

Evaluation Report
on
Member of Parliament
Local Area Development Scheme

Contents

<u>Preface</u>	ii
<u>Executive Summary</u>	iv
<u>Chapter 1 The Scheme and the Study</u>	2
<u>Chapter 2 Objectives, Data Base and Methodology</u>	8
<u>Chapter 3 Recommendation, Sanction and Execution</u>	14
<u>Chapter 4 Mode of Funding and Utilization of Fund</u>	29
<u>Chapter 5 Inter-agency Coordination for Implementation</u>	38
<u>Chapter 6 Monitoring, Supervision and Feedback</u>	41
<u>Chapter 7 Quality and Maintenance of Assets</u>	48
<u>Chapter 8 Impact of the Schemes as Perceived at the Grassroot Level</u>	56
<u>Annexure</u>	68
<u>Project Team</u>	72

Preface

Member of Parliament Local Area Development Scheme (MPLADS) was introduced in December, 1993 to enable the Members of Parliament (MPs) to identify and get implemented small developmental works of capital nature based on locally felt needs so that durable assets will be created in their constituencies. The Ministry of Rural Development (since renamed as Ministry of Rural Areas and Employment) initially administered the scheme. Since October 1994, it has been transferred to the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation. The Ministry prepares the guidelines to be followed and amended this from time to time.

The scheme is under operation during the last 7 years. A couple of localized studies and the two CAG reports (1993-97, 1997-2000), besides the Standing Committee on Finance (1998-99) have pointed to the operational lapses and failure of the Ministry to effectively administer and monitor the scheme and suggested a thorough review of the scheme. At the instance of Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation, Programme Evaluation Organization (PEO) of Planning Commission undertook the study to evaluate the design, implementation and impact of the scheme and to identify the areas of its weakness and strength for the improvement in the performance of the scheme.

The study findings are based on the data and information collected for the reference period 1994-95 to 1998-1999 through a sample survey from structured schedules of 22 State Nodal departments, 92 Lok Sabha MPs, 25 Rajya Sabha MPs, 103 District Collectors, 590 Development functionaries, 590 Village/Urban knowledgeable persons and 2892 local people. These data have been supplemented by secondary data from published and unpublished records of Government Departments and extensive discussions with various respondents and personal visits to a number of work sites by the evaluation team members. The main findings of the study are: -

- (i) Out of 25702 works in 57 sample constituencies during 1993-99 those classified under Roads & Bridges and Community Works dominate constituting about 29 and 24 percent respectively. Of the total works, about 68% are reported to be complete, 14 % are in progress, 9% yet to start and the status of the rest of works (9%) could not be known.
- (ii) Allocation of funds to most of the works in the selected districts was found to be meager despite the fact that there is a large unspent balance (46%) of MPLADS amount. At the aggregate level, about 46.4% of the works got an allocation of less than Rs. 50,000, while the works with an allocation of Rs. 5 lakh or more constitute only 3.6%.
- (iii) Monitoring and Supervision is the weakest part of the scheme, which is largely due to inadequate infrastructure available to the collector vested with the responsibility. Maintenance of the assets created is

another area of weakness of the scheme. This is largely due to the lack of resources allocated specially for this.

- (iv) The impact of the scheme as felt by the knowledgeable persons and local people indicate that about 65% of the created assets have been rated as good and overwhelming majority of them have opined that the created assets are as per the felt needs and has improved their quality of life. However, their opinion about the implementation and maintenance of assets points out to the inadequate arrangements and a need for large scale involvement of PRIs for strengthening the scheme.

The findings of the study suggest that there is a need for revitalizing the scheme in terms of financial management, inter-departmental coordination for implementation and involvement of PRIs for identifying the proper works, monitoring and maintenance of the created assets. It is hoped that the findings of the study will be useful to the Planning/Implementing agencies in introducing the necessary corrective steps for improving the scheme.

The study received constant support and encouragement from Deputy Chairman Planning Commission, Minister of State for Planning and Statistics and Programme Implementation, Chairman (EAC) and Secretary, Planning Commission. The study was designed and conducted under the direction of Shri K.N. Pathak, Deputy Adviser (PEO). As Shri Pathak had to proceed on study leave, the study was completed under the direction of Dr. S. M. Sirajuddin, Deputy Adviser. Shri G.Chakrabarty, Consultant has put in lot of hard work in tabulation and drafting of the report. The present shape of the study was given under the overall supervision and guidance of Dr. S.P.Pal, Adviser (Evaluation) presently on study leave. The efforts put in by the staff of PEO Headquarters and Regional/Project Evaluation Officers under the guidance of Shri V.K.Bhatia, Joint Adviser (PEO) in completing the study deserve special mention.

Thanks are due to the staff of the National Informatics Centre (NIC), Yojana Bhavan Unit for rendering the computational help and assistance required for the study. The help and cooperation received from the officers of the Union Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation is gratefully acknowledged.

(Dr. Arvind Virmani)
Adviser (Evaluation & DP)

Dated: 21st November, 2001.
Place: New Delhi.

Executive Summary

Objective of MPLADS

Member of Parliament Local Area Development Scheme (MPLADS) was introduced in December 1993. The objective is to enable the Members of Parliament (MP) to suggest and get executed developmental works of capital nature based on locally felt needs with emphasis on creation of durable assets.

Administration

The Ministry of Rural Development initially administered the scheme. Since October 1994 it has been transferred to the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation (henceforth, the Ministry). The Ministry prepared guidelines of the scheme and amended this from time to time.

The Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation is the administrative ministry for the scheme at the Centre. At the level of States, each State and Union Territory designates one nodal department for effective implementation of the scheme and co-ordination with the Ministry at the Centre. The head of the district, where the MP recommends works, is responsible for implementation at the ground level. The authority and power to receive fund from the centre, to sanction the works recommended by MPs, to get the work executed and to ensure maintenance of the assets created are vested in him.

Recommendation of Works

Under this scheme each elected member of Lok Sabha suggests developmental works in his constituency. The elected member of Rajya Sabha can recommend works in any district of his State. A nominated member can suggest work in only one State of his choice¹.

Each MP can recommend to the District Collector developmental works, expenditure on each work generally not exceeding Rs. 10 lakhs (enhanced to Rs.25 lakhs while this study was in progress) up to a total expenditure of Rs. 2 crores every year.

The Study

The scheme has been in operation since 1993. However, no comprehensive evaluation of its performance has been undertaken. In view of the comments made by the Standing Committee on Finance in its second report on demand for grants (1998-

¹ The guidelines have been amended while this study was in progress. The amended version reads as follows:
“Nominated members can suggest works in one or more districts anywhere in the Country.”

99) and the CAG of India in its report covering the period 1993-97 regarding underutilization of funds and certain other inadequacies in implementation, the Ministry requested the Programme Evaluation Organisation (PEO) of Planning Commission to undertake this evaluation study.

This study aims at an assessment of the design, implementation and impact of the scheme and identifies the areas of weakness and strength for suitable midcourse corrective action for improved performance of the scheme.

Information Base for Study

The findings of the study are largely based on the data and information gathered for the reference period 1994-95 to 1998-1999 from a sample of MPs, State nodal departments, other development functionaries and local people through a set of structured schedules. These have been supplemented by published and unpublished records of Government departments and studies by other agencies. The evaluation team also held discussions with various respondents and cross-checked the field situation with records by personal visits to a number of work sites. Following are the details of the respondents interviewed in the survey.

The Sample Size

Unit Interviewed	Numbers
State Nodal Department	22
MP (Lok Sabha)	92
MP (Rajya Sabha)	25
District Collector	103
Development Functionary	590
Village/Urban Ward Level Knowledgeable person	590
Local people	2892

Findings of the Study

Choice of Districts

A large number of MPs have selected 1 or 2 districts for recommending works. However, there are quite a few districts in the sample where several Rajya Sabha MPs have recommended works, in addition to the Lok Sabha MP. A disproportionately large amount of money is flowing into these districts out of MPLADS fund alone. Apart from uneven distribution of development fund across districts, this increases the workload for the Collectors and their officials leading to weak monitoring and supervision. Many of these districts are not among the less developed ones in the country/State.

Lack of adequate information available to MPs seems to be one of the contributing factors leading to such an undesirable situation. Many of the MPs do not have full information even about the works they have recommended. Adequate arrangements need to be made for making all relevant information available to the MP. These should cover not only MPLADS but other developmental activities as well. As many of the selected Rajya Sabha MPs have recommended works in the same district (e.g. Muradabad –10 MPs) in addition to recommendation of works by Lok Sabha MP, there is a need for greater co-ordination between the MPs of a state on one hand and between the MPs and nodal agencies on the other so that, appropriate district will be selected for development works. As Rajya Sabha MPs have a wider choice in the selection of district, information made available to MPs will help in proper selection of district. There is a need to lay emphasis on the completion of the selected projects.

Nature and Status of Works

Out of 25702 works recommended and sanctioned in 57 sample constituencies during 1993-99 those classified under *Roads & Bridges* and *Community Works* dominate constituting 29 and 24 percent respectively of the total. These are followed by *Education* and *Drinking Water and Sanitation* in that order.

Of these works, 17545 constituting about 68 percent of the total are reported to be complete while another 3531 (14%) are in progress and about 9 percent are yet to start. However, the current status of 2289 of these works, constituting about 9 per cent of the total, could not be known from Collector's office. This perhaps, is the result of weak monitoring and improper maintenance of records.

Recommendation of Works and Locally Felt Needs

An overwhelming majority of the MPs have taken locally felt needs into consideration while recommending works. However in as many as 148 out of 590 villages/wards where the works were/are being executed the heads of the village/ward suggested that *the MPs while recommending works should take the locally felt needs into account*. Also, 8.5 per cent of the 590 sample works were not found to be in use for the intended purpose. Locally felt needs perhaps vary across socio economic groups comprising the Society. A small group having easy access to the MP at times may impress upon him to recommend works according to *their* felt needs. Consequently the felt needs of many others may get overlooked.

The PRIs may be asked to provide a list of works to be recommended to the MP annually. This list may also be displayed conspicuously for public information. With such a list in hand it will be easier for the MP to prioritize the felt needs of various groups of people in order of importance. A majority of the recommendation of works originating from the PRIs will perhaps ensure that these are the pressing needs of the larger section of the population.

Allocation of Funds and Quality of Assets

Most of the MPs while allocating funds to individual works seem to be thrifty, despite the fact that there is large unspent balance of MPLADS. Both CAG of India and this evaluation team found financial mismanagement of the scheme and consequent inflated reporting of the amount spent. If these are taken account of; the percentage utilization of fund will be much lower than what is being officially reported.

All the works in the sample constituencies when cross tabulated by sectors and amount allocated depicts a distribution, which is skewed towards lower allocation irrespective of the sector. At the aggregate level about 46.4 percent of the works got an allocation less than Rs. 50 thousand while works with allocation of Rs. 5 lakhs or more constitute only 3.6 per cent of the works. Many of these small works are so small that one may classify these as *petty works*. A large number of these come under *Roads & Bridges*. The roads thus constructed are often *Kachcha* and of short length because of inadequate funds. Such roads often fail to connect effectively one village with another or the village with other important places. This perhaps, is not in conformity with the objective of creating durable assets.

Although there is a procedure to prepare a cost estimate by some concerned agency after the MP recommends the work, allocation of fund by MP is generally done without considering such estimates. Discussion of the evaluation team with development functionaries revealed that in majority of the cases allocation of fund is done simultaneously with recommendation of the work. Cost estimates are prepared afterwards and perhaps, made to conform to the amount allocated by the MP.

Knowledgeable persons of the 132 villages/wards out of 590 indicated that funds are not always allocated according to estimated cost of the asset to be created. As many as 23 of the sample Collectors are of the explicit opinion that the quantum of fund allocated by MPs is not enough in many cases to maintain the desired quality of the assets. Allocation of insufficient fund by MPs leaves many of the works incomplete, though often officially reported as complete, or completed by compromising the quality of the asset. In quite a few cases allocation by the MP had to be supplemented by funds from a number of sources to complete the work.

The asset intended to be created may be described in more detail so that its cost implication is clear. Such cost implication and necessary inter-agency coordination can then be taken account of while allocating fund. This will enable the MP to allocate adequate funds for completion of the work leading to creation of a durable and useful asset. The MP may consider allocation of fund only after the cost estimate is prepared and the detailed work plan and coordination mechanism are made available to him. Perhaps, guidelines need to be changed so that funds are not spend thinly over a large number of projects.

The fund under the scheme being non-lapsable a large amount of unspent balance has accumulated which is rising over the years. Reasons for this, cited by Collectors and development functionaries, include recommendation of fewer works by some MPs and inadequate allocation for individual works. One solution to this problem, suggested by some of the MPs, is to make the fund lapsable. If the concerned MP fails to recommend enough works to cover the substantial part, say 80 percent, of the fund for the year the unspent balance may be returned to the Ministry at the Centre. Alternatively Department of Programme Implementation may consider allowing it to use as seed capital for self-help efforts by locals and NGOs. This provision, if made in the guidelines is likely to motivate the MPs to do away with the tendency to allocate inadequate fund for individual works.

Execution of Works

The executing agency is to be selected by the Collector with the limitation that it should be a Government department, Panchayati Raj Institution or a capable NGO of repute. In practice however, majority of the Collectors (57 out of 103) sought advice from the MP in selecting the executing agency. In some States, the MPs while recommending works and allocating funds also suggested the executing agencies.

Engagement of private contractors is not permitted. Almost all the Collectors claimed that no contractor is engaged for works under this scheme. However, as many as 272 of the 590 development functionaries conceded that the work has been actually executed by a contractor. They pleaded that this had to be done since the concerned Government department lacks necessary infrastructure. Local people also corroborated such facts.

Contractors are engaged generally taking shelter behind some technicalities. This also creates an atmosphere where many irregularities thrive. It will be better if the guidelines are amended accordingly and precise procedures specified for this purpose. Similarly, contingency charges are being claimed and sanctioned in many cases though not permitted in the guidelines. Many Collectors and other development functionaries expressed the view that the guidelines should be amended to allow for this.

Monitoring and Supervision

Monitoring and supervision is perhaps the weakest part of the scheme. This seems to be largely due to inadequate infrastructure available to the Collector vested with the responsibility.

Despite suggestion in the guidelines, the number of visits to the sites by the head of the district was far short of the norm. Only 4 out of 103 Collectors in the sample claimed to have personally visited 10 percent or more of the works. However, as many as 93 of them reported to have taken appropriate action on finding the progress unsatisfactory. These Collectors largely depended on other development

functionaries for monitoring. The concerned MPs visited the site in 212 cases out of 590 sample works. Of these, in 132 cases, the MPs visited the sites only once. The concerned Collectors could visit the site in 143 cases, of which in 88 cases the visit was only once.

