

All-India Report on Evaluation of NREGA:

A Survey of Twenty Districts

**Prepared with  
Financial Support and Research Inputs  
from  
Programme Evaluation Organisation (PEO),  
Planning Commission**

By  
Institute of Applied Manpower Research  
Plot No. 25, Sector A-7, Narela  
Delhi – 110 040



## **PREFACE**

National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (NREGA) is the flagship programme of Government of India which is unique and first of its kind. The NREG Act guarantees every rural household up to 100 days of wage employment in a year within a period of 15 days of demand for such employment.

Among other things, such as creation of sustainable assets, rural infrastructure, etc. the scheme ensures better quality of life and enhanced income for rural households by providing 100 days of employment in a staggered manner which is intended to be utilized by the beneficiaries in a rational and judicious way to combat drought, distress migration and lean agricultural seasons, etc.

Assessment of the effectiveness of the scheme vis-à-vis achievement of its desired goals and objectives depends on (a) gauging the outcome of the scheme and (b) analyzing the extent of implementation of the guidelines enshrined in the NREG Act in letter and spirit.

The present study, All-India Report on Evaluation of NREGA, has focused on the above two dimensions of the scheme by capturing the impact of the scheme on quality of life of the households who are benefiting through wage employment, and collecting views and opinions of the beneficiaries on all stages of implementation - right from identification of beneficiaries to providing employment and payment of wages by the gram panchayats concerned.

The information on the above aspects was collected through primary data tapping six thousand beneficiaries spreading in twenty districts which were part of the first phase of implementation of the scheme. Compilation of data, Region-wise and All-India editing of the data, drawing of inferences and preparation of the All-India Report were done by the team consisting of Dr. M. R Prasad, Dr.(Mrs) Kamala Devi, and Mr. Vijay K Saxena. IAMR acknowledges the financial support and research inputs of PEO Division of Planning Commission, Government of India in completing the study. Suggestions are welcome from other research organizations and individuals interested in the similar kind of activity.

**(R. Sridharan)**  
**Director**

IAMR, Delhi  
December, 2008

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

IAMR with deep sense of gratitude puts on record the financial and research inputs rendered by PEO Division till completion of the project on “All-India Report on Evaluation of NREGA: A Survey of Twenty Districts“. Advice rendered by the Planning Commission Internal Committee (PCIC) constituted for this study, and their suggestions through two meetings were highly helpful in completion of the study.

Continuous support rendered by officials of PEO Division of Planning Commission is acknowledged.

IAMR would also like to place on record the initiative taken by **Mrs. S. Bhavani, Senior Adviser** (PEO / PC), and the relentless efforts of Mrs. Nandita Mishra, Director (PEO) in completing the project till its logical end.

(M. R. Prasad)  
Project Coordinator

## CONTENTS

<u>Title</u>	<u>Page No.</u>
Executive Summary	i
Introduction	1
Methodology	3
Section –I : Household Details	4
Section - II : Mechanism of Job Card Registration	5
Section – III: Issue of Job Card	8
Section – IV: Registration and Application for Work	10
Section – V: Impact on Wages, Income and Quality of Life	15
Section – VI: Impact on out-migration	19
Annexure – I: Methodological Note	23
Annexure – II: Tables	25
Annexure – III: Guidelines Issued to Field Staff	73

## **Executive Summary**

The National Rural Employment Guarantee Act, 2005 (NREGA) guarantees 100 days of wage employment in a financial year to any rural household whose adult members are willing to participate in unskilled manual work. The Act is an important step towards realization of the right to work and aims at arresting out-migration of rural households in search of employment simultaneously enhancing people's livelihood on a sustained basis, by developing the economic and social infrastructure in rural areas.

The present study on evaluation of the NREG Scheme is intended to assess the impact of this scheme on the overall quality of life of people by gauging different parameters associated with the improvement of overall quality of life of people such as impact on income – earning levels of each household, expenditure on food and non-food items, household and cultivable assets creation by the beneficiaries. This study also captured the impact of the scheme to arrest out-migration, views and feed-back of the beneficiaries on various facets of implementation of the scheme at grass root level right from the stage of issue of job cards etc.

With the above set of objectives, the study was carried out in 20 districts spread throughout India by targeting 300 beneficiaries from each district. These beneficiaries are hailing from the diverse geography and social background distributed evenly within the selected districts. The data pertains to the year 2006-07 during which period this scheme was launched in the first phase of 200 districts. By way of open-ended questionnaires, data on several variables were collected from these beneficiaries who are part of the NREGA Scheme. Overall impact of the scheme, views expressed by the beneficiaries etc. is elucidated in a nutshell in the following paras.

Female-headed household participation in the works is very encouraging ranging from 12 to 52 percent. Though the scheme envisages at least one-third of the total person-days to be earmarked for women participants, it is too early to judge on this point since the effective time duration of the scheme in these 20 districts is uneven and in some cases the scheme hardly taken off. Most beneficiaries got their job cards through Gram Sabha (GS) meetings and the rest by steps taken by Gram Panchayat (GP). Majority of the rural households agreed that there is a transparent mechanism followed for issue of job cards. Enrollment and registration under the scheme is an open-ended one, however, fifteen percent of the respondents opined otherwise who experienced several visits to GP office for registration purpose.

Verification of all the registrants is done by GS as expressed by majority of the HHs. Besides, review of applications earlier rejected by the GP were also taken up by GS in many districts. GS meetings took place on quarterly basis rather than on monthly basis according to HHs. Migrant families could not register for job card due to their absence.

Views of beneficiaries were also captured on the modalities followed to issue the job card by the officials. One-tenth of the people revealed that ten percent of the eligible adult members of the family are not included in the job card. The job card is in the possession of GP officials in most of the districts of eastern region and only during the season of works, the job cards are handed over to the beneficiaries for their signature/thumb impression. Majority of the HHs agreed that the job card was issued within couple of days of registration. Majority of households expressed that they got their job cards without waiting for much time and without unnecessary visits to GP office. Though affixing of photograph of the households is mandatory, it is not followed in many districts, and in some places the beneficiary paid for it. Job card was not designed to have sufficient space for all the entries in detail as was observed from many entries in the job cards.

Eighty percent of the HHs expressed that they did not get the work within the stipulated 15 days time of demand for work in writing, neither were they paid any unemployment allowance. Further enquiry with GP officials on this point revealed that they are struggling with teething problems of this kind of gigantic scheme and it takes some time to comply with such mandatory guidelines. As far as publicity of the scheme and dissemination of information related to the scheme, all locally available communication modes are utilized to spread the awareness and information about the scheme. On the utility of maximum number of days of works, only small fraction of HHs could utilize more than 35 days of work, remaining still lagging behind. The reason for non-utilisation of maximum permissible 100 days is late starting of the scheme. NREG Scheme stipulates at least one-third of the wage allocation i.e., person-days to women beneficiaries. It was found that only in 42 percent households, the women could share the 1/3<sup>rd</sup> of the allocated person-days (wage days). However, in 22 percent of the households, the women folk did utilize more than one-third of the utilized person-days in the household. In most of the work sites, excepting crèche all the other facilities like shed, drinking water are provided.

