Evaluation of achievements under NRHM

2276. DR. T.N. SEEMA: Will the Minister of HEALTH AND FAMILY WELFARE be pleased to state:

- (a) whether Government has conducted any evaluation of the achievements made under National Rural Health Mission (NRHM) vis-a-vis the general objectives and targets for improvement in health indicators fixed by the Mission;
 - (b) if so, the details thereof;
- (c) the names of States which performed better and the States which fared less than adequate and the details thereof; and
 - (d) the reasons for the non-achievement of the objectives in the backward States?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HEALTH AND FAMILY WELFARE (SHRI SUDIP BANDYOPADHYAY): (a) and (b) Yes. The concurrent evaluation of National Rural Health Mission was done by International Institute of Population Sciences (HPS), Mumbai. Progress vis-a-vis targets set for health indicators like Infant Mortality Rate (IMR), Maternal Mortality Ratio (MMR) and Total Fertility Rate (TFR) is also assessed through periodic surveys.

(c) and (d) The names of States which performed better than national average of decline in IMR, MMR & TFR and names of States which performed less than national average of decline in IMR, MMR & TFR are at Statement-I, II & III respectively.

The High Focus (i.e. backward) States like Uttar Pradesh, Bihar, Chhattisgarh and Rajasthan have shown better performance in reducing IMR, MMR and TFR is given in statement-I, II and III (See below). Orissa and Madhya Pradesh have also performed better in reducing the IMR and MMR.

Reasons for non achievement of goals and objectives by high focus states include low level of achievement at beginning, large proportions of vulnerable sections, difficult terrains lack of absorptive capacity and other determinants of health like literacy, women empowernment etc.

Statement-I
Status of Drop (in Points) in IMR from 2005 to 2009

SI. No. State		IMR SRS 2005	IMR SRS 2009	Drop in IMR
1	2	3	4	5
	State	s Above National Average	e of decline	
1	Orissa	75	6 5	10
2	Uttar Pradesh	73	63	10
3	Bihar	61	52	ģ
4	Chhattisgarh	63	54	9
5	Madhya Pradesh	76	67	9
6	Rajasthan	86	59	9
7	Haryana	δŐ	.51	9
8	Karnataka	5 0	41	9
9	Tamil Nadu	37	28	· Ģ
	State	s Below National Average	of decline	
10	Andhra Pradesh	57	49	8
11	Assam	68	୍ଟ୍ରୀ	7
12	Jharkhand	50	44	6
13	Gujarat	-54	48	· 6 ·
14	Punjab	44	38	6
15	Puducherry	28	22	6
16	Jammu & Kashmir	50	45	5
17	Arunachal Pradesh	37	32	.5
18	Goa	16.	n	.5
19	Maharashtra	36	31	5

1	2	3	4	5
20	West Bengal	38	33	5
21	O & N Haveli	42	37	.5
22	Himachal Pradesh	49	45	4
23	Daman & Diu	28	24	. 4
24	Kerala	14	12	2
25	Delhi	35	33	2
26	Uttarakhand	42	41	Ť
27	Tripura	31	-31	0
28	A & N Island	27.	27	0
29	Manipur	13	16	-3
30	Lakshadweep	22	25	-3
31	Sikkim	30	34	-4
32	Chandigarh	19	25	-6
33	Nagaland	18	26	-8
34	Meghalaya	49	59	-10
35	Mizoram	20	36	-16
	India	58	50	8

Statement-II

Status of Drop (in Points) in MMR from 2004-06 to 2007-09

SI. No	o. State	MMR SRS 2004-06	MMR SRS 2007-09	Drop in MMR
1	2	3	4	5
States	s Above National Average of decli	ne		
1	Assam	480	390	90
2	Uttar Pradesh	440	359	81

1	2	3	4	5
3	Uttarakhand	440	359	81
4	Rajasthan	388	318	70
5	Chhattisgarh	335	269	66
ó	Madhya Pradesh	335	260	66
7	Bihar	312	261	51
8	Jharkhand	312	261	51
9	Orissa	303	258	45
	States E	Below National Average	of decline	
10	Kamataka	.213.	17.8	35
11	Haryana	186	153	33
12	Maharashtra	130	104	26
13	Andhra Pradesh	154	134	20
14	Punjab	192	172	20
15	Kerala	95	81	14
16	Tamil Nadu	111	97	14
17	Gujarat	160	148	12
18	West Bengal	141	145	-4
19	Himachal Pradesh	NA.	NA	NA
20	Jammu & Kashmir	NA	₩.	NA
21	Arunachal Pradesh	NA	NA	NA
22	Manipur	NA.	NA	NA
23	Meghalaya	NÃ	ŊĂ	NA
24	Mizoram	MÃ	NA	NA
25	Nagaland	NA	NA	NA

