

Performance of the Public Distribution System in South India

T Jayan



सत्यमेव परमो धर्मः

IEG Working Paper No. 370

2016

Performance of the Public Distribution System in South India

T Jayan



सत्यमेव परमो धर्मः

IEG Working Paper No. 370

2016

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author is grateful to Jean Drèze, who made useful comments and suggestions on the research proposal of this paper, and to the households in Bangalore Rural district, for cooperating with field survey.

T Jayan is ICSSR Post Doctoral Fellow, Institute of Economic Growth, Delhi, India.
email: jayannagaroor@gmail.com

Performance of the Public Distribution System in South India

ABSTRACT

This paper examines the performance of Targeted Public Distribution System in the four Southern States of Andhra Pradesh, Karnataka, Tamil Nadu and Kerala in terms of off take of food grains, coverage and targeting. The relevance of PDS in South Indian States is lost among the poor and the vulnerable sections of the society due to the coverage of ineligible households and the decline of off take of food grains from FCI. By flouting the central norms with regard to identifying the eligible households and size of entitlement, the States crippled the PDS except in Kerala. Following the implementation of NFSA the PDS is improving in Karnataka in a big way.

INTRODUCTION

Public Distribution System in India continues to be a panacea for ensuring essential food grains at affordable prices to the poor and the vulnerable sections of the population who spend a bulk of consumption expenditure on purchasing food grains. The State Wise Hunger Index discloses the extreme fact that not a single State in the country is less than the hunger index of 9.9 and almost all States have serious to acute situation of hunger. The GHI was developed by the International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI) in 2006 as a means of capturing three interlinked dimensions of hunger inadequate consumption, child underweight, and child mortality.

Even the States of Punjab and Kerala have the hunger index of 13.63 and 17.63 respectively, implying extreme hunger situation. The situation in Madhya Pradesh is very pathetic. The hunger status of industrially better performing States of Tamil Nadu, Maharashtra, Karnataka and Gujarat measured by Hunger Index is worse than that of Assam, a poor industrially performing State. Similarly, the performance of UP, West Bengal and Rajasthan are better than that of Gujarat, Maharashtra and Karnataka. The hunger situation in most advanced industrial State of Gujarat is worse than that of Orissa, with highest incidence of poverty. This corroborates the fact that inclusive growth and target-oriented policies to ensure food security are urgently needed to wipe out hunger and poverty from the country as economic growth alone cannot do so.

Union Government introduced Targeted Public Distribution System in 1997 following the failure of universal PDS to serve the people below the poverty line and poorest of the poor households by dividing the entire population of the country into Below Poverty Line and Above Poverty Line classes. A sizeable quantity of food grains and kerosene are being allotted to APL cardholders at around half of the market price. The Prime Minister launched Antyodaya Anna Yojana (AAY) on December 25, 2000 to make the TPDS more focused and targeted towards the poor and vulnerable sections of the population. By this scheme, food grains at highly subsidized rate of rupees 2 per kg for wheat and rupees 3 per kg for rice are being distributed to 50 million households in the country. The State Govts. were required to identify the Antyodaya Anna Yojana beneficiaries. Food grains are being released to States and Union Territories for the distribution to AAY card holders. Antyodaya scheme is a milestone for eliminating hunger among the poorest 0.5 percent of the population in the country who goes without two square meals a day. Antyodaya Anna Yojana was launched in December 2000 for 10 million poorest of the BPL families to make targeted Public Distribution System more focused and towards the poor. Food grains are being distributed at a highly subsidized rate of rupees 2 per kg for wheat and rupees 3 per kg for rice, the distribution cost, margin to dealers and retailers, are being borne by the concerned States and Union Territories. With the additional inclusion of 5 million BPL families in 2003 headed by widows or terminally ill persons or disabled persons or persons aged 60 years or more with no assured means of

subsistence or societal support, the scheme covered (23 percent of the BPL population) 15 million families.

