
Appendices

Appendix-1.1
(Reference to paragraph 1.6.1, page 5)

Department-wise break-up of outstanding Inspection Reports and Paragraphs

Department	Number of IRs/Paragraphs pending as of 30 September 2021	
	IRs	Paragraphs
Agriculture and Cooperation	447	2,384
Animal Husbandry, Dairy Development and fisheries	209	1,488
Backward Classes Welfare	23	305
Consumer Affairs, Food and Civil Supplies	22	160
Energy	27	130
Environment, Forest, Science and Technology	307	1,356
Finance	45	260
General Administration	14	159
Health, Medical and Family Welfare	81	1,487
Higher Education	121	1,676
Home	69	640
Industries and Commerce	225	1,319
Information Technology, Electronics and Communications	10	93
Infrastructure and Investment	4	27
Irrigation and Command Area Development	880	2,996
Labour, Employment, Training and Factories	109	905
Law	70	319
Minorities Welfare	12	166
Municipal Administration and Urban Development	139	2,474
Panchayat Raj and Rural Development	234	2,755
Planning	26	229
Public Enterprise	1	5
Revenue	29	585
Scheduled Castes Development	23	454
School Education	59	1,025
Transport, Roads and Buildings	255	935
Tribal Welfare	27	352
Women, Children, Disabled and Senior Citizens	108	744
Youth Advancement, Tourism and Culture	30	389
Total	3,606	25,817

Appendix-1.2

(Reference to paragraph 1.6.3, page 6)

Explanatory Notes to be received as of 30 September 2021

(a) Issues exclusively pertaining to the State of Telangana

Department	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	Total
Health, Medical and Family Welfare	2	1	2	2	7
Higher Education	1	2	-	1	4
Home	1	1	-	1	3
Panchayat Raj and Rural Development	-	-	1	1	2
Planning	-	-	1	-	1
Revenue	1	-	-	-	1
Women, Children, Disabled and Senior Citizens	1	-	-	-	1
Youth Advancement, Tourism and Culture	2	-	1	-	3
Total	8	4	5	5	22

(b) Issues common to both the States of Andhra Pradesh and Telangana

Department	2009-10 (Civil)	2010-11 (Civil)	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	Total
Environment, Forests, Science and Technology	-	-	-	1	1	2
Finance	1*	-	1	1	-	3
Health, Medical and Family Welfare	-	-	-	-	2	2
Home	-	-	1	1	1	3
Industries and Commerce	-	-	-	-	1	1
Irrigation and Command Area Development	-	-	1	2	1	4
Minorities Welfare	-	-	1	-	1	2
Panchayat Raj and Rural Development	-	-	1	1	-	2
Transport, Roads and Buildings	-	-	1	1	2	4
Tribal Welfare	-	1	1	-	1	3
Women, Children, Disabled & Senior Citizens	-	-	-	-	1	1
Youth Advancement, Tourism and Culture	-	-	-	-	1	1
Total	1	1	7	7	12	28

* in respect of Audit Report on Revenue Receipts

Appendix-1.3

(Reference to paragraph 1.6.4, page 6)

**Action Taken Notes on PAC Recommendations to be received from
Government of Telangana as of 30 September 2021****(a) Issues exclusively pertaining to the State of Telangana**

Department	I st Legislative Assembly (2014-18)	Total
Health, Medical and Family Welfare	1	1
Total		1

(b) Issues common to both the States of Andhra Pradesh and Telangana

Department	XI th Legislative Assembly (1999-2004)	XII th Legislative Assembly (2004-09)	XIII th Legislative Assembly (2009-14)	Total
Agriculture and Cooperation	-	1	-	1
Backward Classes Welfare	-	-	1	1
Health, Medical and Family Welfare	-	-	2	2
Panchayat Raj and Rural Development	3	-	-	3
Total	3	1	3	7

Appendix-2.1

(Reference to paragraph 2.1.1.3, page 13)