Payment for the wages earned is paid in cash either at the worksite or at GP office at a later date. Fourteen percent of the HHs did not agree that the names of workers, number of days, and the amount is read out at the worksite by the mate of the worksite as stipulated in the guidelines of the Act.

An enquiry is also made to assess the impact of the scheme on the overall quality of life of the beneficiaries. Due to the income generation through this scheme, the number of beneficiaries at the low earning level are reduced to nearly half in size resulting this on the rise of HHs with marginally higher income. It was found that more than half of the beneficiaries are agricultural and unskilled workers. There is also shift in the beneficiaries expenditure pattern on food and non-food items. The survey revealed that the number of families spending less on food has come down drastically where as there is a rise of families who are spending more on food and non-food items.

Only two percent of the HHs opened bank account among the surveyed beneficiaries. More than half of the HHs revealed that they purchased livestock like

sheep/goat etc. during the year. Four-fifths of the HHs do not have any outstanding loan. In the western region, nearly 60% of the HHs have an outstanding loan either from bank or local money lender. 3.3% of the beneficiaries bought a bicycle for the first time, 1.5% of the beneficiaries did buy electric fan, or other appliance, 3.2 % of the HHs purchased steel utensils etc. with the income generated from the scheme.

One of the significant objectives of the NREGA is to arrest out-migration of unskilled, landless labour force from the rural areas to urban areas by ensuring up to 100 days of wage employment within their native jurisdiction so that these 100 days guaranteed wage employment can be judiciously and rationally utilized by the landless peasants during lean and distress seasons. One-fourth of the families surveyed opined that there is migration from their respective village to towns/cities in search of job. Almost fifty percent of the HHs in western region expressed that migration is taking place from their villages. In the north eastern region, in the district of North Lakhimpur, everyone agreed that there is migration from their villages. There is migration taking places from districts such as South Garo Hills (Meghalaya), Medak (AP), and Dahod (Maharashtra) in addition to almost all the districts from the eastern region. In some of these districts, the out-migration is to the extent of 40%.

Contrary to the general perception of better wages upon migration, 70 percent of the beneficiaries revealed that the migration is only for just wages and not for any better wages. This implies that there is a distress migration for just minimum wages to eke out the livelihood and for survival rather than for better wages. Notable among the responses is that 82 and 67 percent of the HHs interviewed in the eastern and northern region respectively expressed that the out-migration is in search of work and meager wages rather than for better earnings which can be viewed as a distress migration. They preferred to stay in their native village if there is enough wage employment available locally.

It is disappointing to note that 38 percent of the HHs did not agree with the measures taken by GP to check out-migration. They expressed that the GP did not take any measures to create sustainable assets to generate wage employment within the village. Only 40 percent agreed that GP is taking appropriate steps to create wage employment. Rest of the beneficiaries did not give their opinion at all about the capacity of GP. Most notable fact is that the eastern region beneficiaries to the extent of 46 percent did not express any confidence in their respective village GP about their efforts of checking out-migration.

**All-India Report on Evaluation of NREGA:**  
**Survey of 20 Districts based on primary data collection**

**Introduction :**

The National Rural Employment Guarantee Act, 2005 (NREGA) guarantees 100 days of employment in a financial year to any rural household whose adult members are willing to do unskilled manual work. The Act has come into force with effect from February, 2006 in 200 districts initially and later on extended to all the rural districts of India from the financial year 2008-09.

The Act is an important step towards realization of the right to work. It is also expected to enhance people's livelihood on a sustained basis, by developing the economic and social infrastructure in rural areas. The choice of works seeks to address the causes of chronic poverty such as drought, deforestation and soil erosion. Effectively implemented, the employment guaranteed under the Act has the potential of transforming the geography of poverty.

NREGA is the most significant act in the history of Indian polity in many ways like grass-root level participation of every citizen and beneficiary through democratic process, multi-layered social audit and transparency mechanism by involvement of civil society, comprehensive planning at village level towards sustainable and equitable development etc. Important salient feature of the Act is to improve the quality of life of rural households who are vulnerable to out-migration in search of daily wage employment by channelising the wage workforce towards developmental activities at the village level itself.

The scheme was initially in progress in the first phase of 200 districts during its cognitive stage has generated lot of enthusiasm among social scientists, and NGOs and led them to initiate several surveys on their own. The surveys as in the cases of any other



scheme are centered around the end results such as targeting all the needy beneficiaries, and implementation of the Act in letter and spirit. The scheme is gigantic in nature and in the process of implementation and achieving the desired output, there are many issues which are straddling the implementing agencies right from District to Gram Panchayat.

The present study on evaluation of the NREG Scheme is intended to assess the overall scenario i.e., the pros and cons associated with the scheme itself, the operational bottlenecks, the efficacy of social audit, and at last to assess the impact of the scheme on the targeted beneficiaries. Exactly with the above purpose, Institute of Applied Manpower Research (IAMR), has conducted survey in 20 districts of these 200 districts spreading throughout the country.

The National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme, besides, the main features mentioned in the above background note, also involves participatory planning and implementation of the scheme through (i) proactive role of Gram Sabha, (ii) rigorous & continuous monitoring by way of social audit, and (iii) involvement of ordinary people at the grass-roots level. It addresses (i) chronic poverty, (ii) drought, (iii) deforestation, (iv) soil erosion etc. It also aims at (i) generating productive assets, (ii) protecting the environment, (iii) empowering rural women, (iv) arresting rural-urban migration.

The scheme is implemented through collaborative partnership right from Grama Sabha to Central Government Community participation by way of (i) Grama Sabha, (ii) local vigilance & monitoring committees, and (iii) Self Help Groups (SHGs), and ensures active role by Civil Society Organisations. At official level, the scheme was embedded with inbuilt monitoring & evaluation mechanism at every layer of implementation including online monitoring through Monitoring and Information System (MIS).

The scheme is implicitly strengthened by mandatory and active participation of local community, and complete transparency in all operations and record keeping. Nevertheless, due to massive funding, extensive coverage of beneficiaries, there is a

necessity to identify and assess the ground realities, channelising labour-intensive activities into sustainable assets at village level, besides, studying the impact of the scheme on migration, quality of life etc.

Since the scheme is going to be in place for an undefined period of time, and is being enlarged in terms of scope and geographical coverage, there are many challenges like non-homogeneity in its effectiveness, region specific disparities and outcomes etc. It is exactly due to this reason, few NGOs have already done some surveys. However, they are very much confined to one or two districts, and more importantly centered around systemic defects, rather than probing the impact on beneficiaries.

Against this background, there is a necessity to carry out an empirical study with two pronged strategy i.e., (i) All India study by capturing signals from all corners of the country, taking into account all the regions, and (ii) comprehensive coverage of all the objectives and clauses enshrined in the NREG Act in a broad manner.

### **Methodology:**

Twenty districts from the first lot of 200 districts were selected for studying the beneficiary level impact and responses. These 20 districts are spreading throughout the country covering 16 states from all the regions. Selection of these districts is done by using the secondary data of districts for the year 2006-07 placed in the NREG website. State averages were calculated based on man-days and job cards issued. Two districts, one above and one below the state average were selected from each state in all the regions except western region where the district data was not available. Wherever the data is available, two districts from each state were selected and more weightage in selection of districts is given to eastern region by selecting 7 districts where there is severe out-migration from this region. List of districts selected for the study is given at Annexure – I.

From each district two blocks were selected in consultation with the district officials concerned and from each block, three gram panchayats were selected for canvassing the schedules. In every GP, 50 beneficiaries were selected on random selection basis from the list of job card holders/beneficiaries available with the GP office. Thus in every district 300 beneficiaries were targeted covering 6000 beneficiaries spreading throughout the country.

The all-India survey report presents the response received from the beneficiaries of the scheme pertaining to the period 2006-07. The information collected is grouped into the following sections such as

1. Household details
2. Mechanism of job card registration
3. Issue of job card
4. Registration & application for job (work)
5. Impact on Wages, Income and Quality of Life
6. Impact on out-migration

Following sections analyses the responses received from the beneficiaries on various issues ranging from their social background to impact of the scheme on quality of life, out-migration etc. The data collected from all the 20 districts is presented in the tabular form. Compilation of all the district and region wise tables are enclosed at Annexure – II.

### **Section – I: Household Details:**

This section deals with household details such as their social background, size of eligible adult members in each household, beneficiaries of other employment related schemes etc. Out of the 6000 job card holders covered in 20 districts, Table 1.1 gives the break up of different social groups such as SC, ST, OBC, General category beneficiaries. Out of the 1200 beneficiaries in four districts of northern region, one-fourth of them are

the female headed households. Female participation at 52% is higher than male counterparts in all the three districts of southern region. Of all the regions, female participation in NREG Scheme is lower at 17.5% in eastern region. Beneficiaries hailing from ST are significant in numbers in the eastern, and north east regions.

Table 1.2 gives the size of the households in terms of number of eligible workers registered under NREGA. 73% of the households (HHs) are having up to three wage earners in a single job card. Nearly 23% of the HHs have enrolled up to six family members as potential wage workers.

Table 1.3 shows the distribution of respondents who are beneficiaries of any schemes other than NREGA. These schemes are related to self-employment, or entrepreneurial /skill upgradation etc. 86% of the HHs expressed that they did not benefit with any such schemes. HHs from southern and eastern region have been benefiting from other such schemes which promote self-employment, skill development etc. From the available secondary data sources at district level, the share of BPL HHs who obtained job cards varies from 26 to 81 percentage among the surveyed 20 districts.

## **Section - II : Mechanism of Job Card Registration:**

This section captures the views of HHs pertaining to the procedures followed by GP in conducting the registration of willing HHs and the efficacy and mechanism of registration process such as survey of HHs, inviting applications, registration for job cards and verification of the same in a transparent manner.

Table 2.1 shows the response of HHs regarding the method of obtaining job card such as (i) approved by Gram Sabha (GS), (ii) oral request, (iii) applied on plain paper, (iv) door to door survey (v) any other method. One-fourth of the HHs got their job cards through GS. Nearly half of the HHs have applied for job card through a plain paper. One-fifth of the beneficiaries got their cards through door-to-door survey conducted by GP. Only seven percent of the surveyed people got the job card by oral request.

Table 2.2 reveals the opinion of respondents regarding approval of all applications prior to registrations by GS. The guidelines dictate that all the eligible HHs who were registered for issue of job card have to be approved by convening of GS meeting and by reading the names of those families in the open meetings of GS.

Eighty five percent of respondents accepted that the names of registered persons were read out in the GS meeting. Remaining fifteen percent respondents expressed that all the registered persons were not read out in the meeting.

The NREGA guidelines also dictate that the registration process has to be an open-ended process to facilitate registration of eligible HHs throughout the year. However, Table 2.3 shows that fifteen percent of the beneficiaries did not experience the same. Very negligible number of people in eastern region revealed that they got the job card by intervention of elected ward members/public servants etc. Collective opinion of individual beneficiaries revealed that the registration process was carried out as a ritual for a period of one week or couple of weeks in their respective villages to report the same to Block / District level officials. During this seasonal period of registration, many families who missed out due to various reasons, one among them, migration to neighboring cities/towns, were making several visits to GP office to register under the scheme.

As per the stipulated guidelines of NREGA, all the eligible registrants have to be verified in an open meeting of GS. Table 2.4 gives the response details of HHs who certified that such norm was followed before issue of job card. Three-fourths of the respondents agreed that proper verification of all applicants was done before issuing of job card.

An attempt was also made to elicit the views of HHs about the review of applications in GS which were rejected earlier due to various reasons. Table 2.5 shows that only 40 percent of the respondents agreed that the applications which were not

approved in the earlier occasion were approved in the consequent GS meetings. Majority of respondents hailing from eastern and southern region expressed their views that once the application was rejected in earlier occasion was not taken up for any review in the consequent meetings. In general, the procedure for reviewing of cases is taking place in a satisfactory, democratic and transparent manner through Grama Sabhas and the applicants were given a chance to present their case in front of other inhabitants of village.

Opinion was collected about the frequency of GS meetings convened for the ongoing activities of registration, approval of works, preparation of plan of activities etc. Table 2.6 shows that there were more quarterly meetings than monthly or bi-monthly meetings. Half of the HHs surveyed opined that GS meetings were convened on quarterly basis. Assessment of the overall responses reveal that the activities are being carried out to a satisfactory level within the guidelines stipulated under NREGA.

Opinion was also sought about the genuine HHs who wanted to register for job card but could not register due to any reason. According to Table 2.7, more than 93 percent respondents agreed that every genuine HH who wanted to register was able to do so. Only three percent of the respondents expressed that some HHs could not register as they were absent due to migration or some other reason.

One of the important objectives of the NREGA is to arrest out-migration. As a step towards this direction, opinion was also gathered from HHs about the families of the same village who migrated and who could register for job card. According to Table 2.8, nearly ninety percent of the HHs revealed that none of the migrant families were able to register for job card. Only three percent agreed that migrant families have also registered for job cards under the NREG Scheme. In eastern region, only eight percent of the respondents agreed that migrant families have also come to know about the NREG Scheme and could register under the scheme.

### **Section – III: Issue of Job Card**

Through this section, opinion of all job card holders is collected on issues such as (i) whether all the eligible HH members are included in the job card, (ii) under whose custody, the job card is kept, (iii) waiting period for applying and obtaining the job card, (iv) number of visits by beneficiaries to obtain job card, (v) whether photograph is enclosed on the card, (vi) physical verification and observations on the entries in the job card.

Ten percent of the respondents opined that all the eligible members of the family were not included in the job card. Such responses are widespread from the eastern region where more than 22 percent of the beneficiaries not satisfied with all the willing members of the family not included in the job card followed by southern region with fifteen percent as per Table 3.1. One of the several reasons expressed by the beneficiaries is non-presence of those families during the registration process due to migration for want of wages. Their case could not be taken up later on due to non-persuasion of those affected families. Such cases are rampant in the eastern region.

It has come to light that in the eastern region nearly one-tenth of the beneficiaries' cards are in the possession of either GP official or Mate looking after the worksites contrary to the fact that job card should be in the custody of respective HHs as shown in Table 3.2. On an average, nearly five percentage of the surveyed HHs agreed that the job cards are surrendered to GP officials and only during work allocation they will be handed over to them for getting entries of wages etc.

Another crucial aspect is the time-lag between application and issue of job card. As per the directives of the NREGA, job card has to be issued at the earliest preferably within couple of weeks. Table 3.3 shows that two-thirds of the surveyed beneficiaries revealed that the job cards were issued to them within 15 days of application. Nineteen percent of HHs revealed that job cards were issued to them within one month of application. In case of only fourteen percent of the families.

An attempt was also made to capture the number of visits by the HHs purely for the purpose of obtaining the job card. Out of the total respondents of 5997, 3464 respondents i.e., 58 percent of the respondents obtained the job cards by visiting the GP office only once. Nearly nine percent of the respondents visited GP office more than twice. According to the Table 3.4, there are instances of more than four visits in eastern and southern regions.

Though affixing of photograph is mandatory on the job card, and it is the responsibility of GP office which is issuing the card, there are cases to the extent of 20 percent among the surveyed cards, that no photograph was affixed. More widespread among them were from the eastern and southern region. One-fourth of the job cards verified in Karauli district in Rajasthan state did not have any photograph on the job card. Nearly 30 percent of the beneficiaries paid for the photographs. Only in half of the cases, GP facilitated the affixing of photograph of HHs on their respective job cards. Data at Table 3.5 reveals that almost all the HHs in the districts of Munger (Bihar) and Davangere (Karnataka) have affixed their own photographs with their own money. In the districts of Sambalpur, Malda (Eastern region), Medak (Southern region) there were no photographs affixed on the job card.

An attempt was also made to check the entries in the job card regarding wage payment, number of days of employment etc. as illustrated in Table 3.6. It was found that in many cases there was no enough space to record wage payment. In two northern districts of Barabanki and Sonbadra, all the job cards did not have enough space for entry of wage payments. As far as recording of quantum of employment provided, Sambalpur (Orissa), Davangere (Karnataka), Palakkad (Kerala) did not made proper entries at all in the respective job cards of HHs. Nearly one-third of the job cards of eastern region did not have proper entries about details of number of days of employment.



#### **Section – IV: Registration and Application for Work:**

This section captured very important aspect of procedures and rules vis-à-vis guidelines of NREGA followed by the officials at GP level by way of views expressed by the beneficiaries. There are several guidelines to be followed by GP officials such as (i) allotment of work on time, (ii) time-lag between application for work and allotment of work, (iii) distance between worksite and residence, (iv) communication and dissemination of information about works and other activities under NREGA, (v) extent of women participation in all the activities carried under NREGA, (vi) facilities at worksite, (vii) redressal of grievances and complaints, (viii) record keeping of attendance, (ix) wage implementation and awareness, (x) procedure to be followed for payment of wages, (xi) delay in providing employment within stipulated time and unemployment allowance etc. This section tries to capture the views of all the beneficiaries in the above aspects.

Table 4.1 captures the data on the extent of fulfillment of obligation by GP to provide employment as a mandatory duty under NREGA for all those applicants who applied for job. Out of 5997 HHs tapped, the 169 HHs expressed that they were not offered employment at the time of investigators interviewed those HHs. Majority among them i.e., 80 HHs out of 1200 HHs hail from western region. The reason could be non-starting of the works in those districts, or those beneficiaries are still under consideration while the work plan is underway.

Table - 4.2 captures whether there is any time lag between application for job and allocation of job. According to the guidelines of the scheme, within a maximum period of 15 days of applying for job in writing, wage employment has to be provided. However, the response of the beneficiaries who got the wage employment speaks the other way. Out of the total beneficiaries, 80 percent of them did not get the employment within the stipulated time. Neither have they got any employment allowance as stipulated in the Act. In the northern and north-eastern region, most of the HHs did not get the job within the stipulated time. All the beneficiaries revealed that they were forced to visit GP office

several times to seek employment even after applying for the job in writing. In other regions only few people got within the stipulated time.

The enquiry at official level revealed that since they are straddling with teething problems of the scheme such as lack of human resources, lack of vision, and lack of plan approvals etc. the work allocation got delayed. Officials are confident that this problem will be solved in due course of time.

Table – 4.3 explains the duration of waiting period after seeking for employment through application. Normally, within the framework of the NREGA, the work has to be provided within fifteen days of seeking employment. However, the primary data analysis shows that only 71.5% of the job-seekers were provided wage employment within the stipulated time period of 15 days. Seven percent of the people were provided after 3 weeks of seeking job.

The scheme was implemented in a gigantic scale at village level and it is commendable that though there is some delay, the work was provided up to the satisfaction of all the job seekers as far as the time lag is concerned. It is commendable to record that 28% of the job-seekers were provided wages within one week of demanding for wage employment. Among the 1712 HHs who constitute nearly one-fourth of the total sample, who were delayed employment beyond two weeks, majority are from the northern and eastern region.

Table – 4.4 tries to capture the HH data pertaining to average number of days of work provided to each and every household. There is a maximum limit of 100 days of employment to each household under this scheme. Only 4.5 percent of job card holders did utilize more than 35 days of wages per family. 14 percent of job card beneficiaries get up to 8 days of employment as on the time of this survey. Most of the beneficiaries did not utilize up to 100 days since the scheme is in its initial stages and all of them are yet to get work allocation in near future according to the version of officials. There is non-uniformity of distribution of number of wage-days in each district since the scheme was

in its different stages of initiation. In some of the districts surveyed, the scheme was hardly launched. Therefore, most of the eligible families are yet to utilize their share of 100 days of wage employment.

As per the guidelines of NREGA, the work site should not be more than 4 km away from the GP office/residence of the beneficiaries. However, it was revealed in Table – 4.5 that 5 percent of the beneficiaries did work in those sites which are beyond 4 kms. Notable among them are from northern and eastern regions. More than half of the HHs did work in the worksites which are within the radius of one kilometer from their residence.

Though it is mandatory to provide transport allowance to job card holders in the event of work site falling beyond the distance of 4 km, it was found in the survey as stated in the Table – 4.6 that no such allowance was paid in spite of working in sites falling beyond the stipulated distance. However, in case of Davanagere district of Karnataka, a very minute number of beneficiaries i.e., 13 HHs expressed that transport allowance was paid.

There has to be several modes of dissemination of information detailing the work allocation so as to inform all the HHs falling in the jurisdiction of GP such as (a) notice board, (b) drum beating, (c) public announcement etc. Through the Table – 4.7 an attempt was made to know the most common mode of communicating the information regarding works. It was found that 55 percent of the HHs did come to know about the works and about the scheme itself through public announcements either in GP or in GS. 29 percent of the people came to know about the scheme and other details through notice boards displayed at GP office. Many among them heard through others who read or seen the contents of the notice board. 16 percent of the beneficiaries have come to know the details through drum beating which is the age-old, traditional way of disseminating the information from the GP office.

NREG Scheme stipulates at least one-third of the wage allocation i.e., person-days to women beneficiaries. Table – 4.8 captures the HH data of women participation in the NREG works. An attempt was made to analyse the participation of women in each and every household compared to the total person-days utilized by the respective households. It was found that in 21.5 percent of HHs, women folk of the family did not take part to the extent of 33% of person-days. Only in 42 percent households, the women could share the 1/3<sup>rd</sup> of the allocated person-days (wage days ). However, in 22 percent of the households, the women folk did utilize more than one-third of the utilized person-days in the household.

The Act under NREGA stipulates to provide basic facilities such as crèche, first aid, drinking water and shade for workers at the work site. An attempt was made as shown in Table – 4.9 to enquire the extent of such facilities provided to the wagers at the work site. Only 80 percent of the HHs did find drinking water facility at the work site. Only one-fourths of the HHs did agree that there is a crèche facility. However, only 83 percent of the HHs who participated in the wage employment did agree that there is a drinking water facility. Though, a shade for resting in between work hours and during lunch recess is mandatory, only 65 percent of the HHs did agree that there is a facility of shade near the work site.

An attempt was also made to enquire with the beneficiaries whether there are any general nature of grievances or complaints regarding works allocation, registration procedures, and job card allocation etc. These grievances do not contribute to any particular lacunae of officials but the views and opinions of beneficiaries expressed during interaction with the investigators. 4.5 percent of the respondents recorded a complaint about works allocation, though in other cases i.e., registration, and allocation of job card there were only minor complaints as per the Table – 4.10. Among the complainants, majority are from the western region. Relatively, there were more complaints on the issue of work allocation compared to the process of registration and issue of job cards. Significant about this enquiry is that majority of beneficiaries

expressed satisfaction with the overall work allocation and not attributed to any complaints in general.

Recording of attendance at the work site is another important step in the overall process of carrying out works under NREG Scheme. Table 4.11 reveals that 53 percent of the participants could not put their signature on the records and recorded their attendance by thumb impression. 58 percent of the HHs in the eastern region are illiterates and put their signature by thumb impression.

Through Table – 4.12 an attempt is made to arrive at an opinion about the awareness of the HHs vis-à-vis minimum wages Vs NREGA wages, maximum hours of work involved per day, prevailing wage rates in the respective places etc. Two-thirds of the participants agreed that there are separate better wages under NREGA Scheme compared to local prevailing wage rates. They also agreed that the prevailing rate for unskilled workers is less than the NREGA stipulated rate.

Table 4.13 shows that the payment of wages is done either at public place, or work site itself, or GP office or through Bank. It is very interesting to note that except in the districts of Medak (A.P.) and Palakkad (Kerala), in no other 20 districts payment is made through bank. One-third of the beneficiaries were paid at the work site itself. 23 percent of the beneficiaries were paid at the GP office while the rest were paid at some other public place.

To make the payment of wage highly transparent, and to make it clear to every beneficiary about the details of payments made, it is mandatory to publicly announce the names, number of days of wages, and total amount to be paid to respective participant in order to rule out the ambiguity among the beneficiaries. However, Table – 4.14 shows that nearly 15 percent of the HHs are not convinced that there was any public announcement of individual names prior to payment of wages. Most of these respondents hail from eastern region, and to be precise majority of the surveyed HHs in Munger and

Kishangunj districts did not agree that there was a public announcement detailing the payment of wages to individual participant at the worksite.

An enquiry was also made about their knowledge of any person who was delayed work allocation beyond stipulated duration and was paid any unemployment allowance. As stated in Table – 4.15 no one has come across any person who was paid any such allowance.

### **Section – V: Impact on Wages, Income and Quality of Life:**

One of the major objectives of the scheme is to improve the income levels and enhance the quality of life of village folks who are thus far eking out with meager income, constraints of low wages, frequent interruptions in wage earnings etc. by providing 100 days of wage employment at prescribed minimum wages applicable in the region. This section is trying to bring out the impact of the scheme on various important attributes which contribute to the enhancement of quality of life such as (i) income levels before and after the scheme in vogue, (ii) distribution of means of income of beneficiaries e.g., agriculture, daily wage, petty business etc. (iii) shift in expenditure pattern on food items after income generation through the present scheme, (iv) expenditure pattern on non-food items before and after implementation of the scheme, (v) beneficiaries of the scheme having electricity connection, (vi) land holding pattern of the beneficiaries of this scheme, (vii) acquisition of movable and immovable assets by the beneficiaries during the year of implementation of the scheme, (viii) status of loans outstanding against the beneficiaries at the time of enquiry, (ix) status of household assets gathered before and after the scheme in vogue, (x) status of cultivation assets owned by the beneficiaries before and after the scheme's implementation, (xi) details of livestock creation prior to and after utilizing the scheme.

NREGS is the most significant scheme to uplift the overall quality of life of rural households. However, the impact time of the scheme is very less, in most districts of survey it is hardly couple of months and the utility of this scheme is not up to the

maximum permissible limit of 100 days at the time of survey. Due to this reason, all the important variables which contribute towards quality of life did not give much output for further analysis since the scheme is not fully and not uniformly implemented in all the districts surveyed. Nevertheless, this little span of impact time has given much of the information to gauge the overall impact in areas such as expenditure pattern on food and non-food, asset creation at household and agricultural level, trends in income shifts etc. Following parts illustrate the impact of each and every variable studied on the beneficiaries of the scheme.

One of the important aspects of impact assessment is rise in income levels of the beneficiaries. Annual income of the beneficiaries is categorized into four groups such as (a) less than Rs. 5,000, (b) between Rs. 5,000 and 10,000, (c) between Rs. 10,000 to 15,000 and (d) above Rs. 15,000 but less than 20,000. This grouping is done based on the feedback from the beneficiaries and after confirming that all the beneficiaries income levels are falling under Rs. 20,000 per annum. Table – 5.1 shows that there is a shift in the first two income bracket of (a) & (b) categories as stated above. Percentage of HHs falling in these categories are reduced from 5.5 and 41.5 to 2.9 and 26.6 percent respectively. On the other hand, beneficiaries earning in the range of Rs. 15,000 and up to Rs. 20,000 increased from 33 and 20 percent to 44 and 26.3 percent respectively as a result of impact of the scheme. The effect is clearly visible in the eastern region where there is a reduction of low income group up to one-third of the original size.

Table – 5.2 captures the income sources of the beneficiaries from various sources such as agricultural yield, unskilled labour, agricultural labour, petty business etc. It was found that 52.3 percent of the HHs are unskilled labourers eking out their livelihood by odd and unskilled jobs. 12 percent of the HHs are agricultural peasants totally depending on seasonal agricultural works. One-fifth of the HHs are generating income from their own agricultural yields/activities. Very small fraction of them are eking out livelihood by petty businesses revolving around rural economy. Most of the HHs depending on purely unskilled labour activities are hailing from eastern region.

An attempt is also made to judge the impact of the scheme on the expenditure pattern of beneficiaries on food items. This information goes a long way in assessing the impact of the scheme on nutritional inputs of the beneficiaries . Here again it is categorized into three groups of beneficiaries i.e., (a) beneficiaries spending less than Rs. 500 on food items per month, (b) spending between Rs. 500-700, and (c) above Rs. 800 per month. The surveyed beneficiaries pattern of the above three categories shifted from 23.5, 27, and 49.5 percent to 15.5, 28 and 56.5 percent. It shows that there is a significant shift of beneficiaries from 49.5 to 56.5 % who are spending Rs. 800 & above on food items. This is the result of reduction of people spending very less i.e., less than Rs. 500 on food items. The region wise impact is shown in Table – 5.3

On the above lines an inference is also drawn to assess the expenditure on non-food items as given in Table – 5.4. It shows that there is an increase of beneficiaries from 6 to 11 percent who are spending more than Rs. 800 on non-food items. In western region there is an increase of three fold among the beneficiaries who are spending Rs. 800 above on non-food items. Non-food items include all eatables, consumables like beverages, alcoholic drinks, non-food supplements to their children etc.

As part of assessment of quality of life, an enquiry is also made to assess the electricity connections in the hutments, dwelling units of the beneficiaries as shown in Table – 5.5. It was revealed that only 31 percent of the beneficiaries are having electricity connection in their residences. 1569 beneficiaries out of 2100 HHs surveyed ( 75%) in the eastern region expressed that they do not have any electricity connection in their dwelling units.

Table – 5.6 gives the land holding status of the beneficiaries. This land holding include all the beneficiaries who claimed to have possessed even one bigha of land in their name or in the name of the head of the family. 53 percent of the beneficiaries are possessing at least a small agricultural land in their name. This data also includes the beneficiaries who are possessing land distributed by state/local government free of cost on various occasions.



An attempt is also made to measure the acquisition of movable and immovable assets by the beneficiaries during the year as stated in Table – 5.7. This asset base also include livestock which is the important asset in rural areas. 68 percent of the HHs revealed that they purchased livestock during the year. This livestock include sheep, goat, poultry etc. Seven percent of the beneficiaries purchased household articles like utensils, pressure cookers, crockery etc. Nearly two percent of the HHs opened bank accounts and deposited some money for the first time. Most of them are from northern and southern region. There was also an interesting revelation that nearly one percent of the beneficiaries and all of them are from southern region purchased some amount of gold during the year.

Table – 5.8 reveals the outstanding loan status of the beneficiaries. Nearly four-fifths of the beneficiaries do not have any outstanding loan. This loan status is from all the sources i.e., banks, local money lenders etc. Only one-fifth i.e., nearly 20% of the HHs have taken loans from the local money lenders. Among them, majority are from southern and western regions. It is interesting to note from the data that out of 300 beneficiaries surveyed in each district in the western region at least 60% of them have declared that they owe money to money lenders.

An attempt is also made to assess the purchasing capacity of the HHs as a result of this scheme by way of measurement of acquisition of household asset base such as bicycle, radio, sewing machine, electrical fittings, fans, steel trunk, etc. as shown in Table – 5.9. This table gives the auditing of household assets base prior to and after the implementation of the scheme. It has come to light that nearly 46 percent of the beneficiaries were already possessing bicycle even before the scheme. With the increase of income due to this scheme, only 3.3 percent of beneficiaries could buy new bicycles. 4.6 percent of people were able to buy radio/transistor. Only 31 out of 5997 HHs did buy sewing machine. 1.5% of the beneficiaries did buy either electric fan or other electrical fittings. 3.2 percent of the beneficiaries purchased steel trunks with the savings out of the income from this scheme.

Table – 5.10 gives the cultivable asset base of the beneficiaries before and after utilizing the scheme's wage income. This table pertains to those who are holding some amount of cultivable land and generating income from this land. It was revealed that sizable number of beneficiaries who are possessing cultivable arid/agricultural land are possessing assets even before implementation of the scheme. However, the increase in asset base with the impact of this scheme is negligible as stated in the table. Nearly 10% of the HHs were already possessing bullock carts, and the increase in this assets is only less than one percent after implementation of the scheme. Nearly five percent of the beneficiaries were already having tube wells and the net increase during this year is mere 11 tube wells from among the huge cohort of nearly 6000 beneficiaries. 1.2 % HHs were possessing harvesters and threshers and its number remained same even after implementation of the scheme. It is most significant to note that 53 beneficiaries were possessing tractors even before on-set of this scheme. It is remarkable that two beneficiaries used the income generated from this wage scheme as a supplement to buy tractor.

Table – 5.11 gives the asset status of livestock of the beneficiaries before and after utilizing this scheme. 27% of the people were possessing milk animals and their number increased to 35% due to impact of the scheme. HHs possessing goat/sheep increased from 22% to 32% whereas the HHs possessing poultry/duck increased from 14 to 22% with the income generation from this scheme.

### **Section – VI: Impact on out-migration:**

One of the significant objective of the NREGA is to arrest out-migration of unskilled, landless labour force from the rural areas to urban areas by ensuring up to 100 days of wage employment within their native jurisdiction so that these 100 days guaranteed wage employment can be judiciously and rationally utilized by the landless peasants during lean and distress seasons. This section analyses the impact of this scheme in arresting out-migration by taking the opinion of households who have enrolled under

the NREGA scheme and who are in possession of the job cards. This section precisely gathers the collective opinion of HHs on important attributes such as (i) details of families migrating in search of work, (ii) any knowledge of mass migration from the village, (iii) permanent migration of families from the village, (iv) wage parity of migration, i.e., attractiveness of wages upon migration, and (v) measures initiated by GP to check migration. In all the following description and illustration of tables, it was described only the opinion and experiences of each and every household regarding the information of migration of other families including self to assess the extent of migration prevailing in the village.

In Table 6.1, it was shown that one-fourth of the families surveyed opined that there is migration from their respective village to towns/cities in search of job. Almost fifty percent of the HHs in western region expressed that migration is prevailing from their villages. In the north eastern region, in the district of North Lakhimpur, everyone agreed that there is migration from their villages.

Table 6.2 illustrates the mass migration scenario in all the 20 districts surveyed. In Malda, and South Garo Hills, almost half of the rural folks expressed that there is a mass migration from their places. In Medak (A.P.) which is adjoining the fast growing Hyderabad metropolitan is experiencing mass migration to the extent of 40 percent. In Dahod of western region it is almost one-third of the rural population.

Table 6.3 also reveals the permanent migration of families from their places. According to the opinion collated in the table, 66 households revealed that according to their knowledge there exists permanent migration of families from their villages. Out of those 66 families, the information given by 37 families reside in the eastern region, 23 families reside in the southern region and the rest from other parts of the country. This implies that there is a mass migration reported from eastern and southern region. Among the districts where the opinion is forthcoming are from Malda from West Bengal and Davanagere from Karnataka where the beneficiaries expressed that there is an exodus from their respective villages in search of livelihood.

Through Table – 6.4, an attempt is made to know the reasons for migration purely in terms of whether there exists enhanced wages upon migration in other places compared to the same kind of work in their own native villages. It is surprising to note that contrary to the general perception of better wages upon migration, 70 percent of the beneficiaries revealed that the migration is only for just wages and not for any better wages. This implies that there is a distress migration for just minimum wages to eke out the livelihood and for survival rather than for better wages. This can be arrested through this NREG Scheme which is intended to address the distress migration of unskilled labour force among other things. Notable among the responses is that 82 and 67 percent of the HHs interviewed in the eastern and northern region respectively expressed that the out-migration is in search of work and meager wages rather than for better earnings which can be viewed as a distress migration.

There is a commendable role to be played by local bodies such as GPs to arrest the out-migration and distress migration. The NREG Scheme has given impetus to these local bodies to generate work within the village framework by sustaining the local resources and creating irrigation, agricultural asset base within the village set up itself. In this context, Table – 6.5 captures the views of beneficiaries vis-à-vis the capacity of GP to initiate measures to arrest the out-migration of the rural folks. It is disappointing to note that 38 percent of the HHs did not agree with the measures taken by GP to check out-migration. They expressed that the GP did not take any measures to create sustainable assets to generate wage employment within the village. Only 40 percent agreed that GP is taking appropriate steps to create wage employment. Rest of the beneficiaries did not give their opinion at all about the capacity of GP. Most notable fact is that the eastern region beneficiaries to the extent of 46 percent did not express any confidence in their respective village GP about their efforts of checking out-migration.

The last two sections which deal with the impact of the scheme on quality of life, asset base and migration were dealt with a limited purpose since the scheme was not uniformly implemented in all the 20 districts which were selected for the study. In some

districts, the scheme was hardly launched, and even in few districts where it was under implementation for more than six months, all the beneficiaries could not utilize the maximum 100 days due to teething problems at the GP level to generate work to the full extent. Nevertheless, the study has brought out very important signals within the time frame of the implementation.

## Annexure – I.

### Methodological Note:

During the finalization of study details, it was proposed to take up 50 districts from among the first batch of 200 districts where the NREGA is under implementation. A presentation was made to a committee chaired by Prof. Abhijit Sen on 20-3-2007. The committee asked us to reduce the districts to 20 only.

These 20 districts were selected on the basis of available data of person-days generated and job cards issued. These districts were the blend of above and below state-average figures of the ratio of person-days generated and job cards issued. On the advise of the members present in the meeting (Mr. V.K.Bhatia, Adviser, PEO, and Mr. H. N. Gupta, Sr. Consultant), more weightage is given to four states of eastern region which constitute major chunk of out-migration of labour force. In all, 20 districts covering 16 states including 2 districts in North-East were finalized for the study in a separate meeting held with Mr. V.K. Bhatia, and Mr. H. N. Gupta. In case of Western region, the four districts were irrespective of above or below average figures since the data on other districts is not available at that point of time. Region-wise list of districts is given below:

### List of Districts:

Zone	State	District	Person-days generated (Lakhs) (A)	Job cards issued (B)	Ratio (A/B)
North	1. U.P.	1. Barabanki	617.64	3860951	16.01
		2. Sonbadra	41.35	333246	12.4
			48.32	145182	33.28
North	2. Haryana	3. Sirsa	19.66	92365	21.3
			11.7	60910	18.1
North	3. Rajasthan	4. Karauli	912.79	1513739	60.3
			110.86	192992	57.4
South	4. A.P.	5. Medak	548.23	5066675	10.82
			23.0	250957	9.16
South	5. Karnataka	6. Davanagere	182.22	790209	23.06
			57.53	149901	38.38

	6. Kerala	7. Palakkad	10.85 5.62	201178 133305	5.39 4.22
East	7. Bihar	8. Kishangunj 9. Munger	297.24 0.51 22.48	3171198 171864 97140	9.4 0.3 23.1
	8. Jharkand	10. Gumla 11. Ranchi	308.14 26.86 7.92	2098713 121809 191326	14.7 3.6 19.1
	9. Orissa	12. Sambalpur 13. Sundergarh	626.61 34.12 28.46	2568529 121590 199962	24.3 27.96 14.0
	10. West Bengal	14. Malda	345.79 21.5	4973481 428076	6.96 4.91
West	11. Maharashtra	15. Bandara	0 0	223316 171853	--- ---
	12. Gujarath	16. Dahod	84.57 21.58	624239 101676	13.55 21.22
	13. M.P.	17. Jabua	1711.77 113.14	4442056 276000	38.54 40.99
	14. Chattisgarh	18. Bilaspur	600.2 96.98	1809969 222211	33.19 43.64
N.E.	15. Assam	19. North Lakhimpur	471.97 88.75	876953 106932	53.82 83.23
	16. Meghalaya	20. South Garo Hills	2.01 0.44	39658 7849	5.1 5.6

In every district, 6 gram panchayats (GPs) falling in two revenue blocks @ 3 GPs from each block were chosen in consultation with the district and block officials. In case of selection of beneficiaries i.e., @ 50 beneficiaries from each GP, it was done by random selection as advised by Prof. Abhijit Sen in the meeting held on 20-3-2007.

Table 3.4 District wise Distribution Frequency of visit by the Beneficiary to GP to get Job Card

S. No	Districts	Frequency of visit by the beneficiary to GP to get job card						
		Only Once	Twice	Thrice	Four Times	Five & above	No Response	Total
	<b>Northern Region</b>							
1	Barabanki	181	102	16	1	0	0	300
2	Sonbhadra	1	178	121	0	0	0	300
3	Sirsa	196	104	0	0	0	0	300
4	Karauli	228	51	15	2	1	0	297
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>606</b>	<b>435</b>	<b>152</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1197</b>
	<b>Eastern Region</b>							
5	Munger	139	80	39	16	26	0	300
6	Kishenganj	135	120	22	15	8	0	300
7	Sambalpur	188	53	59	0	0	0	300
8	Sundergarh	174	98	22	4	2	0	300
9	Gumla	219	33	17	6	6	19	300
10	Ranchi	202	62	19	7	10	0	300
11	Malda	216	52	10	11	11	0	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>1273</b>	<b>498</b>	<b>188</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>2100</b>
	<b>Western Region</b>							
12	Dahod	167	121	12	0	0	0	300
13	Jhabua	245	53	2	0	0	0	300
14	Bhandara	180	120	0	0	0	0	300
15	Bilaspur	288	9	3	0	0	0	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>880</b>	<b>303</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1200</b>
	<b>Southern Region</b>							
16	Devangere	85	100	43	33	39	0	300
17	Medak	158	67	72	3	0	0	300
18	Palakkad	151	94	39	10	6	0	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>394</b>	<b>261</b>	<b>154</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>900</b>
	<b>North-East Region</b>							
19	North Lakhimpur	18	219	48	1	0	14	300
20	South Garo Hills	293	7	0	0	0	19	300
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>311</b>	<b>226</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>600</b>
	<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>3464</b>	<b>1723</b>	<b>559</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>5997</b>

