

PD-AAM-203

11 15374

UNCLASSIFIED
CLASSIFICATION

PROJECT EVALUATION SUMMARY (PES) - PART I

Report Symbol U-4...

1. PROJECT TITLE Gujarat Medium Irrigation (AID Loan No. 386-T-223)	2. PROJECT NUMBER 386-0464	3. MISSION/AID/W OFFICE India
	4. EVALUATION NUMBER (Enter the number maintained by the reporting unit e.g., Country or AID/W Administrative Code, Fiscal Year, Serial No. beginning with No. 1 each FY) <u>83-1</u>	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> REGULAR EVALUATION <input type="checkbox"/> SPECIAL EVALUATION		

5. KEY PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION DATES			6. ESTIMATED PROJECT FUNDING		7. PERIOD COVERED BY EVALUATION	
A. First PRO-AG or Equipment FY <u>78</u>	B. Final Obligation Expected FY <u>78</u>	C. Final Input Delivery FY <u>83</u>	A. Total	\$ <u>215,000,000</u>	From (month/yr.)	<u>8/78</u>
			B. U.S.	\$ <u>30,000,000</u>	To (month/yr.)	<u>9/82</u>
					Date of Evaluation Review	<u>11/82</u>

8. ACTION DECISIONS APPROVED BY MISSION OR AID/W OFFICE DIRECTOR

A. List decisions and/or unresolved issues; cite those items needing further study. (NOTE: Mission decisions which anticipate AID/W or regional office action should specify type of document, e.g., program, SPAR, PIO, which will present detailed request.)	B. NAME OF OFFICER RESPONSIBLE FOR ACTION	C. DATE ACTION TO BE COMPLETED
1. Attached is the Annual Implementation Review Report dated November 1982, highlighting the action taken by GOG on the recommendations made in the Annual Implementation Review Report dated November 1981, and the progress made by the project.		
2. GOG has taken action to remove all constraints to progress identified in the last Annual Implementation Review report. A disbursement of \$12.6 million has been made with another \$1.0 million of claims under process by GOI/GOG up to the period September 1982. Quarterly disbursement rates will rise to over \$2.0 million in FY 83.		
3. GOG is preparing a "Revised Realistic Implementation Schedule" for the remaining project activities and will submit the schedule to AID/World Bank for review in February 1983.	GOG	Feb. 1983
4. The Project Committee will review the revised Implementation Schedule and take decision in March 1983 to further extend the PACD.	D. R. Arora	March 1983

9. INVENTORY OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVISED PER ABOVE DECISIONS <u>NONE</u>			10. ALTERNATIVE DECISIONS ON FUTURE OF PROJECT	
<input type="checkbox"/> Project Paper	<input type="checkbox"/> Implementation Plan e.g., CPI Network	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify)	A.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Continue Project Without Change
<input type="checkbox"/> Financial Plan	<input type="checkbox"/> PIO/T	_____	B.	<input type="checkbox"/> Change Project Design and/or
<input type="checkbox"/> Logical Framework	<input type="checkbox"/> PIO/C	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify)		<input type="checkbox"/> Change Implementation Plan
<input type="checkbox"/> Project Agreement	<input type="checkbox"/> PIO/P	_____	C.	<input type="checkbox"/> Discontinue Project

11. PROJECT OFFICER AND HOST COUNTRY OR OTHER RANKING PARTICIPANTS AS APPROPRIATE (Names and Titles)		12. Mission/AID/W Office Director Approval	
D.R. Arora, Engineer, Irrigation & Water Resources D.R. Shankar Iyer, OSD, Gujarat Irrigation Dept. John R. Westley, Chief, Program Office		Signature <i>P. M. Boughton</i>	
		Typed Name Priscilla M. Boughton Director, USAID/India	
		Date January 13, 1983	

GUJARAT MEDIUM IRRIGATION PROJECT
(Loan 386-0464)