Statement showing the details of sampled works in GHMC

S. No.	Name of the Colony	General / In-situ	No. of houses	Project cost (₹ in lakh)	Expenditure as of January 2021 (₹ in lakh)
EE Division I					
1	ACS Nagar	In situ	48	372.00	71.26
2	Kamala Nagar	In situ	210	1,785.00	601.66
3	Kattamaisamma Silver Compound	In situ	176	1,364.00	942.36
4	T Anjaiah Nagar	In situ	55	340.00	156.17
5	Ziaguda	In situ	840	7,140.00	7,214.07
6	Pilligudesalu	In situ	324	2,491.20	2,073.70
8	Old Marredpally	In situ	536	4,154.00	2,555.66
9	Sai Charan Colony	In situ	108	934.00	839.79
7	Sriramnagar (Near Saibaba Tem)	General	756	6,539.40	5,998.29
10	Bogaram	General	1,080	9,342.00	3,475.49
11	Pratap Singaram	General	2,208	17,112.00	12,860.28
EE Division II					
1	Yerukala Nancharamma Basti	In situ	288	2,491.20	2,309.56
2	Ahmedguda	General	4,428	38,302.20	38,759.99
3	Bagh hayathnagar	General	252	2,179.80	880.89
4	Thimmaiguda	General	864	7,473.60	6,243.34
5	Muraharipally	General	2,484	21,486.60	18,518.14
6	Munugunur-II	General	2,700	23,355.00	0.00
EE Division III					
1	Ameenpur-II	General	1,836	13,898.24	13,882.86
2	Ameenpur-III	General	3,240	28,026.00	16,583.94
3	Bowrampet-II (Dundigal)	General	3,996	34,565.40	33,794.94
4	Edulanagulapally	General	1,944	16,815.60	15,232.29
5	D.Pochampally-II	General	216	1,868.40	1,855.34
EE Division IV					
1	Narsingi	General	216	1,868.40	1,595.47
2	Kardanur-II	General	540	4,671.00	3,829.08
3	Inzapur	General	1,260	10,899.00	1,876.38
4	Mankhal-II	General	2,016	17,438.40	17,461.13
EE Division V					
1	Kollur-I	General	2,052	15,373.34	16,563.87
2	Kollur-II	General	15,660	1,16,909.95	1,11,321.40
Total			50,333	4,09,195.73	3,37,497.35

Appendix-2.2

(Reference to paragraph 2.1.3.2(d), page 26)

Undue benefit to the contractors due to adoption of incorrect/higher rates

(₹ in crore)

S.No.	Gist of Observation	Money value
(i)	<p>Revision of rate for earthwork filling data on the basis of higher labour coefficient, resulting in undue benefit to the contractor</p> <p>The rate for the item of work ‘earthwork filling in foundations with useful excavated earth’ was approved with the labour coefficient of 0.31 in Standard data. However, the rate/data in four projects viz., Ahmedguda, Ameenpur-III, D.Pochampally-II, Edulanagulapally was revised with an irrelevant labour coefficient of 3.12, after finalisation of tenders. In Kollur-II project, the labour coefficient of 3.12 was adopted before finalisation of tenders. Due to this revision, the unit rate of ₹26.58 <i>per cum</i> was revised to higher rates varying from ₹280.52 to ₹334.86 <i>per cum</i>. Thus, pre-tender/post-tender changes made in the data/rate of the five projects entailed an undue benefit of ₹12.65 crore to the contractors.</p> <p>Department replied that rate was revised with labour co-efficient of 3.12 as per the latest amendment issued in SoR 2014-15. However, the Committee of Chief Engineers issued amendments to the Standard data (Buildings) (2011) and stated that the labour coefficient of 3.12 should be replaced with 0.31 in respect of this particular data for earth filling work. Revision of rates with adoption of higher labour-coefficient than the one provided in Standard Data resulted in undue benefit to the contractors. The Chairman, Board of Chief Engineers (BoCE) and the Special Chief Secretary, I&CAD have also been addressed in May 2021 and November 2021 respectively for clarification and the reply is awaited.</p>	12.65
(ii)	<p>Incorrect adoption of higher rate of hire charges for centering and scaffolding, resulting in undue benefit to the contractor</p> <p>As per the Bureau of Indian Standards¹ and the State Revised Standard Data (Buildings), the hire charges for centering works (form works) should be measured in square meters (<i>sq.m.</i>) of actual surface area in contact with the concrete. The rates for centering charges were prescribed in cubic meters in the Schedule of Rates (SoR) and mentioned that the surface area requiring centering per cubic meter would be 3.88 <i>sq.m.</i>. However, the fact of 3.88 <i>sq.m.</i> surface area involved in one cubic meter was ignored while adopting the centering charges in cubic meters. Consequently, the higher rates of ₹5,988.98 <i>per sq.m.</i> for raft footings and ₹555.27 to ₹843.82 <i>per sq.m.</i> isolated footings were allowed on hire charges for centering works in the four test checked projects viz., Ahmedguda, Kardhanur-II, Kollur-II and Narsingi, resulting in undue benefit of ₹6.11 crore².</p>	6.11