AAy scheme has been further expanded as announced in the Union Budget 2004-05 by including another 5 million BPL families. The following criteria were stipulated for the identification of beneficiaries living at the risk of hunger. Landless agriculture labourers, marginal farmers, rural artisans/craftsman such as potters, tanners, weavers, black-smiths, carpenter. slum-dwellers and persons earning their livelihood on daily basis in the informal sector like porters, coolies, rickshaw pullers, hand cart pullers, fruit and flower sellers, snake charmers, rag pickers, cobblers, destitutes and other similar categories irrespective of rural or urban base. Households headed by widows or terminally ill persons or disabled persons or persons aged 60 years or more or single women or single men with no family or societal support or assured means of subsistence. All primitive tribal households. Following this expansion the number of AAY families increased to 20 million (i.e. 30.36 percent of BPL families)

The scale of issue of food grains to the BPL families has been enhanced from 10kg to 35kg since the implementation of TDPS. First time, it was increased to 20 kg per family per month in April 2000 from the initial 10 kg per family per month. The monthly allocation to APL families remained unchanged at 10kg in July 2001. The monthly food grain allocation to BPL families was enhanced from 20 kg to 25 kg. The scale of monthly food grain allocation to AAY families was 25 kg during the introduction of the scheme. In order to enhance the household level food security and to liquidate surplus stocks of food grains in the central pool, the monthly food grain allocation per family was revised to 35kg in April 2002. However, the monthly allocation to APL families ranges from 10 kg to 35kg in various states based on the availability and stocks in the central pool.

PDS is operated under the joint responsibility of the Central and the State Governments. The Central Government, through Food Corporation of India (FCI), has the responsibility for procurement, storage, transportation and bulk allocation of food grains to the State Governments. The operational responsibility including allocation within the State, identification of eligible families, issue of ration cards and supervision of the functioning of Fair price Shops (FPS) rests with the State Governments.

COVERAGE AND TARGETING

The Public Distribution System is already working in South Indian States on the lines of National Food Security Act in terms of coverage, targeting and issue prices. Four kg of rice per unit at one rupee per kg is being distributed to BPL beneficiaries subject to maximum 20 kg per card and 35 kg to AAY cardholders in Andhra Pradesh. Telengana State also follows the distribution system of Andhra Pradesh in terms of allocation and issue prices. Karnataka

implemented National Food Security Act in 2013 and Tamil Nadu has been following universal public distribution system since June 2011 by which maximum 20 kg of food grains per household is being distributed free of cost. Thirty five kg of rice per household is entitled to AAY beneficiaries free of cost. In Kerala, the PDS entitlement ranges from 25 kg of rice at one rupee and 7 kg of wheat at two rupees per BPL beneficiaries. Antyodaya Anna Yojana beneficiaries get 35 kg of rice per household at one rupee per kg in a month. Around 90 percent of rural households in Andhra Pradesh had AAY/BPL ration cards in 2011-12 whereas it was 50 per cent among urban households in the state. More than 93 percent of rural households and 82 per cent of urban households were covered under free rice distribution scheme in Tamil Nadu in 2011-12. In Karnataka, 71 percent of rural households and around 30 percent of urban households had AAY/BPL ration cards in 2011-12. The corresponding figures in Kerala was 28.40 per cent and 19.00 per cent.

Table 1 Coverage and Targeting under PDS in South India

States	Sectors	Possession of BPL and AAY ration cards by Households in 2004-05 (percent)			Possession of BPL and AAY ration cards by Households in 2011-12 (percent)			Poverty Ratio Percent 2004-05	Poverty Ratio Percent 2011-12
		AAY	BPL	TOTAL	AAY	BPL	TOTAL		
Andhra Pradesh	Rural	2.8	53.7	56.5	3.6	84.8	88.4	32.3	12.7
	Urban	1.5	26.6	28.1	1.1	48.6	49.7	23.4	15.6
Karnataka	Rural	9.6	42.1	51.7	7.5	63.5	71.0	37.5	19.8
	Urban	2.0	14.4	16.4	1.8	28.8	30.6	25.9	25.1
Tamil Nadu	Rural	1.5	18.9	20.4	5.6	35.5	41.0	37.5	24.3
	Urban	0.9	19.8	20.7	2.2	21.4	23.6	19.7	20.3
Kerala	Rural	1.8	27.7	29.5	1.4	27.0	28.4	20.2	7.3
	Urban	0.6	12.8	13.4	1.4	17.6	19.0	18.4	15.3

Source: NSSO Data 2004-05 and 2011-12

Off take of Food grains by Poor

It is to examine the off take of food grains by officially below poverty line households and households with Antyodaya and BPL ration cards based on NSSO data in 2004-05 and 2011-12. The officially below poverty line rural poor with AAY/BPL ration cards in Andhra Pradesh obtained 17 kg of food grains in 2004-05 whereas it was 18.40 kg among urban households. On an average 21 kg of food grains from PDS reached the rural and urban poor in the States of Tamil Nadu and Karnataka during this period. The off take by poor in Kerala amounted 23.34kg in rural and 24.64 in urban areas seems to be better as compared to other South Indian States. The 2011-12 data shows that the off take by poor declined substantially in all southern States especially in Kerala where the decline was more than 10 kg among rural and urban sectors. Here the poor means the officially below poverty line expenditure classes

estimated by the Planning Commission. The entitlement off take ratio seems to be very large in 2011-12 as compared to 2004-05 among poor households in all southern States. Entitlement means the quantity of food grain entitled to each AAY/BPL household in accordance with central norms. The off take in these States ranged from 11 kg to 16 kg whereas the entitlement was 35 kg. The off take by beneficiaries with AAY/BPL cards also declined very steeply in all southern States except among rural households in Andhra Pradesh. It ranged from 10 kg to 15 kg in all other sectors. In Tamil Nadu and Kerala, the APL households obtained 8 kg and 5 kg of food grains per household respectively from PDS in 2011-12. In Karnataka and Andhra Pradesh the per household off take by APL beneficiaries was below half a kg

Table 2 Off take of PDS food grains by Poor

States	Household Type	2004-05Kg	2011-12Kg
Andhra Pradesh	Rural Poor	17.00	16.15
	Urban Poor	18.40	13.64
Karnataka	Rural Poor	21.92	16.50
	Urban Poor	21.11	13.26
Tamil Nadu	Rural Poor	20.96	13.27
	Urban Poor	20.99	10.66
Kerala	Rural Poor	23.34	13.78
	Urban Poor	24.64	11.59
Andhra Pradesh	Rural AAY / BPL HHS	15.72	12.83
	Urban AAY/BPL HHS	16.26	6.96
Karnataka	Rural AAY/BPL HHS	21.39	12.63
	Urban AAY/BPL HHS	20.98	5.05
Tamil Nadu	Rural AAY/BPL HHS	20.09	8.55
	Urban AAY/BPL HHS	18.71	4.27
Kerala	Rural AAY/BPL HHS	16.74	6.23
	Urban AAY/BPL HHS	16.98	4.07

Source: NSSO data 2004-05, 2009-10, 2011-12

Table 3 Offtake of PDS food grains by all households

States	2004-05		2009-10		2011-12	
	Rural	Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural	Urban
Andhra Pradesh	15.6 98	16.23 0	12.60 3	6.73 0	11.24	3.55
Karnataka	18.2 04	17.93 2	10.82 6	3.69 0	9.28	2.02
Tamil Nadu	15.8 68	15.7 5	8.42 9	6.26 6	6.06	4.82
Kerala	19.8 08	17.97 4	17.66 5	11.71 5	8.69	7.25

Source: NSSO data 2004-05, 2009-10, 2011-12

Distribution and Leakages of Food Grains

From the data it seems that the monthly BPL allocation of food grains from central pool was insufficient except in Kerala as compared to the norms by which food grains had to be distributed to the BPL beneficiaries whereas the AAY beneficiaries obtained the entitled quantity of 35 kg of food grains per month from FCI. The PDS is working purely on central allocation and the State 'contribution is very low. The monthly average off take from central pool was only 4.21 kg in Andhra Pradesh in 2011-12 for BPL beneficiaries in a month. The monthly average off take is obtained by dividing the off take of food grains for BPL beneficiaries by total number of BPL ration cards. As per the central guidelines the scale of issue under BPL and AAY had been revised to 35 kg per household with effect from April 2002. In the States of Karnataka and Tamil Nadu, the monthly average BPL off take was 7.80 kg and 5.90 kg respectively. The major share of the PDS food grains did not reach the actual beneficiaries due to bogus ration cards. The estimate on bogus cards was made by finding the difference between the actual number of cards issued by the concerned State and the number cards reported in NSSO data. Several studies estimated leakages in PDS based on FCI-NSSO data. The study by Dreze and Khera points that 22 per cent of PDS food grains did not reach the beneficiaries in 2011-12 in Andhra Pradesh due to leakages. It should be mentioned here that 23 percent of ration cards issued in this State was bogus during this period. The leakage was estimated based on the difference between the NSSO off take data and the monthly distribution data from FCI. The NSSO data does not capture the off take for the bogus ration cards from fair price shops. The extent of leakages due to bogus cards was close to total leakages in Tamil Nadu and Andhra Pradesh. Around 65 percent and 28 per cent leakages occurred in Karnataka and Kerala respectively due to bogus ration cards. In Andhra Pradesh, the ration cards outnumbered the total number of households. During 2011-12, the total number of households was 22.5 million whereas the number of ration cards was 24.6 million. In Tamil Nadu and Andhra Pradesh, 60 percent of AAY ration cards was bogus in 2011-12. Around 70 percent of BPL ration cards in Tamil Nadu was bogus. As compared to other States, least number of bogus ration cards are circulating in Kerala.