PES - PART II

ANNUAL IMPLEMENTATION REVIEW

November 1982

1. Schedule and Purpose

The annual implementation review was jointly conducted with the World Bank officials during November 22-28, 1982. Six subprojects (Deo, Panam, Hadaf, Watrak, Bhadar and Mazam] were visited and another five (Fatewadi, Sipu, Guhai, Dantiwada and Machhan-nala) reviewed in depth with the specific project officials during the visit. The progress data both in physical and financial terms for the remaining 17 sub-projects was collected from the GOG Irrigation Department's Project Planning and Monitoring Cell (PPM) and analyzed.

The purpose of the review was to assess the progress made against planned targets, follow-up on the action taken by the Government of Gujarat (GOG) on the recommendations made in AID's Annual Implementation Review for FY 81, identify constraints, if any, affecting project implementation and estimate the shortfall in accrued expenditures expected by the project assistance completion date (PACD).

2. Project Commitments

The Gujarat Medium Irrigation Project is a five-year irrigation sector support project, designated to provide financial support to 33 (now modified to 28) of Gujarat's identified new, ongoing and to be modernized Medium Irrigation Projects (MIP). A project loan agreement was executed between AID and GOI on August 26, 1978 to provide a financial support of \$30 million. In addition, the GOI entered into an agreement with World Bank to provide \$85 million for the same project. The project assistance completion date (PACD) under each of the agreements is June 30, 1983.

The project when completed (PACD - June 30, 1983) envisions the following achievements as outlined in the project paper:

- a. Implementing 13 new and 20 improved MIPs covering 149,000 ha. of irrigated land.
- b. Establishment of a network of automatic river gauging stations.
- c. Development of agricultural plans and establishment of demonstration plots within each MIP.

- d. Preparation of baseline socio-economic studies for each MIP.
- e. Establish a program to carry out water loss measurements in several of the MIPs.

3. Monitoring Responsibility

The project paper provides that the responsibility for monitoring and review of project implementation will rest with the World Bank. However, it was envisioned that AID would participate in some of the World Bank review missions. Near the mid-term of the project it became apparent that the implementation rate was seriously slow and construction quality needed to be improved. As such, AID began taking a more active role in project monitoring to persuade the GOG to remove identified constraints to project progress. This has resulted in creating an awareness amongst the field officers towards quality of construction, formulation of improved canal lining specifications and in accelerating project progress over the last two years.

4. Follow-up by GOG on Annual Implementation Review for FY 81

The recommendations of the Annual Implementation Review for FY 81 are annexed as Attachment A. These recommendations were transmitted to GOI and GOG on December 28, 1981. The results of action taken by the GOG on the five recommendations are summarized below:

1. There has been a significant improvement in the placement of field supervisory staff as a result of prompt action by the GOG. Attachment B depicts the status of field supervisory staff requirements recommended by the Appraisal Committee of the CWC for the 28 subprojects, positions sanctioned by GOG and the staff placement. Based on the GOG analysis of the staff requirements, they have sanctioned 1641 field staff positions compared to the requirement of 1427 estimated by CWC and have filled 1268 of those positions. This is double the strength (621) of the field supervisory staff in position in September of last year. Action is underway to fill the remaining field staff positions which will help in further accelerating the progress of implementation.
2. Due to the scattered nature of canal and distribution works, selection of contractors has been posing a problem in the past. Completion and near-completion status of headworks (dam) in most of the subprojects (see Attachment C) has relieved many contractors to take up construction of canal and distribution works. In addition, the spirited effort by the field officers has resulted in finalization of contracts for a majority of subprojects. It is anticipated that the construction momentum will continue to pick up as a result of this action though it still lags far behind schedule (Attachment C).

3. The GOG has issued instructions to all the field officers to implement upgraded canal and watercourse lining specifications. Lining works with upgraded specifications were inspected on the subprojects visited. However, in a couple of locations, lining works using old specifications were observed due to delays in the modification of contractual terms incorporating improved specifications. After discussions, the GOG has agreed to stop such works and modify the terms of effected contracts.
4. Training workshops for "Irrigation System Network Planning and Design" and "Concrete Mix Design and Compaction of Canal Embankments" were held. Seventy field officers attended Network Planning and Design workshops conducted during February and October 1982, and about 100 participants attended three workshops on Concrete Mix Design and Canal Embankment Compaction, held between February to July 1982. Conduct of these workshops has inculcated an awareness for improved construction quality and better planning which were evident during the inspection of the subprojects.
5. Due to lack of coordination between Agriculture and Irrigation Departments, implementation of agricultural development plans and other relevant activities of importance to improve production output from irrigated land has not progressed. The GOG has recently (October 1982) issued orders transferring area development works in irrigated commands to the Irrigation Department to facilitate the preparation of agricultural development plans and the establishment of demonstration plots.

5. Project Status

- a. Physical: The project has realized the following achievements against the commitments outlined in Section 2:
 1. All river gauging stations established.
 2. All socio-economic baseline studies completed.
 3. Program of carrying out water loss measurements in selected MIPs underway.
 4. Establishment of agricultural development plans and setting up of demonstration plots has lagged behind due to lack of coordination between the Departments of Agriculture and Irrigation. With the transfer of command area development activities from Department of Agriculture to Department of Irrigation, it may now be possible to set up demonstration plots in representative subprojects. However, GOG needs to take immediate action on this important aspect.

5. As regards construction of subprojects, it appears that 22 new and ongoing and six modernization subprojects (Attachment D) with an ultimate combined CCA of about 225,000 hectares will be implemented under the project.

Due to initial constraints of field supervisory staff and availability of funds, the project received a setback in realizing the targeted progress. Attachment C presents a picture of progress against the targets realized up to September 1981 (in brackets) and September 1982. The progress reflects an improving trend in the construction of headworks (dam) while the progress in the construction of canals and distribution system has not made such headway. This is attributed to inadequate staff and budget provisions during the initial stages of the project as explained above and concentration of construction activities at the headworks which are location specific and could be better supervised and controlled even with inadequate staff. Another reason for the slow progress of distribution network has been the delay in finalization of contracts. However, contracts for the majority of distribution networks have now been finalized and works initiated.

Recent devastation in early November due to a severe cyclone in the Saurashtra region has further impeded progress of ten sub-projects (Venu-II, Uben, Machhundri, Shetrunji, Bhadar, Und, Aji-II, Demi-II, Machhu-I and Sukhbhadar) located in this region. Construction activities in these projects won't commence until January 1983, thereby resulting in the loss of three months - a critical construction period. This will result in a delay of the targeted works and rescheduling of implementation program by GOG. Though the budget provisions and the staff are no more a constraint, it appears that the extension of the project by a year will be necessitated in the interest of realizing project construction targets and utilization of credit by GOG.

During the course of review and discussions, the GOG officials agreed to prepare a realistic implementation schedule and submit to World Bank/USAID for review and decision on the extension of the project period.

- b. Financial: Details in Attachment D present the status of total estimated cost of the 28 subprojects, expenditure incurred up to September 1982, expenditure eligible for reimbursement and the budget provisions available through June 1983 (PACD).

Ending September 1982, the project has incurred around 38 percent (Rs. 1802 million) of the total estimated cost (Rs. 4823 million) on the appraised subprojects. This low financial performance is expected to substantially improve during the current GOI financial year with the positioning of adequate staff and availability of funds. The eligible expenditure ending September 1982 (from July 1978

to September 1982) has been Rs. 1484 million, of which Rs. 810 million (51 percent) being eligible for reimbursement by World Bank and AID. This includes Rs. 83 million (\$8.5 million) spent on four subprojects (Mazam, Uben, Shetrunji and Machhu-I) for which GOG has yet to process reimbursement claims. (These subprojects have been appraised by CWC Appraisal Committee, the World Bank has yet to issue authorization for preferring claims.)

Analysis of the percent of project completion based on project costs (Attachment D, column 8) shows that seven approved subprojects have incurred expenditures over 50 percent. Another six subprojects have spent between 35-50 percent. Keeping in view the construction setback suffered by ten subprojects due to the cyclone, it is anticipated that only two subprojects (against six anticipated during last year's Annual Review) will be completed by the PACD and another five a year later.

- c. Disbursement: According to the disbursement schedule presented in the project paper, the project would have spent \$130 million equivalent on construction ending September 1983, of which AID would have disbursed \$26 million as its share. Against the above noted projection, the project has incurred an expenditure of Rs. 1484 million (\$149 million) which is in line with the projected schedule. However, due to certain expenditures such as stockpiling of construction material, advances made to the contractors, etc. which are not eligible for reimbursement unless utilized or adjusted, the eligible expenditures have been of the order of Rs. 810 million (\$95 million)^{1/} only, ending September 1982, thereby resulting in the shortfall of disbursement. Using the agreed to ratio of sharing expenditures (presented in the project paper), i.e. 46 percent by GOG/GOI, 40 percent by World Bank and 14 percent by AID a reimbursement of \$13.3 million qualifies for AID disbursement up to September 1982, against which \$12.6 million have actually been disbursed. Approximately another \$0.7 million will be disbursed covering eligible expenditures incurred ending September 1982. With the availability of adequate funds and positioning of field staff, it is envisioned that the disbursement rate will rise to near \$2.0 million per quarter in FY 83 and over \$2.0 million per quarter in FY 84. The quarterly rates of disbursement for FY 80, 81 and 82 were \$0.67, \$0.82 and \$1.30 million, respectively.

6. Financial Schedule

Attachment D shows that the expenditure incurred between July 1978 and March 1982 totals Rs. 1605 million (Column 4) on the approved subprojects. Budgetprovisions of Rs. 840 million (Column 11) during GOG financial year 1982-83 (April 1982-March 1983) reveal that funding is no more a constraint. The same is true for the field supervisory staff which now have an almost full strength.

^{1/} \$1.00 = Rs. 9.00

However, due to the setback in construction activities as a result of the cyclone, it is anticipated that the project may not be able to spend more than 70 percent of the budget, i.e. about Rs. 600 million during the current GOG/GOI financial year ending March 1983, and that the corresponding disbursement between October 1982-March 1983 may not exceed another \$6 million. This would mean an anticipated cumulative disbursement of \$19 to \$20 million ending March 1983. A budgeted provision of Rs. 250 million (Column 12) during the period April-June 1983 may add another \$2 million by PACD, leaving a shortfall of \$8 million by way of disbursement. As a result of the slow implementation rate in the early years of the project and the recent setback due to the cyclone, it will be necessary to extend the project period to June 1984 (one year) in order to meet the project objectives and to utilize the full credit of \$30 million, as was envisioned in the Annual Implementation Review of the project conducted during November 1981. A disbursement target of \$8 million in a year beyond the current PACD is realistic and achievable even at the present rate of expenditure.

It may be appropriate to take a decision to extend the project after the receipt of a Realistic Implementation Schedule from the GOG which is expected to be made available in February 1983. Realistic Implementation Schedule extending to a closing date of June 1984 may also help in further review of project performance.

7. Recommendations

- a. As agreed to during the Annual Implementation Review, the GOG should prepare a Realistic Implementation Schedule in two months' time and submit it to World Bank and USAID for further review in connection with extending the project closing date by a year, i.e. to June 1984.
- b. Necessary instructions need to be issued by the GOG Irrigation Department to all the field officers in charge of subprojects to adhere to improved canal lining specifications where these are not being adapted by modifying the terms of the contract.
- c. Agricultural development plans need to be developed and demonstration plots established in representative subprojects. This may now be possible with the transfer of CAD activities from the Agriculture to the Irrigation Department.

