"It is easier to steal from the poor precisely because they are poor. They neither see nor understand programme guidelines, false measurement books of work done, false receipts of payments made and all the evidence and papers that a rapacious bureaucracy fabricates to conceal the theft of public money and pass the simple test of the annual paper audit.

The absence of a physical audit in India makes it a blind audit. Why a physical audit has not been introduced all these years is simply because it is so inconvenient for the corrupt and the corrupt rule the system. The implementing department/agency does the physical verification of its own work. Does it require great intelligence to say that this is meant to protect corruption, not remove it?"

- The extent of corruption is 61% in terracing work.

- In four villages the expenditure under the scheme was Rs. 24 lakhs of which Rs. 15 lakhs is the estimated misappropriation.

- In one village 18 bunds out of 46 are "missing".

- Bogus wages paid amount to 62%.

- Bogus payment for work not done ranges from 17% to 39%.
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STEALING FROM THE POOR

Watershed Development

Summary of findings and recommendations

Watershed management and improvement is vital for sustainable dry land farming. The objective is to conserve soil and moisture by reducing surface run-off, increasing percolation and augmenting ground water resources. Works implemented under this programme consist of terracing, nala bunding (using earthen or cement bunds), small dams, tree planting, underground bandharas etc. These works have been done by the non-governmental organizations and by the Agricultural Department of the State Government. Corruption was found in both cases. The survey was conducted in four villages in which, both, the Government and the NGO had executed works.

Main findings

- Misappropriation of three types was found.

(1) The first method was by doing the terracing work by tractors but falsely showing on record that the work was done by manual labour and claiming bogus expenditure from the government. Tractor costs are much lower. The NGO was found to have done this on a large scale. The landowners on whose fields the work was done have themselves stated that labourers were not employed and the work was done through tractors. These statements have been recorded. THE MISAPPROPRIATION WAS 61 %. (Annexure-2 shows the comparative costs of terracing by manual and mechanical methods, based upon the rates declared by the Government. Using tractors is cheaper by more than 50%. The figure of 61% is based upon field enquiry and the statements of beneficiaries, as mentioned above.)

(2) The second method was by showing false expenditure on bunds not actually constructed. The Government Department of Agriculture was found to have done this. THE MISAPPROPRIATION WAS 17 % TO 39 %.
(3) The third method was to pay the labour less than the amount shown on the muster. The government had done this. The method used for calculating this misappropriation, in the absence of musters, has been indicated in the next section in the case studies. The actual costs have been estimated on the basis of the statements of the landowners/labourers which have been recorded. These costs have been compared with the statement of expenditure given by the government. **THE MISAPPROPRIATION WAS 62%**.

- **The NGO and the Government did not cooperate with the institute and did not provide copies of muster rolls for verification by the institute. If this record is provided massive corruption would be exposed. Since the muster rolls were not shown the information regarding the works sampled was obtained from the actual beneficiaries and others.**

**Work done by NGO**

- In four villages in Nasik district (Bhimkhet, Jad, Mohalangi and Talwade Digar) where work was executed by an NGO, Navnirman, it was found that the **extent of misappropriation was 61%**. Out of Rs. 24,78,654 paid to the NGO for terracing the estimated misappropriation was over Rs. 15 lakhs. The NGO claimed excess expenditure by making it appear that the work was done through labourers whereas it was actually done mechanically through tractors which is much cheaper. (Please also see the next section on case studies and methodology for calculating misappropriation.)

- The money was stolen from the poor. Not using labour intensive methods of work execution also defeated one of the objectives of the scheme of generating employment for the poor.

- Two cement bunds constructed by the same NGO at Bhimkhet and Mohalangi at a cost of Rs. 3,48,535 were of poor quality and were leaking.

- The NGO, Navnirman, has refused to show the false musters prepared showing the names of labourers and payments made to them on the basis of which it claimed the money from the government. Three teams from the institute had asked for photocopies of musters. Details of work and expenditure were provided but the false documents were not shown.
Impact of work

- The impact on crop production was significant for wheat, rice and pulses. The details are indicated below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of crop</th>
<th>Increase in production after land improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Wheat</td>
<td>6.4 times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Bajari</td>
<td>1.4 times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Nagali</td>
<td>1.1 times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Rice</td>
<td>3.2 times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Pulses</td>
<td>2.2 times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Ground nut</td>
<td>1.02 times</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Work done by govt.

- The institute met with even more resistance from the government in disclosing records. The government has also executed watershed development works. In spite of several letters to the Agricultural Officer, Satana, and his head office in Pune, and in spite of several telephone calls and 5 trips to his office, the AO, Satana, gave some information regarding only three villages after two and a half months. And even this was incomplete. But the muster roll showing payment to labourers was not provided even though the institute was willing to pay the cost of photocopying. The muster roll is the main voucher in support of major payments made.

- The misappropriation by government officials in terms of showing expenditure on bunds not constructed ranges from 17% to 39% as indicated below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Bunds shown on record</th>
<th>Bunds not made</th>
<th>Amount of theft (Rs.)</th>
<th>% theft</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jad</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,80,648</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>mud bunds made 95-96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talwade Digar</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14,00,000 (estimate)</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>Mud bunds made 92-96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhinkhet</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,97,000</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>Mud bunds made 93-96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The extent of misappropriation by government officials paying wages less than that shown on record is 62% as indicated below:

**Misappropriation through bogus wages**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>No. of bunds verified</th>
<th>Cost of verified bunds (Rs.)</th>
<th>Wages received as stated by labourers</th>
<th>Amount of theft</th>
<th>% of theft</th>
<th>See case study no.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jad</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6,23,093</td>
<td>1,37,081</td>
<td>4,86,012</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhimkhet</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10,15,000</td>
<td>3,92,000</td>
<td>6,23,000</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwade Dighar</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10,02,203</td>
<td>4,81,057</td>
<td>521,1146</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2640296</strong></td>
<td><strong>1010138</strong></td>
<td><strong>1630158</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>62%</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Please also see the section on case studies and methodology of calculating misappropriation).

Of the five bunds in Jad, two were built by the Government on the farms of Shri Lahanu Ahire, former MLA, and his nephew, Shri Raghunath Ahire. It would have to be ascertained if this was a technical necessity and whether or not other areas with poorer farmers could have been selected instead for land improvement.
RECOMMENDATIONS

- A physical audit to be carried out by the audit department should be introduced. Exclusive reliance on a paper/voucher audit is inadequate and has bred corruption.

- However till this reform in the audit system is implemented, an independent agency should do the test physical audit (through actual physical verification of a sample of works).

- Physical test checking of a few works should be prescribed for senior bureaucrats like conservators and secretaries.

- The Government should immediately prosecute the corrupt NGO and those government officials who released funds to the NGO. For works done by the government department the corrupt officials should be prosecuted. Where corruption is so evident, departmental enquiries would not suffice.

- This institute should be empowered to obtain copies of records from all government departments to conduct studies/surveys. Government should issue instructions to all departments immediately.

- Action should be taken against officials for not showing the records.

- Awareness campaigns (also through NGOs, where ever possible) should be launched so that beneficiaries understand the scheme and the method of wage calculation etc.

- A detail work plan for each watershed should be prepared which should contain the survey number-wise location of works to be done. This would ensure that the ridge to valley approach is followed in undertaking the work. This would also ensure that corruption through double counting of works is avoided especially when multiple agencies are working. Physical verification by test checking would become possible by selecting works for inspection from the watershed plan. At present the inspecting officer relies on the list given by the implementing department.
• The villagers/beneficiaries should be involved in preparing the watershed plan so that they know the works that are to be done and could monitor the work and use of funds.

• Priorities for the types and location of works to be done should be fixed in consultation with the beneficiaries. For individual beneficiary works like paddy bunding, terracing/leveling, farm ponds etc. it is important to determine location for targeting the poor.