Table 4 Average household monthly off take from FCI (rice and wheat) Kg in 2011-12

States	Household Type	Average household monthly off take from FCI (rice and wheat) Kg
Andhra Pradesh	All Households	10.38
	BPL Households	4.21
	AAY Households	33.82
Karnataka	All Households	13.80
	BPL Households	7.80
	AAY Households	35.92
Tamil Nadu	All Households	15.78
	BPL Households	5.90
	AAY Households	34.42
Kerala	ALL Households	15.14
	BPL Households	23.22
	AAY Households	34.85

The relevance of PDS in South Indian States is lost among the poor and the vulnerable sections of the society due to the coverage of ineligible households and the decline of off take of food grains from FCI. The coverage under AAY/BPL rose substantially among rural households in Andhra Pradesh from 53.7 percent in 2004-05 to 92 percent in 2011-12 whereas the rural poverty based on monthly per capita consumption expenditure estimate of Planning Commission declined from 32.3 percent to 12.7 percent during this period. In Tamil Nadu and Karnataka also the AAY/BPL coverage increased drastically during this period from 20 percent to 41 percent and from 52 percent to 71 percent respectively among rural households. The rural poverty in Karnataka declined from 37.5 percent in 2004-05 to 19.8 percent in 2011-12. The corresponding figure in Tamil Nadu was 37.5 percent and 24.3 percent. Similar changes under AAY/BPL coverage happened in urban areas also. Only in Kerala, the coverage remained unchanged. However, the BPL off take from FCI declined substantially as given in the table in all States. The PDS food grains off take for BPL beneficiaries declined substantially by 20 percent from 2004-05 to 2011-12 in States of Andhra Pradesh, Karnataka and Kerala whereas the corresponding figure in Tamil Nadu was 25 percent. Again in 2014-15, the offtake declined by 37 percent and 40 percent respectively in Andhra Pradesh and Tamil Nadu. Following the implementation of NFSA in Karnataka, the off take improved slightly. Kerala state registered the same rate decline in offtake. However, the coverage of BPL beneficiaries rose substantially in AP and Karnataka by 40 percent and by 30 percent respectively. Therefore, the average BPL allocation was very low as compared to the norm. The distribution of food grains did not decline with the higher expenditure classes in States except in Kerala.

NATIONAL FOOD SECURITY ACT IN KARNATAKA

Government had notified the National Food Security Act, 2013 on 10th September, 2013 with the objective to provide for food and nutritional security in human life cycle approach, by ensuring access to adequate quantity of quality food at affordable prices to people to live a life with dignity. The Act provides for coverage of upto 75% of the rural population and upto 50% of the urban population for receiving subsidized food grains under Targeted Public Distribution System (TPDS), thus covering about two-thirds of the population. The eligible persons will be entitled to receive 5 Kgs of food grains per person per month at subsidized prices of Rs. 3/2/1 per Kg for rice/wheat/coarse grains. The existing Antyodaya Anna Yojana (AAY) households, which constitute the poorest of the poor, will continue to receive 35 kg of food grains.

IDENTIFICATION OF BPL HOUSEHOLDS

The estimation of poverty in the country is done by the Planning Commission on the basis of a large sample survey of Consumer Expenditure carried out by the National Sample Survey

Organization (NSSO). The Ministry of Rural Development, Government of India conducts the Below Poverty Line(BPL) Census with the objective of identifying the BPL households in the rural areas. It was only in the 8th Plan (1992-1997), for the first time, a detailed procedure was prescribed to identify the BPL families in the rural areas. The need for a systematic survey of BPL families was felt because of the feedback received through the concurrent evaluation of programmes such as Integrated Rural Development Programme (IRDP), which had shown that a significant part of the benefits of the programme had gone to ineligible categories. So it was decided to adopt a systematic approach for conducting the BPL survey. Detailed guidelines were issued making the annual income of the family as the primary criterion to decide the poverty status of the rural household. BPL Survey / Census for the 9th Plan (1997-2002) was conducted in 1997. In order to prevent a situation of ineligible households getting the benefits of the programmes, an exclusion criterion was also incorporated in the guidelines. The special feature of the guidelines of BPL Census 1997 was use of multiple criteria for classification of BPL families which included qualitative parameters like household occupation, housing condition, number of earners, asset position (land operated/owned) livestock and consumer durables used, etc. Household expenditure was made the criterion to classify the household as BPL. If the total expenditure of the household was higher than the poverty line, the household was to be excluded from the BPL List. The next BPL Census was conducted in 2002 using the methodology of score based ranking of rural households for which 13 socio-economic parameters were used based on the recommendation of an Expert Group constituted by the Ministry of Rural Development under the chairmanship of Late Dr. P.L. Sanjeeva Reddy. These are size of land holding, type of houses, clothing, food security, sanitation, ownership of consumer durables, literacy status, household labour force, means of livelihood, status of children, type of indebtedness, migration and preference of assistance. One of the important features of the guidelines issued for BPL census 2002 was to put the ceiling on the number of BPL households to be identified in conformity with the poverty estimates of Planning Commission. States were given the option of deciding the total number of BPL households equal to the Poverty Estimates of 1999-2000 or the Adjusted Share computed by the Planning Commission, whichever is higher. In addition, the States were also given the flexibility of adding another 10% to account for the transient poor.

SOCIO ECONOMIC CASTE CENSUS 2011

For conducting the BPL Census for the Eleventh Five Year Plan, the Ministry, on 12th August, 2008, constituted an Expert Group, under the chairmanship of Dr. N.C. Saxena, to advise it on the suitable methodology. The Expert Group submitted its report on 21st August 2009. The Expert Group recommended the methodology for identification of Below Poverty Line families, which includes criteria for automatic exclusion of a household from the BPL list, automatic inclusion in the BPL list and grading of the households on a scale of one to ten. The

Expert Group has also recommended the methodology for conducting the Census and appropriate appeal mechanisms. The Ministry then held consultations on the issue of finalization of methodology with organizations in the related field including Planning Commission, Registrar General of India, National Sample Survey Organization (NSSO), State Governments, experts and civil society organizations. It was suggested for pretesting the methodology with alternative options. Accordingly, MORD conducted during 2010, a Pilot Survey to field test alternative methodologies and to arrive at the optimum methodology for conducting forthcoming BPL Census. This Pilot was conducted in two stages. Thereafter, the Socio Economic and Caste Census was launched on 29th June 2011 in the country which is being carried out by the respective State/Union Territory Government with the financial and technical support of the Government of India. Socio Economic and Caste Census consist of Census in Rural areas and Urban areas in connection with identification of BPL households areas and Caste Census throughout the country. The SECC 2011 is based on self-declaration model of the respondents. The enumerator has to visit each household along with the Data Entry Operator (DEO) and get the details entered into the Tablet Personal Computer (TPC). However, where enumerators find that the response is prima facie incorrect, they have to record their observations separately in the space provided in the enumeration form. Only socio economic data is collected at the field level and no household is identified as BPL or non-BPL. The enumeration process will be followed by the supervision process.

EXCLUSION, INCLUSION AND DEPRIVATION CRITERIA UNDER SECC 2011

Exclusion criteria:

- (i) Households owning Motorized Two/Three/Four Wheelers/Fishing boats (which require registration);
- (ii) Households owning mechanized Three/Four wheeler agricultural equipments such as tractors, harvesters etc;
- (iii) Households having Kisan Credit Card with the credit limit of Rs.50,000 and above;
- (iv) Households with any member as Government Employee: gazette and non-gazette employees of Central Government, State government, Public Sector Undertakings, Government aided autonomous bodies and local bodies. This will exclude incentive and other honorarium based workers;
- (iv) Households with non-agricultural enterprises registered with the Government;
- (vi) Households with any member in the family earning more than Rs. 10,000 per month;
- (vii) Households paying income tax;
- (viii) Households paying professional tax;

- (ix) Households with three or more rooms with all rooms having pucca walls and pucca roof;
- (x) Households owning a Refrigerator;
- (xi) Households owning landline phone;
- (xii) Households owning 2.5 acres or more of irrigated land with at least one irrigation equipment such as diesel, Electric operated bore well or tube well;
- (xiii) Households owning 5 acres or more of irrigated land for two or more crop seasons;
- (xiv) Households owning 7.5 acres or more of land with at least one irrigation equipment such as diesel! electric operated borewell / tubewell;

Automatic inclusion criteria

- (i) Households without shelter;
- (ii) Destitute/living on alms;
- (iii) Manual scavengers;
- (iv) Primitive Tribal Groups;
- (v) Legally released bonded labourers;

Deprivation indicator criteria

- (i) Households with only one room with kucha walls and kucha roof;
- (ii) Households with no adult member between age 16 and 59;
- (iii) Female headed households with no adult male member between age 16 and 59;
- (iv) Household with disabled member and no able bodied adult member;
- (v) SC/ST households;
- (vi) Households with no literate adult above 25 years;
- (vii) Landless households deriving a major part of their income from manual casual labour. However, the Karnataka State used its own exclusion criteria for identifying the BPL households under National Food Security Act. They are:
 - (i) All families with member paying income tax
 - (ii) Government employees of all groups
 - (iii) Permanent employees of public sector Undertakings/Boards/Corporations
 - (iv) Employees of NGOs/boards
 - (iv) Permanent employees of cooperative societies

- (vi) Professional groups: Doctors, Hospital Employees, Advocates. Chartered Accountants
- (vii) All businessman except those selling goods on cycle or pushcart or on foot path and those selling only vegetables and those selling in petty shops
- (viii) Those in possession of 3 hectre dry land or wet land
- (ix) Families in possession of vehicles (two wheeler, three wheeler, car etc) exceeding 100cc and fuel driven (except those having a auto rickshaw, self driven and without any other source of income
- (x) Aided/unaided school and college employees except employees of unaided Kannada schools
- (xi) Registered contractors, APMC traders/commission agents/dealers in seeds and fertilizers and other dealers
- (xii) Those earning income by renting out house or shops or buildings
- (xiii) Families paying average monthly electricity bill of more than 450 rupees
- (xiv) Those working in multinational companies, firms or industries

Based on these criteria, 76.04 percent of rural households and 49.06 percent of urban households were covered for food grain distribution under National Food Security Act in Karnataka. The findings on the NFSA in Karnataka is based on a field survey among 250 households conducted in the three villages of Bangalore rural district.. The monthly off take from central pool rose by very slightly in Karnataka following the implementation of NFSA. The Karnataka State launched Anna Bhagya Yojana scheme from May 2015. By this scheme the food grains are being distributed to beneficiaries free of cost. The entire sample households belonged to Priority household category. The Socio Economic status of households in Bangalore rural district based on SECC data has been given in the tables. Around 88 percent of households in the district was landless whereas 46.57 percent of total rural households in the state was landless. Around 55 percent households had no member earning more than 5000 rupees a month. The corresponding figure for the state was 70 percent. The schedule consisted of questions with regard to monthly off take from fair price shops, issue prices and the quality of food grains obtained from PDS. The average monthly off take of food grains among the priority households was 23.65 kg. All sample households obtained food grains from PDS. Around 91 percent of households were satisfied with quality of food grains whereas 3 percent of households opined that it was of poor quality.

It provided substantial income benefit among the households. Each Priority household obtained on an average 834.91 rupees in a month from PDS. The off take by BPL households also rose substantially by cent percent as compared to 2011-12 off take under TPDS

Table 5 Socio Economic Characteristics of Rural Households in Karnataka and Bangalore Rural District

Characteristics	Karnataka State (percent)	Bangalore Rural District (percent)
Percentage Distribution by Social Group Scheduled Caste	18.06	18.65
Scheduled Tribe	8.28	2.86
Educational Status of Rural Households Illiterates	31.54	18.75
Literate, below primary	11.36	6.92
Primary	22.16	18.43
Middle level	11.93	18.52
Secondary	12.28	20.58
Higher Secondary	6.25	9.40
Graduation and above	3.61	6.29
Percentage of Households with monthly income of highest earning household member(Rs./ Per month) Less than 5000	69.98	54.08
Between 5000 and 10000	22.27	34.03
More than 10000	8.63	11.87
Percentage of Households owing land	53.43	12.04

Source: Socio Economic Caste Census Data, Ministry of Rural Development, Govt of India

Table 6 Off take of Food grains by Priority Households under NFSA in Bangalore Rural district

Foodgrains Kg	Month 1	Month 2	Month 3
Rice	24.71	17.22	15.78
Wheat	4.97	4.25	4.01
Total	29.68	21.47	19.79

Source: Primary survey

Table 7 Monthly Implicit Income Transfer to Priority Households under NFSA in Bangalore Rural District

Average Household Income Subsidy(Rs/month)				
	Month 1	Month 2	Month 3	Average
Rice	938.99	585.48	132.14	702.77
Wheat	149.10	119.00	128.32	132.14
Total	1088.09	704.48	712.18	834.92

Source: Primary survey

By flouting the central norms with regard to identifying the eligible households and size of entitlement the States crippled the PDS except in Kerala. Following the implementation of NFSA the PDS is improving in Karnataka in a big way.

REFERENCES

- Ahluwalia, Deepak (1995) Public Distribution of Food in India. Coverage, Targeting and Leakages". *Food Policy*, 18, No. 1, pp. 33–54.
- Bapna, S.L. (1990) "Food security through PDS: the Indian Experience". In: D.S. Tyagi and Vijay Shankar Vyas (eds.): Increasing Access to Food. The Asian Experience. Sage Publications, New Delhi, pp. 99–144
- Besely, T. and R. Kanbur, (1988) "Food Subsidies and Poverty Alleviation" *Economic Journal*, 98, pp.701–19
- Binswanger, Hans P. and Jaime B. Quizon (1988) Distributional Consequences of Alternative Food Policies in India. In: Per Pinstrup-Andersen (ed.) *Food Subsidies in Developing Countries. Costs, Benefits and Policy Options*. John Hopkins University Press, Baltimore and London, pp. 301–319
- Centre for Development Studies (1977) *Poverty, Unemployment and Development Policy: A Case Study of Selected Issues With Reference to Kerala*. Orient Longman, Madras
- Cornia, Giovanni Andrea and Frances Stewart (1993) Two errors of targeting. *Journal of International Development*, 5, No. 5, pp. 459–496
- Dantwala, M. L. (1993) Agricultural Policy: Prices and Public Distribution System: a Review. *Indian Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 48, No. 2
- Dev, S. Mahendra and M.H. Suryanarayana (1991) Is PDS Urban Biased and Pro-Rich: An Evaluation. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 26, No. 4, pp. 2357–2366
- Gulati, I.S and T.N. Krishnan, (1975) Public Distribution and Procurement of Food grains: A Proposal. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 10, 21, May 24, pp. 829–42
- Geetha, S. and M.H. Suryanarayana (1993) Revamping PDS: some issues and implication. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 28, No. 41, pp. 2207–2213
- George, P. S (1979) Public Distribution of Food Grains in Kerala: Income Distribution Implications and Effectiveness. *International Food Policy Research Institute*, Research Report No. 7, Washington D.C.
- Ghosh, Jayati, Abhijit Sen and C.P. Chandrasekhar (1996): Using Food Stocks Productively. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 31, No. 21, pp. 1235–1237
- Harris, Barbara (1983) Implementation of Food Distribution Policies. A Case Study in South India". *Food Policy*, May 1983, pp. 121–130
- Howes, S and S, Jha, (1992) Urban Bias in the Indian Public Distribution System. *Economic and Political Weekly*, May 9, pp. 1022–30