ARD:DRArora:tj
November 1982

RECOMMENDATIONS

ANNUAL IMPLEMENTATION REVIEW

November 1981

a. Government of Gujarat (GOG)

1. There is a significant shortfall in the placement of field supervisory (junior engineers and overseers) personnel. Vacant positions need to be urgently filled and additional positions sanctioned to match the requirement as projected by the Appraisal Committee. GOG must give high priority to staffing in order to utilize the available credit even if the PACD is extended for one year. Action is needed to assure that sufficient subdivisions are assigned to the distribution system to synchronize canal construction activities with the headworks. This would also enable utilization of stock piled materials from the preceding years and qualify their costs for reimbursement.
2. Selection of contractors for canals and distribution networks is lagging far behind schedule. Action by GOG is needed to reduce the selection and approval time and thus improve the implementation rate.
3. Implementation of the upgraded canal and watercourse lining specifications must be enforced by GOG in order to improve the construction quality.
4. Continue the training workshops for the field officers in "Irrigation System Network Planning and Design" and "Quality Control in Construction" until all the field staff have been trained.
5. Implementation of agricultural development plans and setting up of a demonstration plot in each of the MIPs has not made any headway. Since this aspect of the program is vital in order to optimize agricultural production, complete orchestration between Irrigation and Agriculture Departments is necessary. GOG urgently need to set up a coordination group to assure that the agricultural development plans are developed and demonstration plots established.

b. USAID

World Bank is a major donor and has the lead responsibility for monitoring the project. The World Bank is now taking a more active role in project monitoring and attempting to see that the identified constraints to project implementation and quality are removed. As such, AID should reduce its monitoring input and concentrate the limited available resources on its other projects. AID should only join the Bank personnel for their periodic reviews of the project.

GUJARAT MEDIUM IRRIGATION PROJECT
STATUS OF STAFF IN APPROVED PROJECTS
AS OF SEPTEMBER 30, 1982

No.	Subprojects	Recommended by Appraisal Committee			Staff Position Sanctioned by GOG			Actual in Position		
		D	SD	FS	D	SD	FS	D	SD	FS
	<u>Appraised</u>									
1.	Machhan-nala	1	5	25	1	6	47	1	6	47
2.	Panam	7	35	150	4	24	113	4	24	113
3.	Sukhi	9	27	166	9	44	179	9	44	169
4.	Ver-II	1	8	40	1	5	23	1	5	14
5.	Sukhbhadar	-	9	45	-	7	43	-	7	40
6.	Machhundri	-	9	40	-	6	31	-	6	24
7.	Kalubhar	-	8	36	-	7	43	-	7	40
8.	Deo	6	18	58	-	6	31	-	6	24
9.	Watrak	5	15	57	2	14	62	2	14	56
10.	Hadaf	-	8	40	2	10	43	2	10	43
11.	Venu-II	-	8	35	1	6	24	1	6	24
12.	Und	4	14	60	2	11	50	2	11	50
13.	Jhuj	-	7	30	1	6	27	1	4	13
14.	Kelia	-	6	30	1	6	27	1	5	15
15.	Demi-II	-	6	30	-	4	16	-	4	16
16.	Guhaf	-	6	30	2	9	46	2	9	46
17.	Dantiwada (M)	-	30	140	-	13	58	-	13	58
18.	Bhadar (M)	-	15	65	2	10	46	2	10	43
19.	Aji-II	-	5	25	-	5	26	-	5	26
20.	Bhadar (P)	2	6	30	2	13	70	2	13	62
21.	Fatewadi	-	16	80	-	8	38	-	8	38
22.	Sipu	1	4	20	4	19	92	4	19	92
23.	Aji-III	-	8	40	2	7	28	2	7	28
24.	Mazam	1	7	37	2	8	37	2	8	33
25.	Uben	-	11	45	-	4	22	-	4	19
26.	Shetrunji (PM)	2	11	50	2	10	46	2	10	36
27.	Mechhu-I	1	5	23	1	5	23	1	5	22
	Sub-Total	34	307	1427	44	285	1641	44	282	1268
	<u>Unappraised</u>									
28.	Kharicut	-	-	-	-	2	8	-	2	8