1	2	3	4	5
26	Sikkim	NA.	NA	NA
27	Tripura	NA	NA	NA
28	Goa	NA	NA	NA
29	A & N Island	NA.	NA	NA
30	Chandigarh	ÄM	ŊĂ	NA
31	D & N Haveli	NÃ:	NA	NA
32	Daman & Diu	ŇĀ	ŇÁ	NA
33	Delhi	NA.	NA	NA
34	Lakshadweep	NA	MA	NA
35	Puducherry	NA.	NA	NA
	India	254	212	42

Status of Drop (in Points) in TFR from 2005 to 2009

SI. N	lo. State	TFR SRS 2005	TFR SRS 2009	Drop in TFR
1	2	3	4	5
	State	es Above National Average	e of decline	
1	Uttar Pradesh	4.2	3.7	0.5
2	Rajasthan	3.7	3,3	0.4
3	Bihar	4.3	3.9	0.4
4	Chhattisgarh	3.4	3	0.4
	States	at or Below National Avera	age of decline	
5	Himachal Pradesh	2.2	1.9	0.3
ò	Madhya Pradesh	3.6	3.3	0.3
7	Maharashtra	2.2	1.9	0.3

1	2	3	4	5
8	Jharkhand	3.5	3.2	0.3
9	Assam	2.9	2.6	0.3
10	Gujarat	2.8	2.5	0.3
11	Haryana	2.8	2,5	0.3
12	Orissa	2.6	2.4	0.2
13	Karnataka	2.2	2	0.2
14	Punjab	2.1	1.9	0.2
15	West Bengal	2.1	1.9	02
16	Delhi	2.1	1.9	0.2
17	Jammu & Kashmir	2.4	2.2	0.2
18	Andhra Pradesh	: 2 :	1,9	0.1
19	Kerala	1.7	1.7	0
20	Tamil Nadu	1.7	1.7	0
21	Uttarakhand	NA:	NA	NA
22	Arunachal Pradesh	ŇĀ	NA	NA
23	Manipur	NA.	NA	NA
24	Meghalaya	NA.	MA	NA
25	Mizoram	NA	NA	NA
26	Nagaland	NA	ïAÿ	NA
27	Sikkim	NA	M¥.	NA
28	Tripura	NA	NA	NA
29	Goa	ŊÄ,	ŊÄ	NA
30	A & N Island	NA:	NA	NA
31	Chandigarh	NA	NA	NA

1	2	3	4	5
32	D & N Haveli	NA.	ŊĄ	NA
33	Daman & Diu	NA	NA:	NA
34	Lakshadweep	NA	M	NA
35	Puducherry	NA:	NA	NA
	India	2.9	2.6	0.3

Sanctioning of new medical institutions

2277. SHRI RAM KRIPAL YADAV: Will the Minister of HEALTH AND FAMILY WELFARE be pleased to state:

- (a) the number of new Medical Institutions which have been sanctioned during the years 2009-10 and 2010-11 by the Medical Council of India (MCI);
- (b) the number of cases pending for sanction of medical institutions during current year, and their status;
- (c) the number of medical institutions which have been sanctioned during above three years, specially in Bihar;
- (d) whether Government has asked MCI to minimize the sanction procedure keeping in mind quality of the new medical institutions; and
 - (e) if so, the details thereof?

THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH AND FAMILY WELFARE (SHRI GHULAM NABIAZAD): (a) to (c) During the academic year 2009-10, 2010-11 and 2011-12 the Central Government/Medical Council of India (MCI) granted permission for establishment of 11, 14 & 21 new medical colleges respectively. One medical college namely Indira Gandhi Institute of Medical Sciences, Patna in Bihar has been permitted by the MCI during the last three years. For the academic session 2012-13, the last date for receiving proposal by MCI is 30.09.2011.

- (d) No.
- (e) Does not arise.

Functioning of health centres

2278. DR. GYAN PRAKASH PILANIA: Will the Minister of HEALTH AND FAMILY WELFARE be pleased to state: