	5.87	9769.13

Further, these outlays are often reduced at the RE Stage , resulting in an even smaller pool of resources for tribal development.

States/UTs with Tribal Research Institutes

1. Andhra Pradesh
2. Assam
3. Chattishgarh
4. Gujarat
5. Jharkhand
6. Himachal Pradesh
7. Karnataka
8. Kerala
9. Madhya Pradesh
10. Maharashtra
11. Manipur
12. Odisha
13. Rajasthan
14. Tamil Nadu
15. Uttar Pradesh
16. Tripura
17. West Bengal
- 18. Andaman & Nicobar Islands**

Staffing Pattern of ITDA, Paderu, Andhra Pradesh

Project Officer

- Asst.Project Officer (General)
 - Administration
 - Administrative Officer
 - Manager & other staff
 - Accounts
 - Asst. Accounts Officer
 - Accounts Manager & other staff
 - Monitoring
 - Dy. Statistical Officer
 - Data Processing Officer & other Computer Operators
 - Horticulture
 - Project Horticulture Officer
 - Horticulture Officers, Sub Assts. & Technical Assts.
 - Agriculture
 - Project Agriculture Officer
 - Asst.Directors of Agriculture
 - Agriculture Officers, Agrl.Extension Officers.
 - Coffee
 - Asst.Director (Coffee)
 - Coffee Sub Assts.
 - TW Engineering
 - Executive Engineer(TW)
 - Head Draftsmen/ Supdt. & other clerical staff
 - Dy.EEs& AEEs
 - Education
 - Dy.Director(TW)
 - Superintendent & other clerical staff
 - ATWOs & HWOs
 - DEO(Agency)
 - MEOs
 - MRPs & CRPs
 - Medical & Health
 - ADM&HO(T)
 - Superintendent & other clerical staff
 - SPHOs, Medical Officers & other health officials
 - Dist.Malaria Officer
 - ADMO
- PVTG Development
 - Asst.Project Officer(PTG)

In addition to the above staff, there are other staff under line department's viz. Education, Medical & Health, Malaria, Engineering, IKP, NREGS etc.as follows.

- Engineering
 - Panchayat Raj Engineering
 - Head Draftsmen/ Supdt. & other clerical staff
 - Dy.EEs& AEEs
 - Rural Water Supply
 - Head Draftsmen/ Supdt. & other clerical staff
 - Dy.EEs& AEEs
 - Roads & Buildings
 - Head Draftsmen/ Supdt. & other clerical staff
 - Dy.EEs& AEEs
 - Spl.Minor Irrigation
 - Head Draftsmen/ Supdt. & other clerical staff
 - Dy.EEs& AEEs
 - Housing
 - Head Draftsmen/ Supdt. & other clerical staff
 - Dy.EEs& AEEs
 - Addl.Project Director
 - Asst.Project Managers
 - DPMs
 - Area Co-ordinators
 - CCs and Computer Operators
- NREGS
 - Project Director, NREGS
 - APDs of NREGS
 - Engineering Consultants
 - Computer Operators
- ICDS
 - CDPOs
 - Supervisors
- Electricity
 - ADE, AP Transco
 - AEs
- GCC
 - Divl.Manager, GCC
 - Superintendent & other clerical staff
 - Sales Managers

ANNEXURE-III**Budget for Administrative Expenses for a Micro Project****a. Administrative Structure Of Micro-Project with Financial Implication:****(in Rupees)**

S.No.	Nomenclature	Qualification	Mode of selection	Tentative remuneration (P.M.)	Unit	Annual Expenditure (Recurring)
1.	Programme Implementation Officer	Under Secretary Level	Deputation	70000	1	840000
2.	Sr. Manager	MBA with 2 years' experience	Out-source	60000	1	720000
3.	Assistant Manager	MBA	Out-source	50000	1	600000
4.	Technical Engineer	BE/B-Tech(Civil)	Out-source	50000	1	600000
5.	Welfare-cum-Extension supervisor	MSW	Out-source	40000	1	480000
6.	Programmer	MCA	Out-source	40000	1	480000
7.	Stenographer	12 th + Stenography	Out-source	20000	1	240000
8.	Logistics Assistant	12 th with computer proficiency	Out-source	15000	2	360000
9.	Messenger	10 th Pass	Out-source	10000	1	120000
10.	Security Guard	10 th Pass	Out source	10000	1	120000
Total (a)						45,60,000

b. Rent, Rates And Taxes (Annual Recurring Expenditure)

(In Rupees)

S. No.	Item	Unit Cost	Annual Expenditure (Recurring)
1.	Office accommodation for the Unit on lease basis	15000 x 12	1,80,000
2.	Electricity / Water Charges	6000 x 12	72,000
3.	Telephone and Internet facility	6000 x 12	72,000
4.	Hiring of one vehicle	2000 x 30 x 12	7,20,000
5.	Office Expense	30000 x 12	3,60,000
6.	Domestic Travel		2,00,000
Total (b)			16,04,000

c. Provision of infrastructure to the Micro Project Unit (Non-Recurring Expenditure):

S.No.	Item	Tentative Cost (in Rs.)
1.	Furniture and Seating arrangements	4,00,000
2.	Computer and other IT peripherals including Server	6,00,000
3.	Machinery & Equipment	2,00,000
Total (c)		12,00,000

Total Annual Recurring Expenditure (a+b) – Rs. 45,60,000 + Rs. 16,04,000
= Rs. 61,64,000

Total Non-Recurring Expenditure (c) – Rs. 12,00,000/-

Grand Total: Rs. 61,64,000 + Rs. 12,00,000/- = Rs.73,64,000/- (Say Rupees Seventy Four Lakh)

Annexure-IV**Towns with 10, 000 or more STs and at least 25% of ST
Population**

S. No	State	Town	Total Popl	ST_Popl	% ST
1	Jammu & Kashmir	Leh Ladakh (MC)	30870	16391	53.1
2	Jammu & Kashmir	Kargil (MC)	16338	11496	70.4
3	Sikkim	Gangtok (M Corp.)	100286	28514	28.43
4	Arunachal Pradesh	Pasighat (NT)	24656	10143	41.14
5	Arunachal Pradesh	Itanagar (NT)	59490	34026	57.2
6	Arunachal Pradesh	Naharlagun (NT)	36158	20766	57.4
7	Arunachal Pradesh	Aalo (NT)	20684	11951	57.8
8	Arunachal Pradesh	Daporijo (NT)	13405	10363	77.3
9	Arunachal Pradesh	Seppa (NT)	18350	14603	79.6
10	Nagaland	Dimapur (MC)	122834	48548	39.52
11	Nagaland	Kohima (MC)	99039	71119	71.8
12	Nagaland	Chumukedima (TC)	25885	19257	74.4
13	Nagaland	Phek (TC)	14204	11766	82.8
14	Nagaland	Mokokchung (MC)	35913	29995	83.5
15	Nagaland	Kohima Village (CT)	15734	13953	88.7
16	Nagaland	Zunheboto (TC)	22633	20378	90.0
17	Nagaland	Wokha (TC)	35004	31570	90.2
18	Nagaland	Tuensang (TC)	36774	33468	91.0
19	Nagaland	Kiphire (TC)	16487	15298	92.8
20	Nagaland	Mon (TC)	26328	24555	93.3
21	Manipur	Ukhrul (CT)	27187	24105	88.7
22	Manipur	Tamenglong (CT)	19363	18603	96.1
23	Mizoram	Kolasib (NT)	24272	21459	88.4
24	Mizoram	Lunglei (NT)	57011	51397	90.2
25	Mizoram	Aizawl (NT)	293416	269450	91.8
26	Mizoram	Serchhip (NT)	21158	19747	93.3
27	Mizoram	Lawngtlai (NT)	20830	19477	93.5
28	Mizoram	Saiha (NT)	25110	23604	94.0
29	Mizoram	Champhai (NT)	32734	32115	98.1
30	Mizoram	Saitual (NT)	11619	11408	98.2
31	Mizoram	Khawzawl (NT)	11022	10879	98.7
32	Meghalaya	Shillong (MB)	143229	73307	51.2
33	Meghalaya	Madanriting (CT)	29194	15245	52.2
34	Meghalaya	Pynthormukhrah (CT)	27219	14756	54.2