• These findings should be circulated throughout the state through the media so that implementing agencies, both government and NGOs, could see a deterrent against corruption and could also attempt to implement the recommendations.

• For other recommendations regarding policy issues please see the other reports.
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Case studies & Methodology for calculating misappropriation

CASE STUDY - 1

Table No.1
Statement showing time taken and area improved by terracing as stated by the beneficiaries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>No. of beneficiaries who gave the area &amp; time</th>
<th>Area improved (Hectares)</th>
<th>Time taken for terracing work by tractor (days)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bhimkhet</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19.27</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jad</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.72</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohalangi</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talwade Digar</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28.29</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) Per day average area improved by tractor = $\frac{2829 \text{ R}}{189 \text{ days}} = 14.96 \approx 15 \text{ ares approximately}$

2) Per day tractor cost (hire charges)

From the oral information received by villagers, in the year 1998 there were different tractor charges per day i.e. Rs. 900, Rs. 1000 and Rs. 1100
Hence average tractor charge per day is $\frac{900 + 1000 + 1100}{3} = \text{Rs. 1000}$

3) Per are tractor hire charges = $\frac{\text{Per day tractor charge}}{\text{Per day area improved in ares}}$
   = $\frac{\text{Rs.} 1000}{15 \text{ are}}$
   = $\text{Rs.} 66.66$
   = Approximately $\text{Rs.} 67/- \text{ per are}$

Based on this calculation the village-wise misappropriation done by Navnirman for terracing work in four villages of Satana block, in Nasik district is given below-
CASE STUDY - 2

Misappropriation by payment of less wages than that shown on record

Anil Raghunath Ahire on whose farm Government had constructed one Mud Bund, worth Rs. 1,82,548/- was interviewed to find out whether so much money was spent. Labourers who worked on Anil’s farm were interviewed. An informal discussion with the labourers revealed the following facts:

a) It took 15 days for constructing the bund on Shri Ahire’s farm.

b) 35 families i.e. 70 labourers worked in this project.

c) Payment was based on work done by one family.

d) The labourers said they received Rs. 700/- to 1000/- per family for 15 days. We researchers along with labourers took Rs. 1000 as the amount given to each family and multiplied it by 35 to get final figure of Rs 35,000/-

e) On being asked if any additional payment was made, the labourers stated that Rs. 5000/- was given to them as a lump sum.

8) Thus out of the total 1,82,548.00 shown on records as money spent by the Government, only 40,000/- i.e. 22% was spent in reality and 78% of the amount, i.e. Rs. 1,42,548/- was misappropriated by the officials. Individual statements of beneficiaries were taken to validate the findings.

9) Thus, in Jad village 78% of the amount for 4 bunds i.e. Rs. 4,86,012/- was misappropriated.
CASE STUDY - 3

We took one case of Parbat Dodha Patil to assess approximately how much was paid to the labourers including other overheads. The details of parbats case are as follows:

1. Amount on record for parbat's (one) nala bund shown by Government is Rs.93,550.

2. Labourers paid for digging were 35 families having approximately 70 members. Payment was however, made per family Rs.250/- on weekly basis. The digging work went on for 5 days. We multiplied 35 families into 250 x 5 days to get a figure of Rs.8750.00

3. Further more, the labourers said approximately 10 tractors gravel was brought from the mountains at the rate of approximately Rs.500/- per tractor. Hence gravel costed Rs.5000/-

4. Mud for bunds was brought from the field, in 25 tractor trips at the rate of Rs 500/-, hence Rs.12,500/-

5. Transporting stones from the mountains to the nala bund site, worked out to Rs.200 per tractor into 25 trips which works out to about Rs.5000/-

6. Rs.5000/- given to 35 labourers for stone pitching.

7. Leveling with the help of bullocks for 21 days per pair owner was paid Rs.750/- hence total of Rs.9000 was paid to 12 pairs.

8. Considering the above heads of expenditure as told by the labourers and given individually in writing, the total cost of parbat's bund as calculated by labourers worked out to Rs.45,250.00.
CASE STUDY - 4

A case study of Bhavrao Choudhary. Bhavrao Choudhary is a tribal on whose farm a bund worth Rs.89,000/-. After calculating the cost of the bund as revealed by the labourers it worked out to Rs.56,000/-. The details are as follows :-

1. 40 families have about 85 members worked on the project for one month.
2. Payment was made to one family on the basis of work output.
3. Out of the 40 families who worked as labourers:
   i) Rs.200 was given per week to 10 families, hence Rs. 200 x 10 x 4 = 8000.
   ii) Rs.350 was given per week to 20 families, hence Rs.350 x 20 x 4 = 28000.
   iii) Rs.500 was given per week to 10 families, hence Rs.500 x 10 x 4 = 20000

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>56000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rs.56,000/- included digging levelling, pitching and other works associated with construction of the bund.

4. Thus, on an average Rs.33,000/- was siphoned by the Government officials per bund, hence for seven bunds the amount works out to Rs.2,31,000.00

5. If Rs.2,31,000.00 is added to the amount 1,97,000 for the physically missing bund the total of misappropriated funds for 8 bunds works out to 4,28,000 in Bhimkhet village.

6. Labourers in Bhimkhet said, their thumb impressions and signatures were taken on the muster.

7. Yet another observation in Bhimkhet revealed by the labourers was that out of 40 families 30 were paid Rs. 200 to 350 per week, because they never fought on the issue of calculation whereas the remain 10 families fought with the officials and were paid Rs.500/- per week.

Conclusion - greater the level of ignorance about calculations and attitude to accept injustice, among the labourers, lesser the weekly wages.

8. Lastly, the area shown on paper to construct bunds was more on paper, but less in reality after verification.

9. Out of the seven beneficiaries interviewed in Bhimkhet 6 i.e. 86% said construction of mud bunds did not have any impact on their crop pattern and production. They produced Ragi & Pulses before and after the construction of bunds.
Table No.1
Villagewise Nala Bunds constructed by Navnirman, Nashik

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No</th>
<th>Village Name</th>
<th>No.of Nala bunds shown</th>
<th>No.of Bandhs physically existed at the time of survey</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mud bund</td>
<td>Cement bund</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bhimkhet</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Jad</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mohalangi</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Talwade Digar</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table No.2
Wastage of Government Grants
due to improper construction of Nala bunds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No.</th>
<th>Name of village</th>
<th>Bund type</th>
<th>No.of Bunds</th>
<th>No.of Bunds having leakage</th>
<th>Expenditure (Wastage of money) (Rs.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bhimkhet</td>
<td>Mud bund</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>154935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>154935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Jad</td>
<td>Mud bund</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>153600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cement</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>153600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mohalangi</td>
<td>Mud bund</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>193600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>193600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Talwade Digar</td>
<td>Mud bund</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>193600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cement</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>193600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>348535</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table No. 3
Misappropriation in amount received by Navnirman for terracing work in four villages of Satana taluka in Nashik District.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No.</th>
<th>Name of village</th>
<th>Terracing area covered (Hect)</th>
<th>Amount shown by Navnirman for terracing</th>
<th>Tractor cost charges for terracing (approx.) (Rs.)</th>
<th>Misappropriation amount (approx.)</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mohalangri</td>
<td>42.86</td>
<td>7,12,020</td>
<td>287162</td>
<td>424858</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Jad</td>
<td>28.34</td>
<td>5,04,750</td>
<td>189878</td>
<td>314872</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Bhimakhet</td>
<td>28.75</td>
<td>533,220</td>
<td>192625</td>
<td>340595</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Talwade Digar</td>
<td>42.49</td>
<td>7,28,664</td>
<td>284683</td>
<td>1524306</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>142.44</strong></td>
<td><strong>24,78,654</strong></td>
<td><strong>954348</strong></td>
<td><strong>1524306</strong></td>
<td><strong>61%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 61% of the total amount allocated by the Government to Navnirman was misutilised.

39 out of 54 land owners stated that the N.G.O. used tractors and work was not done through labourers. In addition to this, statements of other persons members of Gram Panchayat, Sarpanch, ex-M.L.A. etc. were also recorded. These persons have said that tractors were used in the village for terracing work and this work was not done by labourers. Some landholders might have been pressurised by the N.G.O. since they were obliged to the N.G.O. for doing the work on their fields. These labourers might have also shared the illegal profit made by the N.G.O. On checking the musters the truth will surface. On the basis of the evidence collected it can be concluded that tractors were used in all fields. It is also unreasonable to believe that on some field tractors were used and on others only labourers are used.

**TABLE No. 4**
Misappropriation in amount received by Navnirman for terracing work in Talwade Digar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No.</th>
<th>Survey No.</th>
<th>Labour cost shown by Navnirman (Rs.)</th>
<th>Area covered (hectare)</th>
<th>Tractor cost (charges) (approx.) (Rs.)</th>
<th>Misappropriation (approx.) (Rs.)</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>125 to 129</td>
<td>79,430.00</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>29480</td>
<td>49950</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>59,449.00</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>22110</td>
<td>37339</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>119, 120,132</td>
<td>2,01,000.00</td>
<td>11.20</td>
<td>75040</td>
<td>125960</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>52,370.00</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>22110</td>
<td>30260</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>51,015.00</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>24790</td>
<td>26225</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>35,040.00</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>13065</td>
<td>21975</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>26,105.00</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>10050</td>
<td>16055</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>35,980.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>13400</td>
<td>22580</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>28,505.00</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>11658</td>
<td>16847</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>59,100.00</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>22110</td>
<td>36990</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>114, 115</td>
<td>46,900.00</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>20770</td>
<td>26130</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>53,770.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>20100</td>
<td>33670</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>7,28,664</strong></td>
<td><strong>42.49</strong></td>
<td><strong>284683</strong></td>
<td><strong>443981</strong></td>
<td><strong>61%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table No. 5
Misappropriation Amount received by Navnirman
for Terracing work in Jad.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No</th>
<th>Survey No.</th>
<th>Labour cost shown by Navnirman (Rs.)</th>
<th>Area covered (hect.)</th>
<th>Tractor cost (charges) (Approx.) (Rs.)</th>
<th>Misappropriation Amount (Approx.) (Rs.)</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>116,73</td>
<td>86,060/-</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>31825</td>
<td>54235</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>117,118/ A + B</td>
<td>92,040/-</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>34170</td>
<td>57870</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>66, 67, 68, 69</td>
<td>76,740/-</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>29145</td>
<td>47595</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65,540/-</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>25795</td>
<td>39745</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>53,030/-</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>19698</td>
<td>33332</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>33,200/-</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>12529</td>
<td>20671</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>63, 61</td>
<td>53,010/-</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>19698</td>
<td>33312</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>45,130/-</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>17018</td>
<td>28112</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,04,750/-</td>
<td>28.34</td>
<td>189878</td>
<td>314872</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table No. 6
Misappropriation Amount received by Navnirman
for Terracing work in Mohalangi.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No</th>
<th>Survey No.</th>
<th>Labour cost shown by Navnirman (Rs.)</th>
<th>Area covered (hect.)</th>
<th>Tractor cost (charges) approx. (Rs.)</th>
<th>Approx. misappropriation amount (Rs.)</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>24,37,38, 39</td>
<td>1,24,470/-</td>
<td>8.81</td>
<td>59027</td>
<td>65443</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>25/1+2+3</td>
<td>63,520/-</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>25862</td>
<td>37658</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>36/1+2</td>
<td>95,030/-</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>36180</td>
<td>58850</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>42,500/-</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>15879</td>
<td>26621</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>25,040/-</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>9380</td>
<td>15660</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>37,840/-</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>16750</td>
<td>21090</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>34,280/-</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>12864</td>
<td>21416</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>50/1+2+3</td>
<td>73,000/-</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>32160</td>
<td>40840</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>63/1+2</td>
<td>44,020/-</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>16683</td>
<td>27337</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>37,010/-</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>13802</td>
<td>23208</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>34/29-23</td>
<td>51,100/-</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>16415</td>
<td>34685</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>34/3+5+6</td>
<td>84,210/-</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>32160</td>
<td>52050</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>7,12,020/-</td>
<td>42.86</td>
<td>287162</td>
<td>424858</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table No. 7
Misappropriation Amount received by Navnirman for terracing work in Bhimkhet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No</th>
<th>Survey No.</th>
<th>Labour cost shown by Navnirman (Rs.)</th>
<th>Area covered (hect.)</th>
<th>Tractor cost (approx.) (Rs.)</th>
<th>Misappropriation (approx.) (Rs.)</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>69 to 73</td>
<td>1,67,000/-</td>
<td>8.35</td>
<td>55945</td>
<td>111055</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>86, 87</td>
<td>87,500/-</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>29480</td>
<td>58020</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>45,450/-</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>17420</td>
<td>28030</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>46,860/-</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>17420</td>
<td>29440</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>53,000/-</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>20100</td>
<td>32900</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>59,60</td>
<td>53,600/-</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>20100</td>
<td>33500</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>41,010/-</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>17420</td>
<td>23590</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>38,800/-</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>14740</td>
<td>24060</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,33,220/-</td>
<td>28.75</td>
<td>192625</td>
<td>340595</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sr. No.</td>
<td>Name of N.G.O.</td>
<td>Watershed Allotted</td>
<td>Grant disposed</td>
<td>Expenditure</td>
<td>Status of work</td>
<td>Recovery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Navnirman, Satana</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>107.89</td>
<td>49.53</td>
<td>105.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Vanrai, Malegaon</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>39.22</td>
<td>47.24</td>
<td>30.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Bhagirat, Nashik</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>29.71</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Navnirman, Peth</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20.51</td>
<td>7.91</td>
<td>8.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Janakalyan Sanstha, Dindori</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.90</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>7.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Suyash Charitable Surgana Trust</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13.04</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Urban &amp; Rural Social Institute, Peth</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7.82</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Vachan, Igatpuri</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>17.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Yojak, Chandwad</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33.55</td>
<td>21.98</td>
<td>27.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Snehabandh, Nashik</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27.70</td>
<td>5.68</td>
<td>24.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>276.73</td>
<td>184.87</td>
<td>230.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tables prepared by analysing 54 schedules administered, to assess NGO’s work.

Table No. 9

AWARENESS AMONG BENEFICIARIES REGARDING TOTAL GRANT RECEIVED BY NAVNIRMAN FOR WATERSHED DEVELOPMENT.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No.</th>
<th>Awareness Level</th>
<th>No.of Beneficiaries</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Aware of total grant amount received</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Not aware of total grant amount received</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>54</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table No. 10

STATEMENT SHOWING VILLAGEWISE BENEFICIARIES UNDER B.P.L. CATEGORY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No.</th>
<th>Name of the villages</th>
<th>No.of beneficiaries</th>
<th>B.P.L. status</th>
<th>Percentage of B.P.L.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Bhimkhet</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Jad</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Moholangi</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Talwade Digar</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>54</strong></td>
<td><strong>43</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: This question was addressed to 54 families in 4 villages namely Bhimkhet, Jad, Moholangi & Talwade Digar villages of Satana, to evaluate work done by Navnirman.
### TABLE No. 11
**STATEMENT SHOWING THE DETAILS OF LAND HOLDING OF VILLAGE BENEFICIARIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No</th>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Beneficiary</th>
<th>Land holding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Upto 1 acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.</td>
<td>Bhimkhet</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.</td>
<td>Jad</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.</td>
<td>Moholangi</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1 (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Talwade Digar</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1 (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>54</td>
<td>2 (4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE No. 12
**NO. OF BENEFICIARIES HAVING IRRIGATION FACILITY IN 4 VILLAGES OF SATANA TAHSL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No</th>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Total no. of beneficiaries</th>
<th>Irrigation facility</th>
<th>No irrigation facility families</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Well</td>
<td>River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Bhimkhet</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Jad</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Mohalangi</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Talwade (Digar)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>54</td>
<td>16 (30%)</td>
<td>3(6%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE No.13

**STATUS OF ELECTRIC AND DIESEL PUMP IN 4 VILLAGES STUDIED**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No.</th>
<th>Name of the village</th>
<th>Total No. of beneficiaries</th>
<th>Electric pump</th>
<th>Diesel pump</th>
<th>Total A+B</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Electric</td>
<td>Diesel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Electric</td>
<td>Diesel</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Electric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Bhimkhet</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Jad</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Moholangi</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Talwade Digar</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>54</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE No. 14

**PERIOD OF AVAILABILITY OF FOOD GRAINS BEFORE & AFTER TERRACING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No.</th>
<th>Name of village</th>
<th>Scheduled No.</th>
<th>Before</th>
<th>After</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0 to 2 months</td>
<td>2 to 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.</td>
<td>Bhimkhet</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6 (43)</td>
<td>3 (21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.</td>
<td>Jad</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2 (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>Moholangi</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2 (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Talwade Digar</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1 (8)</td>
<td>9 (69)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>54</strong></td>
<td><strong>7 (13)</strong></td>
<td><strong>16 (30)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Figures in the bracket indicates percentage
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Bhimkhet</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>2850</td>
<td>2300</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>4000</td>
<td>6200</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>Jad</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2550</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1400</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>4700</td>
<td>3080</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>Moholangi</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>5850</td>
<td>2100</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1450</td>
<td>2250</td>
<td>1250</td>
<td>4550</td>
<td>6380</td>
<td>1555</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Talwade Digar</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>2840</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>4950</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>4420</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>54</td>
<td>3200</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>4950</td>
<td>12400</td>
<td>4850</td>
<td>1597</td>
<td>3440</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2650</td>
<td>6100</td>
<td>7300</td>
<td>13700</td>
<td>1560</td>
<td>3510</td>
<td>4880</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>1200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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ANNEXURE -2
Statement showing comparative cost of terracing by manual and mechanical methods. (The table gives the cost of excavation of one cubic meter of soil and transportation up till 10 meters)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Parimandal</th>
<th>Area Category</th>
<th>Cost of doing the work by labour (Govt. of Maharashtra, P.W.D.Pune Region) (Rs.)</th>
<th>Cost of doing the work using tractor as communicated by Jt. Director Soil Conservation and Water Management Commissionerate of Agriculture Pune, on 12/09/2002 for the year 1997-98</th>
<th>Cost saving using tractor instead of labour by applying the labour cost of 1998 (Rs.)</th>
<th>% of saving</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parimandal 3</td>
<td>TSP/Hilly Area</td>
<td>21.62</td>
<td>7.35</td>
<td>9.67</td>
<td>56.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Area</td>
<td>18.80</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>7.80</td>
<td>52.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parimandal 4</td>
<td>TSP/Hilly Area</td>
<td>20.70</td>
<td>7.35</td>
<td>8.65</td>
<td>53.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Area</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
JA.K.MUD-6/MANGRI/92/2002
मृद संख्यान व पाणिलोट क्षेत्र व्यवस्थापन
कृषि आयुक्तालय, महाराष्ट्र राज्य,
पुणे - 411 001, दिनांक १२.९.२००२

प्रति,
मा.आयुक्त,
आदिवासी संगोष्ठन व प्रशिक्षण संस्था,
२८ विवस्था गार्डन,
pune- ४११ ००१.

विषय :- मंगळी कामाचे तांत्रिक अभिप्रायावाचत.

संदर्भ :- आपले पत्र क्रमांक -अधि/११०२/प्रव. १९९/का-
५/(५)/०२/३३६९, दिनांक ३०.८.२००२

उपरोक्त संदर्भानुसार त्यांना अनुसूच गटाविषयात येते की, (१) पदार्थसाठी मंगळी काम करण्यासाठी खाचांचे मंजूर मापदंड (cost Norm) सन १९९७ व १९९८ साली सारखे असून परिमंडळ-३ जनजाती उपयोजना/डंगराळ क्षेत्रासाठी रुपये २०९२६/- व इतर क्षेत्रासाठी रुपये १८२२६/- तर परिमंडळ-४ जनजाती उपयोजना/डंगराळ क्षेत्रासाठी रुपये ११८२६/- व इतर क्षेत्रासाठी रुपये १५८६४/- प्रति हॅक्टर असे आहेत. (२) ट्रॅक्टरबद्दल मंगळी काम करण्यासाठी सन १९९७ व १९९८ चे खालवाचे दरसुची नूसार जमीनमध्ये मठ मूळमाचे प्रमाण २५ टक्केपेक्षा जास्त नाही. अशा जमीनमध्ये हंगामाचा साहाय्याने (बुलडोजर, ट्रॅक्टर) खोदकाम करणे, खोदून काठलेली माली निर्देश केल्याप्रमाणे २० मिटर अंतरावर व १ मिटर उंचीपर्यंत पसरविणे व बांध तयार करणे याकामासाठी परिमंडळ-३ व ४ च्या जनजाती उपयोजना/डंगराळ क्षेत्रासाठी रुपये ७३५ प्रति घ.मि. व इतर क्षेत्रासाठी रुपये ७०० प्रति घ.मि. खाच येती.
### ANNEXURE - 2 B

**जोडपत्र एक**
रोजगार हमी योजनेखालील सर्व प्रकारच्या कामांना लागू करण्यात आलेल्या मजूरीची दर अनुसूची १० एप्रिल २००२ पासून

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>अ.क्र.</th>
<th>बाब</th>
<th>युनिट</th>
<th>परिमंडळ (१)</th>
<th>परिमंडळ (२)</th>
<th>परिमंडळ (३)</th>
<th>परिमंडळ (४)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>जननार्थी उपयोजना / डोंगराळ क्षेत्र</td>
<td>रेतर</td>
<td>जननार्थी उपयोजना / डोंगराळ क्षेत्र</td>
<td>रेतर</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>१</td>
<td>२</td>
<td>३</td>
<td>४</td>
<td>५</td>
<td>६</td>
<td>७</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(अ)</td>
<td>जीमीनीकोण व मकन मुखित २५ टक्कूरात अंगीकरण मकन पूर्ण अशा विकाराणी खाद्य कार्य व कार्य काढणी माती निर्देश देयायल आले असतील त्यामागण १० मीटर अंतरापस्त व १ मीटर उंचीपासून नेऊन टक्कर / पसरविकों</td>
<td>घनमौट</td>
<td>२३.४६</td>
<td>२०.४०</td>
<td>२२.५४</td>
<td>१९.६०</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ब)</td>
<td>जीमीनीकोण व मकन मुखित २५ टक्कूरात नासत परंतु ५० टक्कूरात कमी मकन मुखित अशा विकाराणी खाद्य कार्य व कार्य काढणी माती निर्देश देयायल आले असतील त्यामागण १० मीटर अंतरापस्त व १ मीटर उंचीपासून नेऊन टक्कर / पसरविकों</td>
<td>घनमौट</td>
<td>२५.४०</td>
<td>२२.०९</td>
<td>२४.३९</td>
<td>२१.२९</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>