- Howes, Stephen and Shikhajha (1992) Urban Bias in Indian Public Distribution System . *Economic and Political Weekly*, 27, No. 19, pp. 1022-1030
- Jha, S., (1992) 'Consumer Subsidies in India is Targeting Effective?' *Development and Change* 23, 4, pp 101-128
- Jha, Shikha (1994) Food Grain Price and Distribution Policies in India: Performance, Problems and Prospects . Reprint No. 134-1994, Indira Gandhi Institute of Development Research, Bombay; forthcoming in *Asia-Pacific Development Journal*.
- Mooij, Jos, (1998): Real Targeting *The Case of Food Distribution in India*', Institute of Social Studies Working paper series no. 276
- Nolan, Peter (1993) The Causation and Prevention of Famines. A Critique of A.K. Sen *Journal of Peasant Studies*, 21, No. 1, pp. 1-28
- Pal, Suresh, D.K. Bhal and Mruthynjaya (1993) Government Interventions in Food grain markets. The Case of India . *Food Policy*, 18 pp. 414-427
- Parikh, K, (1994): 'Who Gets How Much from PDS How Effectively Does it Reach the Poor?' *Sarvekshana* January-March
- Patnaik, Utsa (1994): Food Availability and Famine A Longer View". *Journal of Peasant Studies*, 19, No. 1, pp. 1-25
- Radhakrishna, R. and K. Hanumantha Rao (1994) Food Security, Public Distribution and Price Policy. *Centre for Economic and Social Studies*, Working Paper 26, Hyderabad
- Suryanarayana, M.H. (1995a) PDS Reform and Scope for Commodity-Based Targeting . *Economic and Political Weekly*, 30, No. 13, pp. 687-695
- Suryanarayana, M.H. (1995b) Some Experiments with Food Stamps . *Economic and Political Weekly*, 30, No. 52, pp. A-151-A-159
- Swaminathan, Madhura (1995) Revamped Public Distribution System. A Field Report from Maharashtra . *Economic and Political Weekly*, 30, No. 36, pp. 2230
- Thopra, R.N. (1988) *Food Policy in India, A Survey*. Intellectual Publishing House, New Delhi.
- Tyagi, D.S. (1990) *Managing India's Food Economy. Problems and Alternatives*. Sage Publications, New Delhi etc.
- Venugopal, K.R. (1992) *Deliverance from Hunger. The Public Distribution System in India*. Sage Publications, New Delhi

RECENT WORKING PAPERS

Title	Name of Author(s)	Paper No.
Strategies for Safe Motherhood in Tamil Nadu: A Note	William Joe et. al.	E/357/2015
Performance of Targeted Public Distribution System in Kerala	T Jayan	E/358/2015
The Dynamics of Government Debt and Economic Growth	Vighneswara Swamy	E/359/2015
Government Debt and Economic Growth: Decomposing the Cause–Effect Relationship	Vighneswara Swamy	E/360/2015
Government Debt and Economic Growth: Estimating Debt Thresholds and Debt Intolerance	Vighneswara Swamy	E/361/2015
Government Debt and its Macroeconomic Determinants: An Empirical Investigation	Vighneswara Swamy	E/362/2015
Migration, Remittances, and Changing Patterns of Livelihood: Evidence from Western Odisha Villages	Arup Mitra Basanta K Pradhan	E/363/2015
Source of Livelihood and Inter-Temporal Mobility: Evidence from Western Odisha Villages	Arup Mitra Basanta K Pradhan	E/364/2016
Impact of ANC Check-ups on Institutional Deliveries in Delhi	Suresh Sharma Jyoti Saini	E/365/2016
Maternal and Child Healthcare: An Analysis of Out-of-pocket Expenditure under the Janani Shishu Suraksha Karyakaram	Suresh Sharma Manisha Bothra	E/366/2016
Utilisation and Impact of Referral Transport System on Institutional Deliveries in Delhi	Suresh Sharma Shruti Pandey	E/367/2016
Income Mobility among Social Groups in Indian Rural Households	Thiagu Ranganathan Amarnath Tripathi Ghanshyam Pandey	E/368/2016
How to Encourage Farmers to Adapt to Climate Change?	Amarnath Tripathi	E/369/2016



सत्यमेव परमो धर्मः

Institute of Economic Growth
University Enclave, University of Delhi
Delhi 110007, India
Tel: 27667101/288/424; Fax : 27667410
Website : www.iegindia.org