S. No	State	Town	Total Popl	ST_Popl	% ST
35	Meghalaya	Nongthymmai (CT)	38004	24723	65.1
36	Meghalaya	Tura (M)	74858	53724	71.8
37	Meghalaya	Nongpoh (TC)	17055	14206	83.3
38	Meghalaya	Williamnagar (MB)	24597	20805	84.6
39	Meghalaya	Baghmara (MB)	13131	11169	85.1
40	Meghalaya	Jowai (M)	28430	25941	91.2
41	Meghalaya	Resubelpara (MB)	19595	18396	93.9
42	Meghalaya	Cherrapunjee (CT)	11722	11262	96.1
43	Meghalaya	Mawlai (CT)	55012	53305	96.9
44	Meghalaya	Nongstoin (TC)	28742	28414	98.9
45	Meghalaya	Mairang (TC)	14363	14228	99.1
46	Assam	Diphu (TC)	61797	28409	45.97
47	Assam	Haflong (TC)	43756	23348	53.4
48	Jharkhand	Chaibasa (Nagar Parishad)	69565	17875	25.7
49	Jharkhand	Bagbera (CT)	78356	25329	32.33
50	Jharkhand	Gumla (NP)	51264	17911	34.94
51	Jharkhand	Khunti (NP)	36390	14022	38.53
52	Jharkhand	Simdega (NP)	42944	19920	46.39
53	Jharkhand	Sarjamda (CT)	23788	11894	50.0
54	Orissa	Joda (M)	46631	12904	27.67
55	Orissa	Biramitrapur (M)	33442	12382	37.03
56	Chhattisgarh	JashpurNagar (M + OG)	28301	11169	39.47
57	Chhattisgarh	Narayanpur (NP)	22106	10789	48.81
58	Madhya Pradesh	Jhabua (M)	35753	13150	36.78
59	Madhya Pradesh	Malajkhanda (M)	34176	12621	36.93
60	Gujarat	Vyara (M)	39789	12283	30.87
61	Gujarat	Dohad (M + OG)	118846	37105	31.22
62	Gujarat	Jhalod (M)	28720	13400	46.66
63	Gujarat	Dharampur (M)	24178	11587	47.92
64	Karnataka	Challakere (TMC)	55194	13845	25.08
65	Lakshadweep	Andrott (CT)	11191	10948	97.8

Source: Census 2011

MC- Municipal Council;
NT - notified town ;
CT-Cantonment Town ;
NP/TC- Nagar Panchayat /Town Council

Table I: State-wise Population of Particularly Vulnerable Tribal Groups (PVTGs)

(Figures in actual)

S. No.	States/ UTs.	Name of PTG	Population				
			1961	1971	1981	1991	2001
1	Andhra Pradesh	1. Chenchu	17609	24178	28434	40869	49232
		2. BodoGadaba	21840	25108	27732	33127	36078
		3. GutobGadaba	-	-	-	-	-
		4. DongriaKhond	21754	34382	39408	66629	85324
		5. KultiaKhond	-	-	-	-	-
		6. Kolam	16731	26498	21842	41254	45671
		7. KondaReddi	35439	42777	54685	76391	83096
		8. Kondasavara	-	28189	-	-	-
		9. BondoPorja	-	-	-	-	-
		10. KhondPorja	9350	12347	16479	24154	32669
		11. ParengiProja	-	-	-	-	-
		12. Thoti	546	1785	1388	3654	2074
		Total	123269	195264	189968	286078	334144
2	Bihar (including Jharkhand up to 1991; only Bihar for 2001)	13. Asur	5819	7026	7783	9623	181
		14. Birhor	2438	3461	4377	8083	406
		15. Birjia	4029	3628	4057	6191	17
		16. Hill Kharia	108983	127002	141771	151634	1501
		17. Korwa	21162	18717	219940	24871	703
		18. Mal Paharia	45423	48636	79322	86790	4631
		19. Parhaiya	12268	14651	24012	30421	2429
		20. SauriaPaharia	55605	59047	39269	48761	585
		21. Savar	1561	3548	3014	4264	420
				Total	257288	285716	52354