¹ BIS Standard IS:1200 Part V² Ahmedguda: ₹3.94 crore, Kardhanur-II: 0.12 crore, Kollur-II: ₹2 crore and Narsingi: ₹0.05 crore

	<p>Department replied that the hire charges for centering works prescribed in terms of cubic metres in SoR 2016-17 were adopted and there was no undue benefit. However, the Preamble of SoR (Buildings) indicate that the rates prescribed were ceiling rates purely for the guidance and the authorities preparing the estimates are responsible for proper rates and correctness/reasonableness of the rates as envisaged in the State Public Works Department Code³. The Chairman, (BoCE) and the Special Chief Secretary, I&CAD have also been addressed for clarification and the reply is awaited.</p>	
(iii)	<p><i>Adoption of incorrect centering charges, resulting in undue benefit to the contractors</i></p> <p>The rate for hire charges of centering work of RCC walls at Kollur-II site was prescribed as ₹964 per <i>sq.m</i> as per the SoR 2016-17 (Public Health). However, a higher rate of centring charges of ₹3,106 per <i>sq.m</i>. prescribed in SoR 2016-17 (Buildings & Electrical) was adopted for construction of 150 mm lift-well walls and 230 mm thick water tank walls resulting in undue benefit of ₹4.27 crore to the contractor.</p> <p>Department replied that the SoR 2016-17 (Public Health) rate of ₹964 per <i>sq.m</i>. cannot be generalised for all the engineering works and a rate of ₹3,106 per <i>sq.m</i>. prescribed in SoR 2016-17 (Buildings & Electrical) was adopted. The work involves construction of 230 mm thick overhead water tank walls for top floors and 150 mm thick lift-well retaining walls which are building items.</p> <p>However, the rate finalised in the tender for hire charges of centering works involved in this work was ₹964 per <i>sq.m</i>. was changed to ₹3,106 per <i>sq.m</i>. after finalisation of tender. The Board of Chief Engineers and the Special Chief Secretary, I&CAD have also been addressed for clarification and the reply is awaited.</p>	4.27
	Total	23.03

³ Para-45 and 113 of State PWD Code

Appendix-2.3

(Reference to paragraph 2.1.3.2(d), page 26)

Avoidable expenditure due to adoption of higher specifications and lack of uniformity

(₹ in crore)

S.No.	Gist of Observation	Money value
(i)	<p><i>Wall painting done with higher specification, resulting in avoidable expenditure and lack of uniformity</i></p> <p>Normal quality colour paint with two coats was provided for the external walls. However, a higher specification item of acrylic emulsion paint with two coats was provided in three projects viz., Ahmedguda, Bowrampet-II and Kollur-II projects. Further, in Kollur-II, the external walls were painted with texture paint of 2-3 mm thickness, in addition to the acrylic emulsion paint. Thus, there was an avoidable expenditure of ₹97.61 crore, for which about 1,235 houses⁴ could be constructed.</p> <p>Department replied the instructions were issued by the higher authorities to provide additional specifications to improve aesthetics, so as to reduce maintenance cost on the poor beneficiaries. However, the above additional improved features are not taken-up across all the projects, which shows lack of uniformity.</p>	97.61
(ii)	<p><i>Fixing windows of higher specifications, resulting in avoidable expenditure and lack of uniformity</i></p> <p>Steel glazed windows (openable on both sides) with unit rate of ₹2,149.66 per sq.m. were provided for the houses. However, the casement openable pre-painted steel windows were provided in the 11 test checked projects⁵ at higher rates, resulting in avoidable expenditure of ₹54.37 crore.</p> <p>Department replied that the instructions were issued by the higher authorities to provide better quality of windows to improve usability and aesthetics. However, the above better-quality windows are not taken-up across all the projects, which shows lack of uniformity.</p>	54.37
(iii)	<p><i>Non-consideration of 50 per cent of manufactured sand to natural river sand, resulting in avoidable expenditure</i></p> <p>State Government notified the Telangana State Sand Mining Rules, 2015, vide Clause-9(v), mandated the Government Departments to use at least 50 per cent of crushed stone/manufactured sand in the constructions, as alternative to natural sand so as to conserve riverbeds. State Government reiterated the above orders again in May 2018⁶ to conserve the sustainable eco-system. The Chief Engineer (Housing), GHMC had also issued instructions (July 2017) to maintain the register for the quality/quantity of</p>	15.34