Source : IAMR Survey, 2007



Table 4.12 : District wise Distribution of Awareness about the Wages

S. No	Districts	Separate Wages being		Min. wages decided by Govt. per day(Rs.)	Wages Actually paid after 7-8 hours of work (Rs.)	Prevailing Wage Rate for Unskilled workers(Rs.)	No Response
		Applied to NREGS Yes	No				
<b>Northern Region</b>							
1	Barabanki	0	300	58	58	50-60	0
2	Sonbhadra	0	300	58	58	40-50	0
3	Sirsa	300	0	95.55	96	100	0
4	Karauli	297	0	55	55	50-55	0
<b>Sub-Total</b>		<b>597</b>	<b>600</b>				
<b>Eastern Region</b>							
5	Munger	300	0	68	50	50-60	0
6	Kishanganj	300	0	68	50	50-60	0
7	Sambalpur	0	300	NA	NA	NA	300
8	Sundergarh	300	0	50	50	40-50	0
9	Gumla	214	86	76.68	77	40-60	0
10	Ranchi	0	300	NA	NA	NA	300
11	Malda	300	0	68	70	60-70	0
<b>Sub-Total</b>		<b>1414</b>	<b>686</b>				<b>600</b>
<b>Western Region</b>							
12	Dahod	300	0	NA	NA	NA	300
13	Jhabua	182	128	63	63	50-60	0
14	Bhandara	300	0	95	95	68	0
15	Bilaspur	300	0	66.7	67	40-50	300
<b>Sub-Total</b>		<b>1082</b>	<b>128</b>				
<b>Southern</b>							
16	Devangere	254	46	69	69	40-60	0
17	Medak	300	0	80	80	80	0
18	Palakkad	294	6	80	80	50-80	0
<b>Sub-Total</b>		<b>848</b>	<b>52</b>				
<b>North-East Region</b>							
19	North Lakhimpur	300	0	66	66	100	0
20	South Garo Hills	300	0	70	70	100	0
<b>Sub-Total</b>		<b>600</b>	<b>0</b>				
<b>Grand Total</b>		<b>3941</b>	<b>1552</b>				<b>900</b>

Source : IAMR Survey, 2007

Table 5.10 : District wise Distribution of Cultivation Assets Created by Job Cardholders Before and After Joining the Scheme

S.No.	Districts	Before								After							
		Sewing Machine	Tube Well	Gent. Set	Bullock Cart	Tractor	Thresher	Harvesters	Others	Sewing Machine	Tube Well	Gent. Set	Bullock Cart	Tractor	Thresher	Harvesters	
<b>Northern Region</b>																	
1	Barabanki	46	26	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	
2	Sonbhadra	0	6	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
3	Sirsa	26	0	0	0	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
4	Karauli	22	0	0	102	0	10	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>112</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	
<b>Eastern Region</b>																	
5	Munger	1	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
6	Kishanganj	0	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
7	Sambalpur	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
8	Sundergarh	12	1	1	112	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
9	Gumla	2	2	0	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	
10	Ranchi	0	10	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
11	Malda	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	
<b>Western Region</b>																	
12	Dahod	0	0	0	57	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	
13	Jhabua	0	0	1	23	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	
14	Bhandara	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
15	Bilaspur	0	0	5	42	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>122</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	
<b>Southern Region</b>																	
16	Devangere	0	0	0	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
17	Medak	27	8	1	27	10	0	0	0	7	0	4	3	2	0	0	
18	Palakkad	0	13	3	2	5	0	2	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	
<b>North-East Region</b>																	
19	North Lakhimpur	4	152	0	67	0	0	47	0	1	1	0	22	0	0	0	
20	South Garo Hills	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	
	<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>152</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	
	<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>140</b>	<b>243</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>485</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	

Note : NA - Data not available

Source : IAMR Survey, 2007

**Table 6.3 :District Wise Distriibution of respondents Knowledge regarding Parmanent Migration from the Village Seasons in which migration takes place**

S.No	Districts	Household response of Permanent Migration from the Village			
		Yes	No	No response	Total
<b>Northern Region</b>					
1	Barabanki	0	300	0	300
2	Sonbhadra	0	300	0	300
3	Sirsa	0	0	300	300
4	Karauli	6	291	0	297
<b>Sub-Total</b>		<b>6</b>	<b>891</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>1197</b>
<b>Eastern Region</b>					
5	Munger	4	296	0	300
6	Kishenganj	7	293	0	300
7	Sambalpur	0	300	0	300
8	Sundergarh	0	0	300	300
9	Gumla	5	295	0	300
10	Ranchi	8	292	0	300
11	Malda	13	287	0	300
<b>Sub-Total</b>		<b>37</b>	<b>1763</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>2100</b>
<b>Western Region</b>					
12	Dahod	0	300	0	300
13	Jhabua	0	300	0	300
14	Bhandara	0	300	0	300
15	Bilaspur	0	300	0	300
<b>Sub-Total</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>1200</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1200</b>
<b>Southern Region</b>					
16	Devangere	20	280	0	300
17	Medak	1	299	0	300
18	Palakkad	2	298	0	300
<b>Sub-Total</b>		<b>23</b>	<b>877</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>900</b>
<b>North-East Region</b>					
19	North Lakhimpur	0	300	0	300
20	South Garo Hills	0	300	0	300
<b>Sub-Total</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>600</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>600</b>
<b>Grand Total</b>		<b>66</b>	<b>5331</b>	<b>600</b>	<b>5997</b>

Source : IAMR Survey, 2007

**Guidelines issued to staff engaged in field study:**

Guidelines were issued to the survey teams to study the following aspects and to submit in their reports after their return. They have submitted their respective district reports after their survey of the districts. These 20 district reports were already submitted to PEO Division which covers the following points.

In addition to the above, the survey teams also engaged local investigators to collect the beneficiary level primary data which was compiled and submitted along with all-India report.

A). Bottlenecks at the institutional level

1. technical & administrative hurdles faced by all the officials involved in implementing the scheme
2. grass-roots level difficulties; views/opinions of GP Members, GS members
3. coverage of beneficiaries : BPL Vs Any rural house-hold
4. difficulties in compliance of features of the NREG Act.
5. Capacity building (staff, training, adhoc recruitments etc.)
6. views of stakeholders (right from GP to district officials, and others) on the convergence of other programmes with NREG Scheme

B). Observations on Social Audit, Transparency, Village-level monitoring:

1. General awareness of the scheme among rural folk
2. Grama Sabha involvement: Unilateral Vs Democratic process
3. comments on functioning of social audit,
4. opinion of members of Village-Level Monitoring Committees (VMC)

C). Observations on role of GP:

1. Local needs Vs Top-down guidelines
2. shortage of manpower to handle the records & multiple registers
3. identification of works and shelf of works
4. Local politics: Gram Panchayat Vs Gram Sabha
5. Registration of households and issue of Job Cards
6. Overall capability of GP to tackle this kind of gigantic scheme like NREGA

D). Difficulties faced by GP in implementation of scheme

1. technical sanction, Administrative sanctions
2. procedural flaws in technical estimates
3. extent of autonomy in planning processes
4. delay in procedures and processes

E). Observations on Payment of Wages:

1. Equal pay or gender-biased wages
2. Cash Vs Cheque/Post Office/Bank A/c
3. promptness of payment, delay & reasons
4. Labour – material ratio & cost

F). Work-site and muster roll Observations:

1. Basic facilities i.e., sheds, drinking water, crèche,
2. participation rate of women,
3. random checking of work-force vis-à-vis muster-roll entries
4. observations on entries in muster-roll, i.e., wages, job card details,
5. views of some wagers i.e., local monitoring committee members

G). Positive Impact of the Scheme:

1. Creation of durable assets at village and household level.
2. arresting out-migration
3. enhanced quality of life, assured wages
4. scope for perspective planning at village level