.....Contd./-

S. No.	States/ UTs.	Name of PTG	Population				
			1961	1971	1981	1991	2001
3	Gujarat	29. Kolgha	-	29464	62232	82679	48419
		30. Kathodi	-	2939	2546	4773	5820
		31. Kotwalia	-	12902	17759	19569	21453
		32. Padhar	-	4758	10587	15896	22421
		33. Siddi	-	4482	5429	6336	8662
		Total	-	54545	98553	129253	106775
4	Jharkhand	34. Asur	-	-	-	-	10347
		35. Birhor	-	-	-	-	7514
		36. Birjia	-	-	-	-	5365
		37. Hill Kharia	-	-	-	-	164022
		38. Korwa	-	-	-	-	27177
		39. Mal Paharia	-	-	-	-	115093
		40. Parhaiya	-	-	-	-	20786
		41. SauriaPaharia	-	-	-	-	31050
		42. Savar	-	-	-	-	6004
		Total	-	-	-	-	387358
5	Karnataka	43. JenuKuruba	3623	6656	34747	29371	29828
		44. Koraga	6382	7620	15146	16322	16071
		Total	10005	14276	49893	45693	45899
6	Kerala	45. Cholanaikayan	-	306	234	-	-
		46. Kadar	-	1120	1503	2021	2145
		47. Kattunayankan	-	5565	8803	12155	14715
		48. Koraga	-	1200	1098	1651	1152
		49. Kurumba	-	1319	1283	1820	2174
		Total	-	9510	12921	17647	20186

.....Contd./-

S. No.	States/ UTs.	Name of PTG	Population				
			1961	1971	1981	1991	2001
7	Madhya Pradesh (including Chhattisgarh)	50. Abujh Maria	11115	13000	15500	-	-
		51. Baiga	-	6194	248949	317549	332936
		52. Bharia	-	1589	1614	-	-
		53. Birhor	513	738	561	2206	143
		54. Hill Korwa	23605	67000	19041	-	-
		55. Kamar	-	13600	17517	20565	2424
		56. Sahariya	174320	207174	281816	332748	450217
		Total	209553	309295	584998	673068	785720
8	Maharashtra	57. Katkari/Kathodi	-	146785	174602	202203	235022
		58. Kolam	-	56061	118073	147843	173646
		59. Maria Gond	-	53400	66750	-	-
		Total	-	256246	359425	350046	408668
9	Manipur	60. Maram Naga	-	5123	6544	9592	1225
		Total	-	5123	6544	9592	1225
10	Odisha	61. ChuktiaBhunja	-	-	-	-	2174*-
		62. Birhor	-	248	142	825	702
		63. Bondo	-	3870	5895	7315	9378
		64. Didayi	-	3055	1978	5471	7371
		65. Dongria Khond	-	2676	6067	-	-
		66. Juang	-	3181	30876	35665	41339
		67. Kharia	-	1259	1259	-	-
		68. KutiaKhond	-	3016	4735	-	-
		69. LanjiaSaura	-	4233	8421	-	-
		70. Lodha	-	1598	5100	7458	8905
		71. Mankirdia	-	133	1005	1491	1050
		72. PaudiBhuyan	-	4424	8872	-	-
		73. Saura	-	2845	2917	-	-
		Total	-	30538	77267	58225	68745

.....Contd./-

S. No.	States/ UTs.	Name of PTG	Population				
			1961	1971	1981	1991	2001
11	Rajasthan	74. Saharia	23125	26796	40945	59810	76237
		Total	23125	26796	40945	59810	76237
12	Tamil Nadu	75. Irular	79835	89025	105757	138827	155606
		76. Kattunayakan	6459	5042	26383	42761	45227
		77. Kota	833	1188	604	752	925
		78. Korumba	1174	2754	4354	4768	5498
		79. Paniyan	4779	6093	6393	7124	9121
		80. Toda	714	930	875	1100	1560
		Total	93794	105032	144366	195332	217937
13	Tripura	81. Riang	56579	64722	84004	111606	165103
		Total	56579	64722	84004	111606	165103
14	Uttar Pradesh (including Uttarakhand upto 1991; only Uttar Pradesh for 2001)	82. Buksa	-	-	31807	34621	4367
		83. Raji	-	-	1087	1728	998
		Total	-	-	32894	36349	5365
15	Uttranchal	84. Buksa	-	-	-	-	46771
		85. Raji	-	-	-	-	517
		Total	-	-	-	-	47288
16	West Bengal	86. Birhor	-	-	658	855	1017
		87. Lodha	-	45906	53718	68095	84966
		88. Toto	-	-	675	-	-
		Total	-	45906	55051	68950	85983
17	Andaman & Nicobar Island	89. Great Andamanese	-	-	42	32	43
		90. Jarawa	-	-	31	89	240
		91. Onge	-	-	97	101	96
		92. Sentinelese	-	-	-	24	39
		93. Shom Pen	71	212	223	131	398
		Total	71	212	393	377	816
All India		Grand Total	773684	1403181	2260767	2412664	2770496