⁴ ₹97.61 crore/₹7.90 lakh⁵ Ahmedguda, Ameenpur-II, Ameenpur-III, D. Pochampally, Edulanagulapally, Kollur-I, Kollur-II, Mankhal-II, Pilligudiselu, Thimmaigudem and Yerukala Nancharamma Basti⁶ G.O. Ms No. 37 of Industries and Commerce (Mines.1) Department dated 29 May 2018

	<p>sand consumed in the works. However, the mandated ratio of 50 <i>per cent</i> use of manufactured sand was not adhered to, resulting in avoidable expenditure of ₹15.34 crore in 10⁷ projects test checked.</p> <p>Department replied that the sand was being supplied at free of cost for these works and the lead charges of 165 km were only allowed in the estimates. The permission of the Chief Engineer (Housing), GHMC was obtained (July,2017) to use the manufacturing sand wherever, the natural (river) sand is not available so as to maintain the mandated 50 <i>per cent</i>.</p> <p>The use of natural sand and manufactured sand was done keeping in view of the short supply of natural sand and to prevent the stoppage of works and to avoid contractual obligations.</p> <p>However, the Department incurred avoidable expenditure of ₹15.34 crore towards transportation charges due to non-utilisation of manufacture sand.</p>	
(iv)	<p><i>Paving of stilt floor with higher specification, resulting in avoidable expenditure and lack of uniformity</i></p> <p>Cement flooring for the stilt floor was provided for the Kollur-II project. However, the paving of stilt floor was done with precast concrete blocks, resulting in avoidable expenditure of ₹2.81 crore. Audit also noticed in other test checked projects that the flooring was done with cement</p> <p>Department replied that the instructions were issued by higher officials to provide additional specifications to improve aesthetics, so as to reduce maintenance cost on the poor beneficiaries. These additional items and improved specifications got executed within the approved square foot rates, by pursuing the contractors. However, the above additional improved features are not taken-up across all the projects, which shows lack of uniformity.</p>	2.81
	Total	170.13

⁷ Sriram Nagar, Old Marredpally, Ameenpur-II, D. Pochampally-II, Edulanagulapally, Injapur, Ahmedguda, Kollur-II, Thimaiguda, Bagh Hayathnagar

Appendix-2.4

(Reference to paragraph 2.1.3.2(d), page 27)

Non-deduction of statutory recoveries and revenue on the cost of material excavated from the site and non-remittance of cost of excavated hard rock into Government Account

(₹ in crore)

S.No.	Gist of Observation	Money value
(i)	<p>Non-recovery of cost of excavated earth/hard rock provided to the contractor</p> <p>As per the State Standard Specifications⁸, the materials excavated and found suitable for back filling or other use shall be stacked separately. Further, as amended⁹ in the Telangana Minor Mineral Concession Rules-1966, the executing Department should prepare action plan for earmarking land for stacking of excavated material till its disposal. The recovery was proposed in Kollur-II project @ ₹194 per cum with (63 per cent)¹⁰ towards excavated hard rock. Though the recoveries were proposed in other works, no uniform rate was followed and the recoveries are yet to be proposed in the remaining projects. It was proposed @ ₹131.73 per cum (with 30 per cent excavation) in nine¹¹ projects. An amount of ₹0.41 crore (including 5 per cent GST) has to be recovered from the contractor's bills of 10 projects¹² towards use of excavated hard rock.</p> <p>Department replied that the excavated hard rock which is useful but not used on the work was recovered at a uniform rate of ₹194 per cum from subsequent intermediate stages wise payments by all the Housing Divisions. Recovery/remittance particulars yet to be furnished by the Department.</p>	0.41
(ii)	<p>Utilisation of amount recovered towards cost of excavated hard rock instead of crediting to Government account</p> <p>The Financial Code prescribes that the revenue realised by the Government Departments should be deposited to the Government account at the earliest. As noticed from the Workslip-9 and the final deviation statement of Kollur-II project, the revenue of ₹3.57 crore (excluding 5 per cent GST) accrued as the cost of excavated hard rock was utilised for the work. However, this amount was utilised in the work, instead of remitting the same to Government account.</p> <p>Department replied that the recovery amount of rock of ₹3.57 crore was used for statutory payment of GST @ 12 per cent on works contract, after deducting embedded tax component and VAT provision of 5 per cent. The Government was requested to accord revised administrative sanction and the revenue of ₹3.57 crore will be remitted to the Government account on receipt of the funds. The remittance particulars are awaited.</p>	3.57
Total		3.98

⁸ Standard Specification 308(2) of State Standard Specifications

⁹ G.O. Ms. No.6 Industries and Commerce (Mines-I) Dept. dated 8 February 2016

¹⁰ The balance 37 per cent quantity of rock utilised in the work

¹¹ Pratapsingaram, Bogaram, Sriram Nagar, Sai Charan Colony, T. Anjaiah Nagar, Pilligudiselu, Old Maredpally, ACS Nagar, Kamala Nagar,

¹² Pratapsingaram, Bogaram, Sriram Nagar, Sai Charan Colony, T. Anjaiah Nagar, Pilligudiselu, Ziaguda, Old Maredpally, ACS Nagar, Kamala Nagar

Appendix: 2.5
(reference to Paragraph 2.2.3.5, page 40)

Non-Correlation of Meter reading

Sl. No.	Name of the District	Invoice No.	Vehicle No.	Date of Transportation	No. of sheep units	Distance (in km)	Transportation Cost (in ₹)	Starting Meter Reading	Ending Meter Reading
1	Mahabubnagar	8	AP03TE0159	02.01.2018	6	1,126	63,844	68,683	69,809
	Mahabubnagar	7	AP03TE0159	19.01.2018	6	1,151	65,262	1,71,116	1,72,267
2	Mahabubnagar	181	AP03TE0159	07.06.2018	6	342	19,391	2,14,563	2,14,928
	Mahabubnagar	184	AP03TE0159	08.06.2018	7	302	19,977	28,476	28,822
	Mahabubnagar	255	AP03TE0159	18.06.2018	6	940	53,298	3,71,692	3,72,665
3	Mahabubnagar	15	AP22Y2943	07.01.2018	6	261	10,852	2,49,348	2,49,663
	Mahabubnagar	23	AP22Y2943	07.02.2018	6	321	13,347	2,47,182	2,47,580
4	Nalgonda	374	AP09X4005	24.11.2017	5	105	6,505	1,09,250	1,09,399
	Nalgonda	372	AP09X4005	25.11.2017	6	140	10,408	1,08,606	1,08,746
	Nalgonda	62	AP09X4005	04.08.2018	6	98	7,285	3,63,613	3,63,767
	Nalgonda	23	AP09X4005	06.08.2018	6	196	14,571	1,36,632	1,36,833
	Nalgonda	24	AP09X4005	08.08.2018	6	144	10,705	1,36,353	1,36,498
	Nalgonda	25	AP09X4005	10.08.2018	6	196	14,571	1,91,342	1,91,539
5	Nalgonda	21	AP09Y9988	21.09.2018	6	344	25,573	3,92,146	3,92,606
	Nalgonda	20	AP09Y9988	23.09.2018	6	385	28,621	3,72,041	3,72,431
	Nalgonda	19	AP09Y9988	27.09.2018	5	398	24,656	3,62,074	3,62,482
	Nalgonda	22	AP09Y9988	28.09.2018	6	353	26,242	3,82,018	3,82,394
6	Nalgonda	54	AP24TB1077	19.09.2018	5	438	27,134	2,69,010	2,69,470
	Nalgonda	53	AP24TB1077	21.09.2018	6	301	22,376	2,69,470	2,69,771
7	Nalgonda	11	AP24TB6306	28.09.2018	6	353	26,242	2,68,092	2,68,468
	Nalgonda	12	AP24TB6306	29.09.2018	6	320	23,789	2,58,097	2,58,417
8	Nalgonda	14	AP24TB6306	01.10.2018	6	373	27,729	2,58,706	2,59,079
	Nalgonda	94	AP24TB6306	02.10.2018	6	330	24,532	2,58,806	2,59,138
	Nalgonda	95	AP24TB6306	04.10.2018	6	330	24,532	3,50,628	3,50,968
	Nalgonda	93	AP24TB6306	05.10.2018	6	330	24,532	2,60,594	2,60,926
9	Nalgonda	4,891	AP24TB6726	17.12.2017	5	259	16,045	3,87,718	3,87,977
	Nalgonda	4,921	AP24TB6726	18.12.2017	6	126	9,367	3,87,061	3,87,187
	Nalgonda	3,393	AP24TB6726	11.09.2018	6	324	24,086	36,980	37,309
	Nalgonda	4,205	AP24TB6726	15.09.2018	6	395	29,364	32,709	33,149
	Nalgonda	4,274	AP24TB6726	01.10.2018	5	361	22,364	2,23,786	2,24,156
	Nalgonda	4,252	AP24TB6726	03.10.2018	6	389	28,918	4,38,155	4,38,544
10	Nalgonda	3,386	AP24TB7146	08.09.2018	5	275	17,036	74,586	74,905
	Nalgonda	3,388	AP24TB7146	09.09.2018	5	385	23,851	98,590	98,993
11	Nalgonda	4,237	AP24TB7677	25.09.2018	6	302	22,451	2,56,789	2,57,092
	Nalgonda	3,697	AP24TB7677	28.09.2018	6	269	19,997	2,56,300	2,56,603
12	Nalgonda	4,219	AP24TB9677	22.09.2018	6	374	27,803	9,23,302	9,23,704