Out of 103 Collectors interviewed, 92 claimed to have sent the monitoring report to the Ministry as prescribed in the guidelines. However, a large number of Collectors seem to have failed to send monitoring reports to concerned MPs every 2 months. As many as 48 MPs out of 116 reported that they have not received such reports at all, while another 14 received it only occasionally.

As many as 82 of the Collectors disclosed that they have no arrangement for teleconferencing, another 18 are not aware of any such facility. Among the 117 MPs, interviewed as many as 84 are not aware of any such facility.

Discussions by the evaluation team revealed that Internet and teleconferencing facilities do not exist in majority of the States. It seems the Ministry that formulated the guidelines has itself failed to follow the part pertaining to it. The ambition of the Ministry to *always have a complete and updated picture of the works under implementation* could not be achieved due to its own failure to provide facility for Internet and Teleconferencing. Thus, the object of *instantaneous monitoring of constituency wise progress* using Information Technology remained a goal yet to be reached. The Bureau of Parliamentary Studies and Training also failed to arrange for any training for the district officials. The responsibility of training the district officials has been shifted to the State governments while this study was in progress. However, it would be advisable to impart training to the district officials of the entire country by a centralized agency so that there could be better scope of uniformity and if possible replicability of the success story of the district of one State in the other.

Works recommended and sanctioned in the sample constituencies have been tabulated by sectors and current status. For 2289 of these works constituting about 9 per cent of the total, numbering 25702, current status could not be known from Collectors office. It seems that in a large number of cases, once the work is sanctioned and fund released, nobody kept track of progress. Such '*status not known*' works are largest in number among those classified under *Drinking Water and Sanitation* followed by *Roads & Bridges*. The evaluation team during its field visits failed to locate quite a few of the assets claimed to have been created in these sectors. Such cases, largely a consequence of weak monitoring perhaps, encourages various types of irregularities to thrive. The evaluation team also found quite a few cases where the actual status of the work was at variance with what is officially recorded.

An overwhelming majority of the Collectors and other development functionaries conceded weak monitoring and pleaded inadequacy of staff and other infrastructure to be the major reason for this. It seems necessary to strengthen the State nodal department in terms of staff and other infrastructure for this purpose. At the ground level the PRIs may be involved in execution as well as in monitoring to a

larger extent. This is already being done in a few States like Madhya Pradesh and Kerala with good results. Since the local people for whose benefit the assets are created, have stakes in timely completion of the work, the quality of the assets created and its proper maintenance and upkeep, supervision by PRIs at ground level is likely to be more effective. The PRIs may send monitoring reports to the State nodal department and the Collector periodically. The Collector on receipt of these reports can then make it available to the Ministry and the concerned MPs.

Maintenance of Assets

Maintenance of assets created is another area of weakness of the scheme. This seems to have received less attention than it deserves.

Despite suggestion in the guidelines only 55 of the 103 Collectors claimed that they could ensure some provision of maintenance before sanctioning works. For many of the assets created there seem to be no arrangement, either physical or financial, for maintenance. In fact, nobody seems to know how and by whom these assets are being maintained. Information gathered on this from different sources failed to match each other even closely. For some of the assets there is a *natural* agency for maintenance, upkeep and use. For example, assets created for an existing school or hospital will be used and looked after by the school or hospital. For others, it is necessary to locate an agency to maintain the assets. This should preferably be done before the work is sanctioned. As many as 95 of the Collectors claimed that they are maintaining a list of the assets created. However, many of them failed to make such a list available to the evaluation team. For many others, information about the assets supplied to the PEO regional offices at different times were found to be at variance with each other.

Functionaries at different levels conceded poor maintenance of the assets and pleaded inadequacy of institutional arrangement and finance responsible for this. Availability of adequate fund for this purpose will also need to be ensured either from public fund or through user charges to be collected.

Awareness Among People and Perceived Impact

The evaluation team during its visits to the worksite observed widespread lack of awareness about the scheme among the people. Even a board displaying the relevant information, which is mandatory according to MPLADS guidelines, was not erected in majority of the cases. Out of 590 development functionaries as many as 353 conceded that such a board could not be erected for one reason or the other. Among them, 61 appeared to be not even aware of this condition laid down in the guidelines.

During discussions with local people it was revealed that many of them were aware that the work in the village/ward *is being done by such and such MP*. However, they rarely had other details about the scheme or even about the particular work in his village/ward.

An overwhelming majority, more than 95 per cent, of the local people voted the assets created as useful to them. They also felt that the majority, about 83 percent, of the assets have a positive impact on their lives. For the majority of the assets, about 67 percent, the quality has also been assessed to be good by them. However, they felt only 53 percent of the assets are being maintained properly. For another 22 percent, quality of maintenance is rated to be average. One aspect of impact of the scheme, not less important by any means, is the perception of the common people for whose benefit the assets have been created. If they feel happy about it a part of the job is perhaps, well done. It is another matter to scrutinize what has been really achieved and what more could have been achieved with this quantum of fund if optimally used.

Awareness among the people is perhaps the best watchdog for successful implementation of any scheme. Displaying the details of the work at the site may be made mandatory. In addition, full details about all the ongoing works under MPLADS (and other such schemes) in the district may be displayed prominently at Collector's office. This will expose the scheme to public scrutiny and is likely to improve its performance. Other methods of publicity through local newspapers and electronic media may be explored. In addition, explaining the scheme in a meeting of the *Gram Sabha* for the benefit of those who cannot read and write is likely to be very effective.

It may however, be emphasised that the local people's knowledge about the scheme is limited. Their perception about the quality and utility of the assets should not be extended to infer about the overall performance of the scheme. Thus, satisfaction of the majority of the local people with the assets already created should not lead to the conclusion that money allocated under the scheme is being properly utilized and the scheme has achieved its intended objective.

Suggestions

Analysis in chapters 3-8 has shown that the scheme in its present form has a number of strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies at various stages from recommendation, execution, monitoring to maintenance of assets created. These have been located, discussed and commented upon during the course of analysis of available data and information. Some changes in the scheme seem to be necessary to improve its performance and achieve optimum benefits out of it. Some of the important suggestions for revitalizing the scheme are:

- Many of the MPs do not have full information even about the works they have recommended for effective monitoring and supervision of the works in progress. Adequate arrangements need to be made for making all relevant information available to the MP. These should cover not only MPLADS but other developmental activities as well. In addition, emphasis on co-ordination between MPs (both Lok Sabha and Rajya Sabha) and between MPs and nodal departments is required for the selection of districts. Upper limit on number of projects and completion of the same as per specifications with appropriate fund need to be ensured in the guidelines.

- The State nodal departments will need to be strengthened in terms of staff and other infrastructure. At the ground level, the PRIs may be involved in execution as well as in monitoring to a larger extent. The Collector may continue to receive fund from the Ministry and recommendation of works from MPs. He may also scrutinise the recommendations, accord administrative sanction and release fund for individual works. The execution, monitoring and supervision may be largely shared between the strengthened State nodal department and the PRIs. The PRIs may send monitoring reports to the State nodal department and the Collector periodically. The Collector on receipt of these reports can then make it available to the Ministry and the concerned MPs. Relevant information about other developmental activities in the district may also be made available to the MP. Equipped with these detailed information the MPs are likely to be in amore comfortable position to recommendation specific works.
- To help the MPs to prioritise the felt needs of various groups of population, the PRIs may be asked to provide a list of works to be recommended to the MP annually. This list may also be displayed conspicuously for public information.
- In majority of the states similar schemes with fund at the control of the members of respective Legislatures are in operation. The development fund allocated under these Schemes is substantial. It may be appropriate to think in terms of co-ordination of works recommended under these schemes together with those recommended for the respective Lok Sabha Constituencies and utilize them in a more fruitful way without interfering with the freedom of individual MPs and MLAs to recommend works of their choice within their budgetary limits. Focus must be on most important felt needs of the people and limiting the number of active projects per district. Allocating adequate money to the selected projects and completing the same. Such co-ordination will offer a few distinct advantages. First, with the consent of the MPs and MLAs it may be possible to allocate adequate money to selected works. Second, the approval and sanction of such schemes need not undergo routine departmental scrutiny, instead a simplified and speedy procedure may be followed by creating a separate agency for implementation under the State nodal department. Third, a single watchdog committee of representatives from major political parties for each LS constituency (with 6/7 MLA constituency) with the MP on the Chair may be formed to oversee the works in progress. The committee should meet quarterly to review progress and suggest remedial measures wherever needed
- To avoid inadequate allocation of fund for individual works, the asset intended to be created may be described in more details so that its cost implication is clear. The MP may consider allocation of fund only after the cost estimate is prepared and the detailed work plan and coordination mechanism are made available to him.

- Since engaging contractors and payment of contingency charges cannot be avoided for pragmatic reasons the guidelines may be amended accordingly and precise procedures specified for this purpose.
- For some of the assets there is a *natural* agency for maintenance, upkeep and use. For others, it is necessary to locate an agency to maintain the assets. This should preferably be done before the work is sanctioned. Availability of adequate fund for this purpose will also need to be ensured either from public fund or through user charges to be collected, wherever possible.
- One solution to the problem of rising unspent balance is to make the fund lapsable. If the concerned MP fails to recommend enough works to cover the substantial part, say 80 percent, of the fund for the year the unspent balance may be returned to the Ministry at the Centre. In case of a new MP, elected during the course of a financial year, the entire amount of Rs. 2 crore need not be released for him. The unspent balance of the predecessor MP should lapse. Amount to be released for the successor MP for the remaining part of the year may be determined in consultation with him. The amount thus released to the successor MP and the amount spent by the predecessor MP together should not exceed Rs. 2 crores. These procedural changes will prevent accumulation of unspent balance without affecting the development works under the scheme.
- Displaying the details of the work at the site may be made mandatory. In addition, full details about all the ongoing works under MPLADS (and other such schemes) in the district may be displayed prominently at Collector's office. Other methods of publicity through local newspapers and electronic media may be explored. In addition, explaining the scheme in a meeting of the *Gram Sabha* for the benefit of those who cannot read and write is likely to be very effective. The details may also be provided exhaustively on the internet so that it could be closer to public scrutiny which goes along the basic objective of the scheme which emphasizes creation of assets as per the felt needs of the people.

Chapter 1

The Scheme and the Study

Introduction

1.1 This scheme, Member of Parliament Local Area Development Scheme (MPLADS) was introduced in December, 1993 to enable the members of Parliament (MPs) to identify and get implemented small works of capital nature based on locally felt needs with emphasis on creation of durable assets in their respective constituencies. The scheme was perhaps, conceived in the light of the experience of two similar schemes operating in Maharashtra. During seventies each councilor of Mumbai Municipal Corporation had control over a fund of Rs.15000 per year to be spent on development of roads, parks and other civic amenities in their constituencies. In 1978 a similar scheme was introduced in Maharashtra with a fund of Rs.25 lakhs per year per member at the hands of the MLA/MLCs. The experience of proper functioning of these schemes appears to have prompted the proposal for such a scheme for the members of parliament at the centre in 1991. After prolonged discussion the proposal was accepted, the guidelines prepared and the scheme was introduced in 1993. By now the majority of the states also have similar schemes with varying amounts of fund at the control of the members of the respective legislatures. India is perhaps, the only country where such schemes are operating.

The Ministry of Rural Development (since renamed as Ministry of Rural Areas and Employment) initially administered the scheme. Since October 1994, it has been transferred to the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation (henceforth, the Ministry). The Ministry prepared guidelines to be followed, covering various aspects of the scheme and amended this from time to time. The salient features of the up -to -date (September, 1999) guidelines are indicated below:

Objectives of the Scheme

1.2 The main objective of the scheme is to enable the members of Parliament to recommend and get executed small works of capital nature in their constituencies. Those works can be taken up under the scheme as are developmental in nature and based on locally felt needs, with emphasis on creation of durable assets.

Administration of the Scheme

1.3 The Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation is the administrative ministry for MPLADS at the centre. At the level of states each state and union territory designates one nodal department for effective implementation of the works taken up under this scheme and coordination with the Ministry at the centre. The head of the district, where the MP recommends works, is directly responsible for implementation of the scheme at the ground level. The authority and power to receive

the MPLADS fund from the centre, to sanction the works recommended by MP after scrutinizing its conformity to the guidelines, to sanction the expenditure involved, to get the work executed and ensure maintenance of the assets created under this scheme are vested in him. In the National Capital Territory of Delhi, the Municipal Corporation of Delhi and for urban areas in Calcutta the Calcutta Municipal Corporation has these authorities and Powers.

Choice of Area

1.4 Under this scheme each elected member of the Lok Sabha (LS) can suggest developmental works to be executed out of MPLADS fund in his constituency. The elected members of the Rajya Sabha (RS) can choose one or more districts for this purpose from the state from where he has been elected. The nominated members of LS and RS can select one or more districts from any one state of their choice and suggest developmental works¹. When the scheme was launched each MP could choose only one district for suggesting developmental works. This has been revised in February 1997. According to this revised guidelines the Rajya Sabha MPs can now select more than one district for this purpose.

Recommendation of Works

1.5 Each MP can recommend to the district Collector developmental works, expenditure on each work generally not exceeding Rs. 10 lakhs (enhanced to Rs.25 lakhs in May 2000 while this study was in progress), up to a total expenditure of Rs. 2 crores every year. Initially this limit was Rs. 1 crore per MP per year. Since 1998-99 this fund has been enhanced to Rs. 2 crores per MP per year. The works recommended by the MP should be developmental in nature, based on locally felt needs with emphasis on creation of durable assets.

1.6 Initially, the works recommended under the scheme needed to conform to the general pattern of programme and projects within district plans and the centrally sponsored and central sector programmes operating within the district. Since the transfer of this scheme to the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation, the revised guidelines do not insist on such conformity.

Sanction of Works and Implementation

1.7 The Collector on receipt of the recommendation from the MP would scrutinize these for conformity to the guidelines suggested by the Ministry and the established procedure in the state prepared for the purpose. If found conformable, he should accord administrative sanction as far as possible, to all the works within 45 days. He should also release fund for the purpose and get these implemented through govt.

¹ The relevant provision in the guidelines has been amended while this study was in progress. The amended version reads as follows. "Nominated members can suggest works in one or more districts anywhere in the country."

agencies, Panchayati Raj Institutions (PRIs) or any other reputed and capable non-governmental organization (NGO). Engaging private contractors is not permitted.

1.8 The Collector should invariably get the concurrence of the MP in identifying, selecting and according administrative sanction of the works under the scheme. Normally the advice of the MP should prevail.

1.9 In case the district Collector finds on scrutiny that a work recommended by the MP cannot be sanctioned and implemented he should send a comprehensive report with reasons, within 45 days, to the MP under intimation to the nodal department of the state and the Department of Programme Implementation at the centre.

1.10 When there is a change in the MP, for whatever reason it may be, the following principle should be followed, as far as possible in executing works.

- If the work identified by the predecessor MP is under execution, it should be completed.
- If the work identified by the predecessor MP is pending sanction due to administrative reasons beyond a period of 45 days from the date on which recommendation was received for taking up the work, it should also be executed provided the work is otherwise as per norms.
- If the predecessor MP had identified the work, but it was not taken up for execution because of reasons other than administrative it can be executed subject to the confirmation of the successor MP.

Release of Fund

1.11 The guidelines prepared by the Ministry suggested norms to be followed regarding release of fund. These include the following:

- i) The Ministry would allocate fund to each Lok Sabha constituency, Rajya Sabha MP and nominated member each year immediately after the vote on Account/Budget is passed. Allocation of fund will be made keeping in view the actual progress achieved in expenditure and execution of works. In other words, fund would be available in the budget to the extent of Rs. 2 crores per MP per year.
- ii) The Ministry would release fund four times (earlier twice) in a year on the basis of the physical and financial progress of the works under implementation and further requirement of fund for works recommended.
- iii) Fund released by the Ministry would be non-lapsable. Fund released in a particular year, if they remain unutilized, can be carried forward to the

subsequent year without detracting from the allocation per year per constituency.

- iv) When there is a change in MP, for whatever reasons it may be, if the predecessor MP has not identified any work at all, allocation or release of fund to such predecessor MP will not be additionally given to the successor MP over and above the entitlement of the latter MP for the year concerned².
- v) In respect of Rajya Sabha MP, the unspent balance left by the predecessor MPs in a particular state will be equally distributed amongst the successor Rajya Sabha MPs in that particular state.
- vi) At the time of release of fund, the Department of Programme Implementation in consultation with the head of the concerned district will make an assessment of the fund required to complete the ongoing works. Such requirements of fund will be met first and then only the balance allocation will be considered for works further recommended.
- vii) Release of fund by the Collector should be arranged through the administrative authority available nearest to the work site such as a Block Development Officer.
- viii) Payment of advances of any type to the contractors/suppliers for any work falling within the scheme is prohibited.
- ix) If the concerned MP is not interested in utilizing the fund, he may write to the Ministry so that release is withdrawn.
- x) In case, a constituency falls in more than one district, the head of the (nodal) district that receives the money released by the Ministry shall make the required fund available to the other concerned district(s) in keeping with MP's choice so that the head(s) of such other district(s) could implement the works recommended by the MP in his districts(s).

Monitoring and Supervision

1.12 The guidelines concerning monitoring and supervision at the level of states and districts includes the following:

- i) Each state Govt./UT Administration shall designate one nodal department for physical monitoring through field inspection and for coordination with the Ministry.

² This provision included in the guidelines circulated on February 1997 is excluded in the latest version circulated on September 1999. However, the reasons behind this provision being excluded from the guidelines issued at later stage are not elaborated.

- ii) A schedule of inspections that prescribes the minimum number of field visits for each supervisory level functionary of the implementing agency may be drawn up by the state nodal department.
- iii) The heads of district should visit and inspect at least 10 per cent of the works every year. He should also involve the concerned Members of Parliament in such inspection and monitoring to the maximum extent feasible.
- iv) The heads of the district should also furnish monitoring reports once in two months to the MPs and the Ministry. The Ministry would decide the monitoring formats and other issues of details relevant to this scheme from time to time within the framework of the scheme.
- v) It should be the responsibility of the senior officers of implementing agencies of these works to regularly visit the work site and ensure that the works are progressing satisfactorily as per the prescribed procedures and specifications.
- vi) Officers of district at the sub-divisional and block level shall also closely monitor implementation of these works through visits to work site.
- vii) The Ministry should always have with it a complete and updated picture of the works under implementation. To facilitate this the district heads should communicate information on the progress of works under the scheme on the Internet for which connectivity is available in the Parliament.
- viii) The Ministry in coordination with the Lok Sabha Secretariat and the Rajya Sabha Secretariat will furnish software required for reporting on the Internet
- ix) A senior commissioner level officer at the state head quarters should conduct annual meetings involving the head of districts and MPs to assess the progress of works under the scheme. Periodic teleconferences may also be organised to clarify doubts and remove bottlenecks.
- x) In order to bring about continuous improvement in the implementation of the scheme, the Bureau for Parliamentary Studies and Training (BPST) may arrange training of district officials in batches, involving and bringing about interaction with the MPs.³

3 The relevant provision in the guidelines has been amended while this study was in progress. The amended provision reads as follows.

“State Governments concerned may make arrangements for training of district officials concerned with the implementation of MPLAD Scheme. In the light of experience gained in the functioning and performance of district officials corrective measures may be incorporated by the states in their training programmes to improve deficiencies observed in implementation of the scheme”.

- xi) To improve awareness among the people, signboards indicating the details of the work and the information that the work is under MPLADS may be prominently erected at the site.

Maintenance of Assets Created

1.13 Regarding maintenance of assets created under MPLADS the guidelines include the following suggestions:

The head of the district should ensure that provision for maintenance and upkeep of the assets created under the scheme is forthcoming from the concerned local body or some relevant agency such as government aided institution or registered society.

1.14 Apart from those indicated here the guidelines suggested many other detailed norms and procedure to be followed at various stages from recommendation of works to maintenance and use of the assets created. These details are available in the guidelines circulated by the Department of Programme Implementation.

Need for this Study

1.15 The scheme is in operation since December 1993. However, no comprehensive evaluation study on its performance and efficacy has been undertaken. A couple of localised studies covering some limited aspects are available. The findings of these studies indicate to various deficiencies including low utilization of fund, slow progress, failure to yield durable assets and other irregularities.

1.16 The two reports of the Comptroller and Auditor General (CAG) of India, covering the periods 1993-97 and 1997-2000 have also made similar and more pointed observations about the operation of the scheme. The latter report in particular commented as follows:

- “Overall, the audit findings reveal failures: in operationalising the MPLADS; in meeting its stated objectives; in conforming to the prescription of the scheme by the MPs at the recommendation stage and the District Officers at the execution stage; and last but not the least, admitted failure of the Ministry to effectively administer and monitor the scheme.”

1.17 The CAG reports suggested a thorough review of the scheme covering the manner of resource transfer along with the technical and administrative arrangement. The Standing Committee on Finance in its second report on demand for grants (1998-99) also made similar suggestions to the Ministry. Accordingly, the Ministry requested the Programme Evaluation Organisation of the Planning Commission to undertake this evaluation study of the MPLADS, to assess the design, implementation and impact of the scheme, and identify the areas of its weakness, and strength.

Chapter 2

Objectives, Data Base and Methodology

2.1 The Programme Evaluation Organisation (PEO) of the Planning Commission at the instance of the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation has undertaken this evaluation study to assess the design, quality of implementation and impact of MPLADS.

Objectives of the Study

2.2 The broad objectives of the study include the following:

- i) To study whether the guidelines laid down for the MPLADS in regard to sanction, execution of works and mechanism of maintenance of assets created are being followed.
- ii) To examine the nature and modality of coordination between district Collectors, development functionaries and the MPs and its impact on implementation of the programme.
- iii) To examine the modality, phasing and schedule of release and utilization of fund for various works under the scheme including the problems arising in fund management.
- iv) To study the monitoring and feedback mechanism adopted at different nodes and its impact on implementation and outcome of the programme.
- v) To study whether the works implemented under the MPLADS have in any way been supplemental to the District Plan Schemes and whether the scheme has met the felt needs of the people.

2.3 The findings of the study may also help in (a) assessing the extent to which the specified objectives of the scheme are being met (b) identifying the areas of success and failure (c) making diagnostic analysis of such successes and failure, to identify the causal factors and (d) to make mid-course intervention to modify design and implementation for better performance of the scheme.

The Data Base

2.4. The findings of this study is largely based on the analysis of the data collected from a sample of the following:

(1) Members of the two houses of Parliament (2) Nodal department of states and Union Territories, (3) District Collectors/chief coordinators, (4) Development functionaries (5) Head/knowledgeable person of villages/wards of the location of works under the scheme and (6) Members of public living in the area or otherwise related to such works or persons though not living in the closer vicinity of the created asset but using it such as road, culvert, school, dispensary, mobile van etc. These data have been supplemented by data from other sources including published and unpublished records of govt. departments and studies and investigations by other agencies.

2.5 The sample survey covers 20 states and 2 Union Territories (listed in Annexure-2.2). Other States and Union Territories had to be excluded due to operational difficulties.

Selection of Lok Sabha MPs

2.6 The sampling unit for Lok Sabha has been the constituencies. All the constituencies in a state have been grouped into a suitable number of geographical regions depending on the size of the state. However, this grouping of states is purely on geographical lines and the political dimension of regional variations has not been taken into account. These groups in each state were then further stratified into two on the basis of their utilization of fund for MPLADS – higher (above state average) and lower (below state average). From each of these strata so formed a pre-assigned number of constituencies have been selected at random. The selected sample contained 2 to 4 constituencies from each sample state except A&N Islands, Chandigarh and Sikkim, which are represented by only one MP in Lok Sabha. The unit of observation has been the Lok Sabha MPs holding office during 1994-99 in these selected constituencies. Thus the sample included 57 current and 39 ex-MPs of Lok Sabha spread over 22 States and Union Territories. Of these 96 selected MPs, 4 failed to respond bringing down the effective sample size to 92 only. The list of selected constituencies is included in Annexure 2.1.

Selection of Rajya Sabha MPs

2.7 In case of Rajya Sabha the current MPs in each state have been stratified into two on the basis of their utilization of fund of MPLADS i.e. category of Rajya Sabha MPs who have spent more than 50% of the fund allocated for them and those who have spent less than 50% of the fund. A pre-assigned number of MPs have been selected at random from each non-empty stratum. However, in case of such states where the total number of Rajya Sabha MPs is 10 or less only one MP has been selected at random without stratification. The sample included 28 Rajya Sabha MPs spread over 20 states. The Union Territories of Chandigarh and Andaman & Nicobar Islands have no representation in Rajya Sabha. Despite best efforts by the evaluation team response from three of these MPs could not be obtained. Thus, the effective sample includes 25 Rajya Sabha MPs only.

Selection of Districts

2.8 For each of the Lok Sabha constituencies and Rajya Sabha MPs in the sample a district wise list of all works undertaken out of MPLADS fund since the inception of the scheme have been prepared. Out of these the district with the largest number of works in case of a Lok Sabha constituency/Rajya Sabha MP in the period 1996-98 has been chosen for detailed study. Thus, there are 85 such districts in the sample. In a few cases the district thus selected happened to be different from the nodal district to which MPLADS fund is released by the Ministry at the centre. All such nodal districts, numbering 18 have also been selected in the sample for detailed study. Thus, there are 103 districts in the sample

Selection of Works, Villages and Wards

2.9 In the chosen districts the works under MPLADS have been grouped into seven sectors as enumerated below:

1. Roads and bridges
2. Irrigation.
3. Drinking water and sanitation
4. Community works
5. Education
6. Health and
7. Others

2.10 One work from each of the non-empty sectors has been selected at random. In case, one or more sectors are empty in the chosen district, selection has been made from other sectors to make the number of sample works seven in each district. However, a few of the works thus selected turned out to have been abandoned or not yet started making the effective sample size 590, smaller than $595 = (85 \times 7)$.

2.11 The villages/urban wards where sample works are located have been selected for collection of data on various aspects of development, amenities available and awareness of MPLADS. In addition, information about popular perception and impact of works undertaken under MPLADS have also been gathered for analysis from people living around the place of the selected work and /or likely to be influenced by it. For this purpose two sets of respondents have been interviewed. The first set of respondents included the Sarpanch/Pradhan/Patel of the sample village and the Municipal Councilor, numbering 411 constituted more than two third of the total respondents. When such respondents were not available on the days when the evaluation team visited the site, other knowledgeable persons in the village/ward were interviewed. The sample contains 590 respondent of this set one from each sample village/ward. An attempt was made to interview 5 local people for each of the 590 sample works. However in a few cases this could not be done due to operational and other difficulties. The evaluation team could gather information and opinion from

2892 of the local people which falls short of the targeted number, $590 \times 5 = 2950$, by 58. Thus this second set of respondents contains 2892 local people.

2.12 Besides, formal and informal discussions were held by the field teams of PEO and the headquarter officials with the selected MPs, officials of the state nodal departments, district Collectors and development functionaries working with various implementing agencies during the course of field investigations to supplement the data collected in the survey. The team also visited a large number of work sites to assess the progress of the scheme at the grass root level and scrutinize the assets created, their maintenance and use.

Instruments used for Collection of Data

2.13 The following instruments were structured and used for collection of data from the units of observation in the sample.

Schedule for MPs

2.14 This schedule has been designed with a view to get the first hand information from the selected MPs on the aspects relating to recommendation of work according to the identified objective of the scheme, sanction by the concerned district Collectors/heads of the implementing agencies, release of fund, coordination among MPs, Collectors and Development functionaries, monitoring of the work, utilization of fund and maintenance of assets created.

Schedule for Nodal Departments at the State Level

2.15 This schedule has been designed to collect information at the state level from the department designated as nodal department by the concerned State Govt. for physical monitoring through field inspection and for coordination with the Ministry. This schedule covers the information from State nodal departments on aspects relating to monitoring, mandatory field inspection, and coordination with development agencies for State Legislature Development Schemes (i.e. MLA Development Scheme if existing in the concerned state) and utilization of fund.

Schedule for District Collectors/ Chief Coordinator

2.16 This schedule has been designed for collecting basic information from heads of the districts/ heads of the implementing agencies at the district level on details of LS constituencies/RS MPs covered by them, progress of works under MPLADS, procedure followed for sanction of the works, release of fund, coordination with MPs, selection of executing agencies/ implementing agencies, training of district official by Bureau of Parliamentary Studies and Training, monitoring of works and maintenance of assets created.

Schedule for Development Functionaries

2.17 This schedule has been designed for collecting information from the development functionaries (i.e. the key functionary responsible for implementation at the local level). Such functionaries include the BDOs, executive engineers, assistant engineers, junior engineers and BDPOs. The information collected through this schedule pertains to description of sample works, cost of work, schedule of work, training of the respondent development functionary, monitoring and supervision and maintenance and utilization of assets created.

Schedule for Villages/Urban Wards

2.18 This schedule has been designed for collecting information at the level of Panchayat/village/urban ward where the work has been executed. The information collected through this schedule pertained to the physical details of the village/urban ward, relating to the existing amenities/services/facilities available, maintenance of created assets and the impact of the assets created on quality of life of the people. The respondents were the executives of PRIs, local bodies, local school teacher and other knowledgeable persons in the area.

Schedule for Local People

2.19 This schedule has been prepared to collect information from the local people about their awareness of the scheme, perception about quality and maintenance of the asset and the impact of the selected work on their quality of life.

Quality and Composition of the Works

2.20 In the process of selecting the district from a constituency for detailed study some information about all the works undertaken under MPLADS in the constituency have also been collected. These data have been subjected to analysis to throw light on the nature, quality and composition of the works undertaken under the scheme.

The Sample Size

2.20 Following are the details of the respondents interviewed in the survey.

Unit interviewed	Numbers
State Nodal Department	22
MP (Lok Sabha)	92
MP (Rajya Sabha)	25
District Collector	103
Development Functionary	590
Village/Urban Ward Level Knowledgeable person	590
Local people	2892

The Reference Period

2.21 The reference period for the study was 1994-95 to 1998-99 i.e. from the beginning of the MPLADS till the preceding year of the study.

Orientation of the Field Teams

2.22 The study design and the instruments were finalized in the meeting of the heads of the Regional Evaluation Offices (REOs) of the PEO held on 3rd & 4th February 2000. For the field staff of the REOs and PEOs regional orientation programmes were held at Chennai on 21st & 22nd February, 2000, at Mumbai on 24th & 25th February, 2000 at Kolkata on 8th & 9th March, 2000 and at Lucknow on 9th & 10th March, 2000 where all the instruments prepared for the study were explained to field teams of the selected states. The study was launched in the field in April 2000.

Chapter 3

Recommendation, Sanction and Execution

The outcome of implementation of any scheme largely depends on the activities of the agencies involved, the choice they make when there are multiple options and the way the discretions are exercised. In this scheme the MPs and the Collectors have major roles at various stages. This Chapter looks at the decisions and actions taken by the MPs, Collectors and other functionaries, constraints faced by them and the consequences thereof with a view to suggest steps to improve the impact of the scheme on the quality of life of the people.

Choice of Districts

3.2 An elected member of Lok Sabha covers the district(s) within his constituency and recommends works there, while for the elected Rajya Sabha members the area of choice is wider covering the entire state. Table 3.1 displays the number of districts so chosen by Lok Sabha MPs in the sample for recommending developmental works. Out of the 117 MPs in the sample there are 46 MPs whose constituency covered more than one district or who recommended works in more than one district. A large number of MPs have recommended works in 1 or 2 districts only while quite a few of them have done so covering more than 4 districts:

Table 3.1

Number of districts covered by selected MPs for recommending works

Number of districts covered	Number of	
	Lok Sabha MPs	Rajya Sabha MPs
1	34	1
2	11	4
3	11	2
4 and above	5	12
Information not available	31	6
Total	92	25

3.3 Presumably, these districts have been selected by more than one MP keeping in view their level of development and availability of various amenities according to the judgment of and advice received by the respective MPs in this regard. A look at this issue from the other angle brings forth an interesting fact. There are quite a few districts in the sample where several Rajya Sabha MPs have recommended works in addition to the respective Lok Sabha MP. Information about a few of such districts in the sample is displayed in Table 3.2. Many of these districts are however, not among

the less developed ones in the country/state. There seem to be other considerations than the development status of the district that attract such a large number of MPs to recommend works in these districts. The information collected in this sample survey and those compiled by the Ministry proved inadequate for identification of these factors. An analysis of data on inflow of fund from MPLADS to each of the districts in the country together with other relevant information may reveal these factors. This study team however, could not locate such a data set from any source.

Table 3.2

Some Districts in the Sample Chosen by Rajya Sabha MPs in addition to its being covered by concerned Lok Sabha MP

Name of the districts chosen by more than one Rajya Sabha MP	Number of Rajya Sabha MPs selecting the district for works
Muradabad	10
Bhopal	6
Thanjavur Thiruvananthapuram Allapuzha Meerut Badaun	5
Raigarh Thirunelveli Salem Thiruvallur Lucknow Muzaffarnagar Kanpur Nagar	4
Hyderabad Kancheepuram Kanpur Dehat Jaypore (Orissa) Kamrup Patiala	3
Cuddapah Sarguja Pudukottai West Siang East Sikkim South 24 Parganas Hughli Mehsana	2

Nature and Size of Works Recommended and Sanctioned

3.4 In the process of selecting the sample districts from a constituency a district wise list of all the works recommended and sanctioned in the sample constituencies was prepared. Some auxiliary information relating to these works have also been gathered. These works numbering more than 25 thousand have been classified into 7 sectors and cross tabulated according to the current status of these works in table 3.3.

Table 3.3

Distribution of works sanctioned by sectors and status in the sample constituencies

Sector	Current status*					Total	Work of this sector as % to total
	Yet to start	In progress	Completed	Abandoned	Not known		
Roads & Bridges	670 (8.87)	972 (12.87)	5401 (71.50)	18 (0.24)	493 (6.53)	7554 (100.00)	29
Irrigation	61 (8.16)	129 (17.25)	535 (71.52)	2 (0.27)	21 (2.81)	748 (100.00)	3
Drinking water & Sanitation	302 (8.81)	356 (10.39)	2067 (60.33)	10 (0.29)	691 (20.17)	3426 (100.00)	13
Community works	642 (10.64)	892 (14.78)	4016 (66.56)	12 (0.20)	472 (7.82)	6034 (100.00)	24
Education	364 (7.59)	718 (14.78)	3334 (69.53)	6 (0.13)	373 (7.78)	4795 (100.00)	19
Health	44 (8.73)	77 (15.28)	336 (66.67)	0 (0.00)	47 (9.33)	504 (100.00)	2
Others	190 (7.19)	387 (14.65)	1856 (70.28)	16 (0.61)	192 (7.27)	2641 (100.00)	10
All sectors	2273 (8.84)	3531 (13.74)	17545 (68.26)	64 (0.25)	2289 (8.91)	25702 (100.00)	100

* Figures in parentheses are percent of works in that status

3.5 It is revealed that of these 25702 works 17545 constituting about 68 per cent are complete, 3531 constituting about 14 per cent are in progress. However for about 9 per cent of these works the current status could not be known from Collector's office. It seems that in a large number of cases once the work is recommended, sanctioned and fund released, no body kept track of the progress. Such *status not known* works are largest in number among those classified under *Drinking water and sanitation* followed by *Roads and bridges*. The evaluation team during their field visits failed to locate quite a few of the assets claimed to have been created in these sectors. Such cases, largely a consequence of weak monitoring, perhaps encourage various types of irregularities to thrive.