D - Division SD - Subdivision FS - Field Supervisory Staff
M - Modernization Subprojects

GUJARAT MEDIUM IRRIGATION PROJECT
SCHEDULE AND PROGRESS OF PHYSICAL WORKS
AS OF SEPTEMBER 30, 1982

(Percent)

No.	Subprojects	----- Engineering Design -----				----- Construction -----					
		----- Dam -----		----- Canal -----		----- Dam -----		----- Canal -----		----- Dist. System -----	
		Target	Achieved	Target	Achieved	Target	Ach.	Target	Ach.	Target	Ach.
1.	Machhan-nala	100 (100)	100 (100)	100 (100)	100 (72)	100 (82)	100 (82)	100 (72)	85 (50)	100 (-)	10 (-)
2.	Panam	100 (100)	100 (100)	100 (100)	100 (100)	100 (100)	100 (100)	100 (74)	94 (74)	100 (67)	83 (65)
3.	Sukhi	100 (100)	95 (92)	100 (90)	90 (62)	100 (75)	50 (41)	100 (65)	35 (6)	100 (-)	15 (-)
4.	Ver-II	100 (100)	100 (100)	100 (100)	92 (70)	100 (80)	75 (65)	100 (85)	40 (20)	100 (65)	30 (0)
5.	Sukhbhadar	100 (100)	100 (100)	100 (55)	100 (55)	100 (100)	50 (98)	100 (12)	80 (5)	100 (5)	12 (-)
6.	Machhundri	100 (100)	100 (100)	100 (100)	100 (60)	100 (100)	50 (40)	100 (58)	50 (20)	100 (52)	- (-)
7.	Kalubhar	100 (100)	90 (100)	100 (82)	100 (85)	100 (100)	55 (56)	100 (25)	95 (15)	100 (42)	20 (-)
8.	Deo	100 (100)	96 (95)	95 (52)	100 (35)	95 (61)	70 (30)	61 (23)	38 (6)	60 (-)	- (-)
9.	Watrak	100 (100)	100 (100)	100 (100)	90 (80)	95 (60)	70 (60)	100 (75)	45 (31)	86 (23)	- (-)
10.	Hadaf	100 (100)	100 (90)	100 (70)	100 (50)	100 (62)	60 (30)	82 (35)	30 (10)	82 (4)	- (-)

		----- Engineering Design -----				----- Construction -----					
		----- Dam -----		----- Canal -----		----- Dam -----		----- Canal -----		----- Dist. System -----	
		Target	Achieved	Target	Ach.	Target	Ach.	Target	Ach.	Target	Ach.
11.	Venu-II	100 (100)	100 (100)	100 (62)	70 (62)	100 (70)	67 (57)	65 (18)	- (-)	62 (20)	- (-)
12.	Und	100 (100)	100 (100)	85 (45)	75 (25)	100 (79)	29 (79)	65 (15)	- (0)	55 (6)	- (0)
13.	Jhuj	100 (100)	100 (65)	95 (32)	90 (-)	68 (28)	28 (21)	50 (12)	- (-)	40 (-)	- (-)
14.	Kelia	100 (100)	100 (80)	100 (76)	95 (-)	100 (64)	98 (79)	50 (23)	- (0)	62 (23)	- (0)
15.	Demi-II	100 (100)	100 (100)	100 (40)	50 (5)	100 (60)	70 (60)	75 (10)	- (-)	-	-
16.	Guha I	100 (100)	100 (100)	48 (18)	50 (20)	65 (20)	30 (15)	48 (10)	- (-)	35 (5)	- (-)
17.	Dantiwada (M)	100 (-)	100 (-)	100 (-)	100 (-)	92 (-)	63 (-)	65 (22)	40 (23)	43 (8)	16 (0)
18.	Aji-II	100 (100)	95 (90)	80 (10)	60 (10)	60 (10)	40 (25)	38 (-)	- (-)	20 (-)	- (-)
19.	Bhadar (P)	100 (95)	100 (90)	100 (58)	85 (75)	95 (67)	78 (57)	75 (38)	50 (28)	75 (-)	14 (-)
20.	Fatewadi (M)	- (-)	- (-)	100 (4)	100 (-)	- (-)	- (-)	45 (31)	24 (-)	8 (4)	- (-)
21.	Sipu	100 (70)	80 (50)	52 (35)	50 (-)	30 (20)	10 (-)	8 (5)	- (-)	- (-)	- (-)
22.	Aji-III	100 (100)	95 (80)	90 (60)	40 (15)	70 (58)	60 (50)	25 (50)	- (5)	25 (-)	- (-)

