

Chapter-Wise Annexures

Annexures to Chapter 1: Meghalaya: A Socio-Economic Profile and Projections

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

State	Age Groups (Years)			
	0-14	15-29	15-65	65+
Arunachal Pradesh	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	23.97	12.62	88.32	11.68
Ri-Bhoi	11.54	7.43	86.07	13.93
West Khasi Hills	5.47	2.19	90.85	9.15
Jaintia Hills	14.46	7.22	88.85	11.15
East Garo Hills	9.85	4.23	90.26	9.74
West Garo Hills	19.33	61.52	55.58	44.42
South Garo Hills	15.38	4.79	92.75	7.25

Source: Provisional Population Totals of Meghalaya, Census of India 2011

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 (%)
	2011	2011	2002	2007	2007-08	2001
Jaintia Hills	68.38	173	39.51	77.34	26,015	62.31
East Khasi Hills	75.51	122	46.74	34.51	31,202	74.13
Ri-Bhoi	72.39	77	49.94	60.63	19,866	66.11
West Khasi Hills	79.3	73	47.66	86.17	12,592	35.38
East Garo Hills	77.22	109	55.94	90.60	15,365	33.22
West Garo Hills	84.7	292	53.71	18.13	17,566	36.49
South Garo Hills	63.26	103	45.33	102.01	28,749	19.66
Meghalaya	75.48	132	48.90	52.28	22,352	44.93
India	74.04	382		34.61	31,29,717	

Sources: Meghalaya Human Development Report and State Development Report; infant mortality rates from the Birth and Mortality Survey, 2007; literacy rates and density of population (people per sq. km) from Census 2011, 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 and Statistics, Government of Meghalaya (Table 5.2.4 (3) from the SDR).

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

(1999-2000 to 2010-11 at constant 2004-05 prices)				
Year	Meghalaya		India	
	Per Capita NSDP (Rs)	Increase over Previous Year (%)	Per Capita NSDP (Rs)	Increase over Previous Year (%)
1999–2000	19,651		19,675	
2000–01	20,410	3.87	20,092	2.12
2001–02	21,243	4.08	20,943	4.23
2002–03	21,741	2.35	21,368	2.03
2003–04	22,803	4.89	22,857	6.97
2004–05	24,086	5.62	24,143	5.63
2005–06	25,642	6.46	26,015	7.75
2006–07	27,242	6.24	28,067	7.89
2007–08	27,764	1.92	30,332	8.07
2008–09	30,963	11.52	31,754	4.69
2009–10	32,569	5.19	33,843	6.58
2010–11	34,430	5.71	35,993	6.35

Source: Central Statistical Organisation, www.mospi.nic.in; Older series (1999–2000) data adjusted for change of base to 2004–5

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

	1999–2000	2004–05	2010–11
India			
Primary	25.00	19.03	14.51
Secondary	25.30	27.93	27.81
Tertiary	49.70	53.04	57.68
Meghalaya			
Primary	22.93	23.25	17.01
Secondary	23.31	26.14	31.42
Tertiary	53.76	50.61	51.57
NER			
Primary	32.35	25.71	22.25
Secondary	18.40	26.30	24.57
Tertiary	49.26	47.98	53.18

Source: Central Statistical Organisation, Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation, GoI. www.mospi.nic.in

Notes: Data for all NER states, except Mizoram is available for 2011–12 also.

[Caution: The Fifteenth Plan period has its first year overlapping with the last year of the Fourteenth Plan in the following three tables 1.A6, 1.A7, and 1.A8.]

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 Population 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 from the data sources listed under Table 3.

Table 1.A7: Meghalaya: Projected Trajectory of Growth
(At 2009–10 prices)

Plan Period	Years	Required GSDP CAGR (%)	Projected GSDP (Rs crore)	Derived Per Capita GSDP (End year)	Implied Per Capita GSDP Growth (%)
11 th	2010–11 to 2011–12	7.85	54,950	48,039	6.59
12 th	2012–13 to 2016–17	9.45	83,154	712,65	8.21
13 th	2017–18 to 2021–22	10.25	134,713	109,955	9.06
14 th	2022–23 to 2026–27	10.25	219,433	170,100	9.12
15 th	2026–27 to 2029–30	10.25	193,294	223,453	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

Annexures to Chapter 2: Participatory Planning and Inclusive Governance

Table 2.A1: Role of the Governor of the State in Respect of District and Regional Councils

Description of the Powers 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

Description of the Powers Entrusted to the Governor	Details of the Provision in the Sixth Schedule	
	Para	Brief Content
		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
Give prior assent to laws, rules and regulations of the District and Regional Councils	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: Agriculture and Rural Development

Table 3.A1: NER and India: Resource Endowments and Land Occupational Patterns in 2008–09

States	(Per cent)									
	Forest/land	Net area shown/ land	Net area sown/ total cropped area	Not available for cultivation/ Net area shown	Forests/ Net area shown	Permanent pastures & other gands/ land	Land under misc. trees & groves not included in net area sown/ net area sown	Culturable waste land/ net area shown	Fallow lands other than current fallows/ net area shown	Current fallows/ net area shown
Arunachal Pradesh	91.08	3.73	76.45	30.33	2442.65	0.34	17.54	30.81	33.18	18.96
Assam	23.61	35.07	69.10	95.39	67.31	2.04	7.12	2.80	2.14	4.58
Manipur	86.16	12.01	100.00	11.44	717.37	0.05	2.54	0.42	0.00	0.00
Meghalaya	42.57	12.75	84.27	79.58	333.80	0.00	56.34	138.38	55.28	20.77
Mizoram	75.58	4.50	100.00	140.00	1677.89	0.24	48.42	5.26	180.00	63.16
Nagaland	53.24	19.49	78.61	31.01	273.10	0.00	38.29	18.99	28.16	23.10
Sikkim	44.12	14.80	90.68	233.64	298.13	0.55	4.67	1.87	28.04	4.67
Tripura	57.77	26.69	94.92	47.86	216.43	0.00	9.64	0.36	0.36	0.36
North-East	26.65	18.45	74.56	83.09	144.40	0.81	13.97	14.11	13.48	8.50
India	22.78	46.24	72.46	30.65	49.26	3.38	2.41	9.03	7.30	10.29

Source: Statistical Year Book India, 2012, MOSPI, CSO, GoI

Note: Fallow land is permanent fallow land. Where 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

Districts	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 2004–05)

State	Year	Primary	Secondary	Tertiary
Meghalaya	2004–05	24.46	24.74	50.80
	2010–11	16.88	27.18	55.95
NER	2004–05	26.83	24.52	48.65
	2010–11	23.39	22.28	54.32
India	2004–05	19.03	27.93	53.05
	2010–11	14.51	27.81	57.68

Source: Central Statistical Organisation (CSO)

3.1: INDICES OF SPECIALISATION

3.1.1 Regional Specialisation 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 north-east as a percentage of the total net sown area for the north-east 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 = north-east) 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.

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:

$$DRSI_{NSA} = X_{ij}/X_j/X_{iM}/X_M$$

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:

$$DRSI_{PQ} = Q_{ij}/Q_j/Q_{iM}/Q_M$$

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.

DRSI for Agricultural Crops

Table 3.A5: 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 and 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 and 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.A6: 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 and 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 and 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

DRSI for Horticultural Products

Table 3.A7: 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.A8: 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

3.1.2 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= north-east 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.A9: 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.

3.1.3 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:

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

where C_{ij} is the per capita consumption expenditure in state i for the j th commodity and C_{ij} = 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.A10: 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.A10*, 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 of the country. Similarly, the entire NER has a higher than national average demand for meat, fish, eggs, 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.

3.1.4 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 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 classifications 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.A11* 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.A12a* and *3.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.A11: 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.A12a: Meghalaya and NE: 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.A12a 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.A12b: 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.

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.A13 provides a mapping between consumption and production at the district level.

Table 3.A13: 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.A14a: 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 and 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 and 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.A14a*) 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 Khasi 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.A14b: 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 and 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 and 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. For rice, only Ri-Bhoi and West Garo Hills; for maize only Ri-Bhoi; and for ginger only East Khasi Hills, West Khasi Hills, and Meghalaya as a whole show less than 100 scores. As in the first case, for the rest of the products in all the districts, dependency scores have been exorbitantly high.

Table 3.A14c: 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 and 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 and 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.A14c*), all the districts except for West Khasi Hills, Jaintia Hills, and NE as a whole show scores less than 100 for fruits. For rice only Ri-Bhoi, East Garo Hills, West Garo Hills, and South Garo Hills are not dependent; for maize only Ri-Bhoi, West Khasi Hills, and West Garo Hills; and for ginger only East Khasi Hills, West Khasi Hills, 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.

3.1.5 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.A15: 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.A15* show that Meghalaya has productivity advantages for the following products: 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 specialisation given by the RSI has some economic basis.

Annexures to Chapter 5: Tourism

Table 5.A1: Tourists in North-East India, 2010

(Number)

States	Tourists		
	Domestic	Foreign	Total
Arunachal Pradesh	227,857	3,395	231,252
Assam	4,050,924	15,157	4,066,081
Manipur	114,062	389	114,451
Meghalaya	652,756	4,177	656,933
Mizoram	57,292	731	58,023
Nagaland	21,094	1,132	22,226
Sikkim	700,011	20,757	720,768
Tripura	342,273	5,212	347,485

Source: NEDFi Databank. <http://db.nedfi.com/user>

Annexure 5.A2: 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 from the Ministries of DoNER, Tourism, Civil Aviation, and 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 including 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 north-east <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 30 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 the 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 TV spots ('Mesmerizing NE') have already been telecast on popular channels and have received appreciation. These spots, based on the theme of the north-east as a safe destination for investors as well as tourists, were given to an agency.</p> <p>MHA has also begun a campaign with emphasis on security aspects to allay apprehensions about travel restriction in consultation with MDoNER.</p> <p>The Ministry organised a successful conclave on 16 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 seminars. 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 of organising major commemorative events to which descendants 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.</p>	<p>Ministry of DoNER has written to the State Governments of Nagaland and 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>
4.	<p>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.</p>	<p>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.</p>
5.	<p>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.</p>	<p>NEC has finalised an agreement with the Infrastructure Leasing and Finance Services (IL&FS) which has been signed on 17 October 2007. ILFS has initiated steps for supporting budget hotels in the</p>

	Ministry of DoNER also to be associated.	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, and 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 by 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. It has been decided to modify and redraft the bid document. NEC is finalising the bid document for inviting fresh bids.
7.	NEC/Ministry of DoNER will organise promotional events at different locations in the country aimed at government servants for LTC visits to tourism destinations in the NE.	The Ministry initiated a COS Note for relaxation of LTC Rules for travel to the NE. DOPT has recently issued orders for allowing air travel to non-entitled officials and conversion of HTC to LTC for travel to the NE. A major event was organised in Vigyan Bhawan, New Delhi on 16 January 2008 for LTC holders inviting them to come to the NE. Government of India employees from Ministries and Organisations, 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 organised 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 business persons from the region.

9.	<p>The Union Minister of Tourism and Culture, Smt. Ambika Soni, announced the establishment of one Institute of Hotel Management (IHM) in each state of the NER that does not have such an institutions (Assam and Meghalaya already have one IHM each).</p>	<p>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.</p>
10.	<p>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.</p>	<p>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 NER in Aviation Hospitality and Tourism Management. The programme is to be imparted by Ashok Institute, a unit of ITDC, at Bangalore from 1 July 2008.</p>
11.	<p>Ministry of DoNER will follow up issue of relevant Notifications by the DIPP under the North East Industrial and Investment Promotion Policy (NEIIPP) 2007 within June 2007.</p>	<p>The necessary notifications have been issued by DIPP which includes the services sector.</p>
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. State governments to identify inter-state tourism circuits and share the details with the Ministries of Home Affairs, Tourism, DoNER, and the 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</p>	<p>Ministry of Tourism has sanctioned a Convention Centre at Hotel Brahmputra Ashok at Guwahati.</p>

	and with all required infrastructure with 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 organised the 'North East India Trade and Investment Opportunities Week' at Bangkok from 1-4 October 2007 with a session dedicated to Tourism.

Annexures to Chapter 6: Infrastructure

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

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 on 26 September 1999, or old series and as on 2 February 2006 for new series.

Table 6.A2: Meghalaya Districts: Electricity, Water Supply, and North-East 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 North-east 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 North-East 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 North-East 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 North-East 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 Hills	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 Hills	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 Hills	Govt	0.011	0.007	0.009	0.122
	Private	0.989	0.993	0.991	0.878
West Garo Hills	Govt	0.031	0.007	0.012	0.073
	Private	0.969	0.993	0.988	0.927
South Garo Hills	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	2010–11
Meghalaya	189 (98.94)	189 (98.94)	188 (98.93)	289.62
NER	983 (27.87)	1,035 (24.02)	1,115 (25.56)	2,530.82
India	87,595 (24.72)	97,884 (28.97)	1,12,684 (26.18)	1,26,994

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, 2011
(MW)

State	State	Private	Central	Total
Arunachal Pradesh	94.71	0.03	118.62	213.36
Assam	446.80	24.50	507.54	978.84
Manipur	50.86	0.00	106.94	157.80
Meghalaya	186.08	0.00	100.54	289.62
Mizoram	88.33	0.00	50.59	138.92
Nagaland	30.67	0.00	72.51	103.18
Sikkim	52.11	0.00	149.37	201.48
Tripura	169.36	0.00	95.71	265.07

Source: NEDFi Databank of NER databank <http://db.nedfi.com/user>

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 and 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
Uttranchal	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 1 April 2005

** Storage capacity of CWC and SWCs as on 1 April 2005***This information have been taken from the State Profiles prepared on the basis of the information obtained from various states in 1998–99

6.1 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 rupees one 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 north-east with railhead.

The 30 km rail line was declared a 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 Dudhnoi to Mendhipathar, and ultimately passing through the West Garo Hills, East Khasi Hills, and Jaintia Hills districts, the official said. The Ministry has taken up final location survey for this alignment. The ambitious project will start from Jogighopa in Assam.

Construction of railways in NER is costly due to the 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 the railway network in the NER is adopted through declaring the projects as National Projects where funds are provided additionally, over and above the normal Gross Budgetary Support for Railways.

The study commissioned by the North Eastern Council had suggested the following rail links for major development of NER. The details of these 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 the railway map.	The state government is unable to provide land due to stiff local resistance and has proposed an alternative route from Depa to Mendhipathar. Railways have been advised to carry out a final location survey for this alignment.

Major development/modernisation works planned/in progress at non-metro airports (as on 01 December 2006):

S.No.	Airport/State	Scheme	Estimated Cost (Rupees crore)	Present status
5	Shillong, Barapani	Construction of new terminal building complex for 150 passengers	30.00	Drawings have been finalised and estimated under preparation. Work likely to be taken up during 2006–07.

Annexures to Chapter 7: Trade and Regional Cooperation

Table 7.A1: 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.A2: 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

9.1 Externally Aided Projects

9.1.1 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 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 emphasised 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 marginalised groups
- Helping government service organisations and NGOs 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.

9.1.2 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 the 2009—10 pipeline. The total cost of the project in the first investment programme is USD 298.6 million and the target date for ADB approval for the Tranche 1 loan (USD 94.8 million) is February 2010.

A total length of 522.6 km of roads and bridges covering six north-east 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 (NH51) costing Rs 154.91 crore and expected to be completed by 2015.

9.1.3 The World Bank

In the north-eastern 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 of People and Institutions

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

State	HDI 1999–2000	HDI 2007–08	Rank 1999–2000	Rank 2007–08
Kerala	0.677	0.79	2	1
Delhi	0.783	0.75	1	2
Himachal Pradesh	0.581	0.652	4	3
Goa	0.595	0.617	3	4
Punjab	0.543	0.605	5	5
NE (excluding Assam)	0.473	0.573	9	6
Maharashtra	0.501	0.572	6	7
Tamil Nadu	0.48	0.57	8	8
Haryana	0.501	0.552	7	9
Jammu and Kashmir	0.465	0.529	11	10
Gujarat	0.466	0.527	10	11
Karnataka	0.432	0.519	12	12
West Bengal	0.422	0.492	13	13
Uttarakhand	0.339	0.49	16	14
Andhra Pradesh	0.368	0.473	15	15
Assam	0.336	0.444	17	16
Rajasthan	0.387	0.434	14	17
Uttar Pradesh	0.316	0.38	18	18
Jharkhand	0.268	0.376	23	19
Madhya Pradesh	0.285	0.375	20	20
Bihar	0.292	0.367	19	21
Orissa	0.275	0.362	22	22
Chhattisgarh	0.278	0.358	21	23
All India	0.387	0.467		

Source: Santosh Mehrotra's own computations, India Human Development Report 2011: Towards Social Inclusion by Santosh Mehrotra

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 Pradesh	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

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 (various years)**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			2011		
	Rural	Urban	Total	Rural	Urban	Total	Rural	Urban	Total	Rural	Urban	Total
West Garo Hills	21.69	61.25	25.91	34.34	78.29	39.32	46.09	85.17	50.78	65.06	92.58	68.38
East Garo Hills	33.05	47.41	33.51	46.99	68.79	48.38	57.97	82.15	61.57	72.71	91.84	75.51
South Garo Hills	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	62.66	77.10	63.67	70.41	91.52	72.39
West Khasi Hills	31.47	52.35	31.97	49.06	71.82	50.52	63.13	83.83	65.50	78.01	89.36	79.30
Ri-Bhoi	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	52.28	83.96	55.21	76.26	85.71	77.22
East Khasi Hills	31.95	65.25	43.73	46.36	83.68	60.04	63.72	88.65	74.74	78.64	91.55	84.70
Jaintia Hills	20.77	66.01	24.51	30.35	81.37	35.32	48.97	91.14	52.79	60.75	91.78	63.26
Meghalaya	27.45	64.12	34.08	41.05	81.74	49.10	57.00	87.12	63.31	71.15	91.33	75.48
All India	29.65	57.40	36.23	44.70	73.10	52.20	59.40	80.30	65.38	68.91	84.98	74.04

Source: Census of India, 1981, 1991, 2001, and 2011 (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			2011		
	Male	Female	Persons	Male	Female	Persons	Male	Female	Persons	Male	Female	Persons
West Garo Hills	32.04	19.55	25.91	46.93	31.32	39.32	57.51	44.51	51.03	73.38	63.34	68.38
East Garo Hills	39.01	27.66	33.51	54.7	41.7	48.38	67.39	55.74	61.7	79.56	71.32	75.51
South Garo Hills	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	62.6	48.61	55.82	76.77	67.72	72.39
West Khasi Hills	34.08	29.75	31.97	52.98	47.94	50.52	67.02	64.21	65.64	80.29	78.30	79.30
Ri-Bhoi	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	69.22	62.67	66.07	78.52	75.85	77.22
East Khasi Hills	46.96	40.3	43.73	62.86	57.04	60.04	78.12	75.82	76.98	85.26	84.15	84.70
Jaintia Hills	24.63	24.38	24.51	34.37	36.31	35.32	50.52	55.54	53	59.75	66.71	63.26
Meghalaya	37.89	30.08	34.08	53.12	44.88	49.1	66.14	60.41	63.31	77.17	73.78	75.48
All India	46.89	24.82	36.23	64.13	39.29	52.21	75.85	54.16	65.38	82.14	65.46	74.04

Source: Census of India, 1981, 1991, 2001, and 2011

Table 10.A6a: Schools with Drinking Water, 2008–09

(Per cent to total)

Districts	Primary only	Primary + UP	P+Sec/HSec	UP only	UP + Sec
East Khasi Hills	72.99	2.88	2.52	19.57	2.04
West Khasi Hills	64.66	7.35	7.75	13.60	6.64
Jaintia Hills	71.18	5.58	4.52	13.41	5.31
Ri-Bhoi	60.57	15.24	6.91	13.01	4.27
East Garo Hills	80.35	2.65	0.88	14.87	1.24
West Garo Hills	70.76	2.16	3.07	19.11	4.89
South Garo Hills	75.10	4.72	1.67	14.67	3.84