Source: Office of RGI & Census commissioner of India, Ministry of Home Affairs

- Survey by TRI Odisha in 2002

Table II: State-wise number of Particularly Vulnerable Tribal Groups (PVTGs)

Sl. No.	Name of State/UT	No. of PTGs
1	Andhra Pradesh	12
2	Bihar (including Jharkhand)	9
3	Gujarat	5
4	Karnataka	2
5	Kerala	5
6	Madhya Pradesh (including Chhattisgarh)	7
7	Maharashtra	3
8	Manipur	1
9	Odisha	13
10	Rajasthan	1
11	Tamil Nadu	6
12	Tripura	1
13	Uttar Pradesh (including Uttarakhand)	2
14	West Bengal	3
15	Andaman & Nicobar Islands	5
	Total	75
Source: Annual Report 2012-13, Ministry of Tribal Affairs		

Annexure - VI

Requirement for Conservation-cum-Development Plan (CCD) for PVTGs

(Rs. in Crore)

S. No.	Name of States/UT	Requirement proposed by States in CCD Plan for the 12 th Plan period								
		2012-13		Deficit against demand (%)	2013-14		2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	Amount proposed for 12 th Plan
		Amount proposed	Amount released		Amount proposed	Amount released	Amount proposed	Amount proposed	Amount proposed	
1	Andhra Pradesh	318.96	20.00	93.73	92.00	30.00	207.39	63.49	69.61	751.45
2	Bihar**	10.72	0.00		10.72		10.72	10.72	10.72	53.60
3	Chhattisgarh	66.05	20.00	69.72	31.75	14.00	24.65	25.08	24.07	171.60
4	Gujarat	10.67	7.00	34.40	10.97	10.00	10.92	11.17	11.03	54.76
5	Jharkhand	20.95	6.31	69.88	50.36		9.66	8.09	93.16	182.22
6	Karnataka	44.62	6.59	85.23	34.61		27.85	32.99	30.81	170.88
7	Kerala**	2.50	0.00		8.50		10.50	8.50	5.00	35.00
8	MadhyaPradesh	78.60	43.50	44.66	75.48	45.00	67.83	65.28	65.28	352.47
9	Maharashtra*	0.00	0.00		0.00		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
10	Manipur	1.00	1.00	0.00	1.00		1.00	1.00	1.00	5.00
11	Odisha	107.15	32.50	69.67	60.89	20.00	60.41	61.79	58.21	348.45
12	Rajasthan	26.84	15.00	44.11	29.49		32.51	33.45	36.73	159.02
13	Tamil Nadu	34.38	14.00	59.28	25.46	20.00	25.56	25.88	26.45	137.73
14	Tripura	9.66	7.00	27.54	9.51	9.50	6.90	5.63	5.63	37.33
15	West Bengal**	27.79	0.00	100.00	28.18		30.72	27.19	29.11	142.99
16	Uttarakhand	9.47	4.00	57.76	9.61		10.30	10.76	12.47	52.61
17	U.P.**	1.24	0.00	100.00	0.13		0.13	0.13	0.13	1.76
18	A&N Islands**	5.88	0.00	100.00	0.93	0.75	0.83	2.00	1.10	10.74
	Total	776.48	176.90		479.59	149.25	537.88	393.15	480.51	2667.61

*Proposal of Maharashtra not yet received.
**Funds not released due to pending Utilization Certificates/non compliance as per the CCD plan.