		----- Engineering Design -----				----- Construction-----					
		----- Dam -----		----- Canal -----		----- Dam -----		----- Canal -----		----- Dist. System-----	
		Target	Achieved	Target	Ach.	Target	Ach.	Target	Ach.	Target	Ach.
23.	Mazam	100 (100)	100 (100)	50 (58)	65 (5)	65 (55)	60 (30)	6 (4)	2 (-)	- (13)	- (-)
24.	Uben	100 (-)	100 (-)	55 (-)	50 (-)	100 (-)	100 (-)	2 (-)	- (-)	- (-)	- (-)
25.	Shetrunji (M)	- (-)	- (-)	- (-)	- (-)	- (-)	- (-)	- (-)	24 (-)	- (-)	- (-)
26.	Bhadar (M)	- (-)	- (-)	- (-)	- (-)	- (-)	- (-)	32 (22)	31 (23)	31 (4)	- (-)
27.	Machhu-I	- (-)	- (-)	100 (100)	100 (100)	-	-	- (5)	- (-)	- (5)	- (-)

Figures in brackets indicate progress as of September 30, 1981

(M) - Modernization subprojects

GUJARAT MEDIUM IRRIGATION PROJECT

ESTIMATED SUBPROJECT COSTS, EXPENDITURES, ELIGIBLE REIMBURSEMENTS AND BUDGET

AS OF SEPTEMBER 30, 1982

No.	Subprojects	Estimated Cost	GOG Expenditure					% Project Completion by Cost	% Eligible Expendit. To Cost in Co. (7)	Eligible Reimours. by Sept. 1982	(Million Rs.)	
			----- up to July 1978	July '78 to March '82	Apr. '82 to Sept. '82	Cum. up to Sept. '82	July '78 to Sept. '82				-----GOG Budget -----	Apr. '82 to Mar. '83
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
	<u>Appraised</u>											
1.	Machhan-nala	85.1	7.1	43.8	5.0	55.9	48.8	65.7	68.4	33.4	20.0	9.0
2.	Panam	430.5	162.7	182.1	16.6	361.4	198.7	83.9	69.7	138.5	29.5	8.2
3.	Sukhi	481.5	38.5	153.0	46.6	238.1	199.6	50.0	50.4	100.7	75.4	16.6
4.	Ver-II	96.4	4.0	42.5	6.0	52.5	48.5	54.5	62.9	30.5	13.4	10.8
5.	Sukhbhadar	139.7	8.1	32.4	1.5	42.1	33.9	30.1	59.3	20.1	10.1	7.2
6.	Machhundri	113.4	15.4	34.5	1.6	51.5	36.1	37.6	52.4	18.9	11.8	10.9
7.	Kalubhar	113.0	4.5	38.1	2.8	45.3	40.8	40.1	59.3	24.2	14.4	6.0
8.	Deo	189.3	1.8	86.9	18.5	107.2	105.4	56.6	49.0	51.7	42.6	15.0
9.	Watrak	262.5	52.4	54.5	5.9	112.8	60.4	43.5	37.2	22.5	50.0	7.2
10.	Hadaf	94.9	1.2	38.5	3.6	43.3	42.1	39.4	49.4	20.8	28.9	11.9
11.	Venu-II	136.9	1.2	44.3	1.4	46.9	45.7	33.4	47.7	21.8	29.6	7.5
12.	Und	289.0	1.8	64.0	5.6	71.5	69.7	24.8	34.9	24.3	30.7	18.4
13.	Jhuj	139.8	-	26.4	4.9	31.3	31.3	22.4	87.8	27.5	40.4	10.0
14.	Kelia	90.1	-	37.8	5.2	43.0	43.0	47.7	84.4	36.3	19.8	6.7
15.	Demi-II	74.2	-	20.2	2.3	22.5	22.5	29.9	40.9	9.1	16.1	5.3