Source: DISE, 2008–09**Table 10.A6b: Schools with Blackboards, 2008–09**

(Per cent to total)

Districts	Primary only	Primary + UP	P+Sec/HSec	UP only	UP + Sec
East Khasi Hills	76.33	2.25	1.71	18.14	1.57
West Khasi Hills	68.36	7.28	5.86	13.86	4.64
Jaintia Hills	73.15	5.22	3.46	14.58	3.59
Ri-Bhoi	65.67	14.17	4.90	12.53	2.72
East Garo Hills	80.64	1.79	0.77	15.64	1.15
West Garo Hills	76.38	1.57	1.32	17.11	3.62
South Garo Hills	77.55	4.09	1.32	14.04	3.01

Source: DISE, 2008–09**Table 10.A7: Drop-out Rates — All Classes: Meghalaya and India**

State	Classes I–V			Classes I–VIII			Classes I–X		
	Boys	Girls	Total	Boys	Girls	Total	Boys	Girls	Total
Meghalaya	37.2	35.51	36.36	62.51	58.34	60.43	76.78	75.5	76.14
India	25.7	24.41	25.09	43.72	41.34	42.68	56.55	57.33	56.71

Source: Selected Educational Statistics 2007–08**Table 10.A8: Meghalaya: Trained Teachers 2006–07**

(Per cent to total)

Districts	Primary		Primary with Upper primary		Primary with Upper Primary Sec/Higher Sec		Upper Primary Only		Upper Primary with Sec/Higher Sec	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
East Garo Hills	70.27	85.33	0.54	1.33	0.54	0.00	28.11	13.33	0.54	0.00
East Khasi Hills	53.59	61.90	12.93	12.17	7.76	7.50	19.68	15.30	6.03	3.14
Jaintia Hills	58.32	70.70	8.22	7.51	3.21	4.32	25.85	15.12	4.41	2.35
Ri-Bhoi	60.61	57.80	12.63	16.06	5.05	4.13	20.20	19.27	1.52	2.75
South Garo Hills	81.87	89.86	0.00	1.45	0.52	0.00	17.62	8.70	0.00	0.00
West Garo Hills	61.85	69.71	0.29	0.68	0.07	0.34	36.90	29.10	0.88	0.17
West Khasi Hills	62.40	66.88	4.00	7.64	4.80	1.27	23.20	15.92	5.60	8.28

Source: DISE 2008–09

Table 10.A9: Use of Public Health Facilities in North-East States, 2005–06
(Per cent)

States	Percentage of 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					
Arunachal 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: Central Bureau of Health Intelligence

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

(Percentage of children aged 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
North	
Delhi	2.9
Haryana	11.2
Himachal Pradesh	9.1
Jammu and Kashmir	4.1
Punjab	11.9
Rajasthan	11.7
Uttaranchal	18.7
Central	
Chhattisgarh	19.4
Madhya Pradesh	16.9
Uttar Pradesh	19.8
East	
Bihar	19.2
Jharkhand	14.7
Orissa	22.6
West Bengal	23.3
North-East	
Arunachal Pradesh	9.6
Assam	8.9
Manipur	4.6
Meghalaya	7.6
Mizoram	6.2
Nagaland	4.5
Sikkim	13.2
Tripura	14.4
West	
Goa	14.5
Gujarat	27.3
Maharashtra	16.5
South	
Andhra Pradesh	9.0
Karnataka	19.9
Kerala	22.6
Tamil Nadu	15.2

Source: NFHS 3

Table 10.A13: Meghalaya: Anaemia among Adults

(Per cent)

	NFHS-3			NFHS-2
	Total	Urban	Rural	
Ever married women age 15–49 years who are anaemic	45.4	36.1	47.9	63.3
Pregnant women age 15–49 years who are anaemic	56.1	*	57.1	58.6
Ever-married men age 15–49 who are anaemic (%)	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 and Gynaecologists</i>	26
<i>Physicians</i>	25
<i>Paediatricians</i>	26

Source: RHS, 2008