	Nalgonda	4,240	AP24TB9677	25.09.2018	6	302	22,451	58,690	58,993
13	Nalgonda	3,395	AP24TC3971	11.09.2018	6	353	26,242	98,745	99,110
	Nalgonda	3,399	AP24TC3971	13.09.2018	6	456	33,899	45,950	46,431
	Nalgonda	4,210	AP24TC3971	18.09.2018	6	402	29,885	2,88,504	2,88,930
	Nalgonda	80	AP24TC3971	22.09.2018	6	443	32,933	4,90,053	4,90,508
	Nalgonda	4,258	AP24TC3971	30.09.2018	4	320	15,859	25,643	25,978
14	Nalgonda	524	TS06UA3006	17.02.2018	6	125	9,293	1,16,907	1,17,050
	Nalgonda	505	TS06UA3006	18.02.2018	6	112	8,326	11,770	11,897
15	Suryapet	1,808	AP02TB9522	20.02.2018	6	616	41,913	2,53,937	2,54,553
	Suryapet	1,819	AP02TB9522	22.02.2018	5	625	35,438	3,28,917	3,29,542
16	Suryapet	3,130	AP12W0763	03.08.2018	5	598	33,907	1,05,200	1,05,798
	Suryapet	3,288	AP12W0763	04.08.2018	6	373	25,379	1,60,430	1,60,803
					278		11,72,781		

Cost of 278 sheep units = ₹1.11 lakh X 278 units = ₹308.58 lakh

Subsidy on the above = ₹308.58 lakh X 75% = ₹231.44 lakh

Subsidy on transportation cost = ₹11.73 lakh X 75% = ₹8.80 lakh

Total subsidy in sheep cost and transportation = ₹240.24 lakh or ₹2.40 crore

Appendix-2.6
(reference to Paragraph 2.6, page 55)

Statement showing the details of Damages/Interest due, paid and balances to EPFO

S. No	Name of ULB/ DRDA	Damages/Interest levied (₹)	Damages/Interest paid (₹)	Balance (₹)
Municipal Corporations				
1.	Greater Warangal	1,45,96,383	1,45,96,383	--
2.	Khammam	25,17,461	--	25,17,461
Total		1,71,13,844	1,45,96,383	25,17,461
Municipalities				
1.	Pedda Amberpet	79,377	44,773	34,604
2.	Nirmal	1,17,43,437	1,17,43,437	--
3.	Nagarkurnool	43,86,873	43,86,873	--
4.	Adilabad	74,23,798	74,23,798	--
5.	Bellampally	17,44,218	17,44,218	--
6.	Dubbaka	5,64,390	5,64,390	--
7.	Kamareddy	3,84,544	3,84,544	--
8.	Siricilla	12,71,653	12,71,653	--
9.	Ieeja	17,09,528	--	17,09,528
10.	Narayanpet	35,30,897	--	35,30,897
Total		3,28,38,715	2,75,63,686	52,75,029
District Rural Development Agencies				
1.	Warangal (Urban)	59,21,763	59,21,763	--
2.	Nalgonda	22,45,904	22,45,904	--
Total		81,67,667	81,67,667	---
Grand Total		5,81,20,226 (5.81 crore)	5,03,27,736 (5.03 crore)	77,92,490 (0.78 crore)