No.	Subprojects	Estimated Cost	GOG Expenditure		Cum. up to Sept.'82	July'78 to Sept.'82	% Project Completion by Cost	% Eligible Expendit. To Cost in Co. (7)	Eligible Reimburs. by Sept. 1982	(Million Rs.)		
			up to July 1978	July'78 to March'82						Apr.'82 to Sept.'82	--- GOG Budget ---	Apr.'82 to Mar.'83
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
16.	Guhal	168.9	-	21.1	2.0	23.1	23.1	13.7	21.7	5.0	63.8	15.9
17.	Dantiwada (M)	255.6	1.4	49.0	5.6	56.0	54.6	21.9	65.2	35.6	35.3	9.1
18.	Bhadar (M)	117.0	0.3	15.1	3.9	19.3	19.0	16.3	62.6	11.9	20.0	5.2
19.	Aji-II	81.9	-	17.3	4.6	21.9	21.9	26.8	5.9	1.3	24.8	7.7
20.	Bhadar	177.2	7.1	80.5	9.7	97.3	90.2	67.7	72.0	64.9	38.9	7.6
21.	Fatewadl (M)	189.7	6.7	19.9	6.7	33.3	26.6	17.6	61.3	16.3	28.1	10.4
22.	Sipu	411.1	2.9	48.6	5.1	56.6	53.7	13.0	18.0	9.7	66.4	11.9
23.	Aji-III	228.4	-	39.7	4.6	44.3	44.3	19.4	4.1	1.8	38.7	9.3
24.	Mazam	131.1	-	39.3	14.8	54.1	54.1	41.2	62.1	33.6	41.8	7.9
25.	Uben	64.5	-	41.0	6.9	47.9	47.9	74.2	69.9	33.5	11.3	2.0
26.	Shetrunji (M)	192.2	0.4	17.0	2.9	20.3	19.9	10.6	80.4	16.0	28.5	9.7
27.	Machhu-I (M)	69.1	-	0.5	1.8	2.3	2.3	3.7	-	-	11.3	2.1
	<u>Sub-Total</u>	<u>4823.1</u>	<u>317.5</u>	<u>1605.5</u>	<u>196.1</u>	<u>1801.6</u>	<u>1484.1</u>		<u>51.0</u>	<u>809.9</u>	<u>841.7</u>	<u>249.5</u>
<u>Unappraised</u>												
28.	Kharicut (M)	66.9	0.5	17.2	0.3	17.5	17.0	26.1	84.7	14.4	10.3	4.7
	<u>Total</u>	<u>4890.0</u>	<u>318.0</u>	<u>1622.7</u>	<u>196.4</u>	<u>1819.1</u>	<u>1501.1</u>		<u>52.2</u>	<u>824.3</u>	<u>852.0</u>	<u>254.2</u>

(M) - Modernization subprojects