3.6 Among the works recommended and sanctioned those under sectors *Roads and bridges* and *Community works* dominate, constituting 29 and 24 per cent respectively

of the total works recommended and sanctioned in sample constituencies. These are followed by *Education* and *Drinking water and Sanitation* in that order. This is the aggregate picture covering all the sample constituencies.

Recommendation of Works and felt Needs

3.7 The MPs while recommending works are expected to keep the felt needs of the people in view. The guidelines suggested by the Ministry however, do not specify any method to be adopted to ascertain the locally felt needs. The concerned MP ascertains this using his own judgment and advice received by him. Information gathered from the MPs and displayed in Table 3.4 below indicates that an overwhelming majority of the MPs kept the locally felt needs in view while recommending works. Presumably, this must have been done on the basis of the information available to the MP and the advices he might have received in this regard. The data collected in this sample survey permits to crosscheck the effectiveness of this method with popular perception. The Evaluation team canvassed a schedule with the heads of the villages/ wards where the works had been/were being executed. In as many as 148 out of 590 such villages/wards the heads interviewed suggested that *the MPs while recommending works should take the locally felt needs into account*. Also about 8.47 per cent of the total number of assets created in the sample constituencies were found to be in use other than the intended purpose. For example a concrete platform near a hospital constructed out of MPLADS fund is being used as an open-air latrine polluting the area.

Table 3.4

Criteria adopted by MPs while recommending works

Criteria	Number of MP using this as	
	First priority	Second priority
Judge the felt needs of the people	67	43
Go strictly by the guidelines	45	43
Others	5	24
Total	117	110*

* 7 of the MPs covered under the sample indicated only one Priority.

Similarly in two districts in Karnataka a large number of community halls have been constructed. It is a common scene in both these districts to find people fetching water in small pushcarts. Shortage of drinking water is a perennial problem. One of these community halls has been constructed long before the village became inhabited. Currently the private contractors are using this for storing construction materials for the houses under construction in the village. There are also instances of constructing more than one community hall in the same village. A freedom fighters home constructed in a town of the same state is being used by truck drivers to park their trucks.

Locally felt needs perhaps, varies across socio-economic groups comprising the society. A small group having easy access to the MP at times may impress upon him to recommend works according to *their* felt needs. The works thus recommended may not always correspond to the pressing needs of the larger section of the population. Consequently, the felt needs of many others may get overlooked. Involving the local people through PRIs/local bodies or beneficiary committees as in Kerala may improve the situation. The PRIs may be asked to provide a list of works to be recommended to the MP, periodically. It may then be easier for the MP to prioritize the felt needs of various groups in order of importance. Majority of the recommendation of works originating from the PRIs will perhaps, ensure that these are the pressing needs of the larger section of the population.

Allocation of Fund and Quality of Asset Created

3.8 Another occasion for the MP to exercise his discretion is the time of his allocating fund for individual works recommended by him. The works recommended and sanctioned in the sample constituencies have been cross tabulated by sector and fund allocated by the concerned MP in table 3.5. For quite a few of the works, including some reported to be complete, information about the amount allocated was not available in Collectors office. The table therefore confines to only those works for which such information could be obtained. Table 3.5 depicts the aggregate picture for all the sample constituencies. It is clear from the data displayed in table 3.5 that allocation of fund is skewed towards lower amounts irrespective of sectors. Around 46.4% of the works got an allocation less than Rs. 50 thousand. Only in case of 3.6% of works the amount allocated was Rs. 5 lakhs or more. Even in case of *education* and *health* where assets to be created are likely to be costly, percentage of works getting an allocation less than a lakh were 63.7 and 43.1 respectively. Of these 37.4% and 29.1% of the allocation falls short of Rs. 50 thousand. A large number of these small works come under *Roads and Bridges*. The roads thus constructed are often *kachha* (Kharanja) and are of short length because of allocation of inadequate fund. In quite a few cases these fail to adequately connect one village to another or the village to other important places such as nearest town, nearby schools, colleges and Government offices. This perhaps, is not in conformity with the objective of creating durable assets. Allocations of inadequate fund often fail to ensure durability and usefulness of such assets.

Table 3.5**Sector wise distribution of completed works by amount allocated in the sample constituencies**

Sector	Amount allocated (Rs. Lakhs)*						Percentage of works in this sector
	0-.50	0.50-1.00	1.00-5.00	5.00-10.00	Above 10.00	All	
Roads and Bridges	2012 (37.25)	1103 (20.42)	2044 (37.84)	225 (4.17)	17 (0.31)	5401 (100.00)	30.78
Irrigation	167 (31.21)	103 (19.25)	227 (42.43)	37 (6.92)	1 (0.19)	535 (100.00)	3.05
Drinking Water & Sanitation	1219 (58.97)	357 (17.25)	437 (21.14)	45 (2.18)	9 (0.44)	2067 (100.00)	11.78
Community works	2504 (62.35)	680 (16.93)	730 (18.18)	93 (2.32)	9 (0.22)	4016 (100.00)	22.89
Education	1247 (37.40)	877 (26.30)	1147 (34.40)	58 (1.74)	5 (0.15)	3334 (100.00)	19.00
Health	98 (29.17)	47 (13.99)	159 (47.32)	28 (8.33)	4 (1.19)	336 (100.00)	1.92
Others	896 (48.28)	400 (21.55)	458 (24.68)	95 (5.12)	7 (0.38)	1856 (100.00)	10.58
All Sectors	8143 (46.41)	3567 (20.33)	5202 (29.65)	581 (3.31)	52 (0.30)	17545 (100.00)	100.00

* Figures in parentheses are percentage of works in that sector getting this allocation.

3.9 Although there is a procedure to prepare a cost estimate by the concerned agency after the MP recommends the work, in majority of the cases allocation of fund is made simultaneously with recommendation of works. Cost estimates are prepared afterwards and perhaps, made to conform to the amount allocated by the MP. Consequently, many of the works are either completed by supplementing the fund allocated by MP by fund procured from other sources or compromising the quality of the asset created. The findings of the evaluation team during its field visits also corroborated these facts. In quite a few cases the work either remained incomplete due to insufficient fund allocated by the MP or were supplemented by fund from other sources. An appropriate example, of course not the only one, is a gymnasium constructed for a school in Assam. Because of inadequate fund the *completed* gymnasium has no sports infrastructure and thus remained virtually incomplete. Some times fund is allocated in several small instalments. In Madhya Pradesh a stadium is under construction for quite sometime. Apart from MPLADS, fund is flowing in from MLAs, State Government and local bodies, but all in piecemeal, more than one time in a year and every year.

3.10 Most of the MPs while allocating fund to individual works seem to be thrifty despite the fact that there is a large unspent balance of MPLADS fund as depicted in Table 3.6. Both CAG of India and this evaluation team found financial mismanagement of the scheme and consequent inflated reporting of amount spent. If these are taken into account the percentage utilization of the fund will be much lower than what is being officially reported. There are wide variations across states, which

can be seen in Annexures 3.1 and 3.2 of this Chapter. This paradox of rising unspent balance and allocation of inadequate fund by the MPs going together needs to be examined in greater details. This study team however, failed to undertake such analysis with the available data on hand.

3.11 To avoid inadequate allocation of fund and its undesirable consequences, the asset intended to be created may be described in more details to make its cost implications clear. Such cost implication can then be taken account of while allocating fund. This will enable the MP to allocate enough funds for completion of the work leading to creation of a durable and useful asset. The MPs may consider allocation of fund only after the cost estimate is made available to him.

Table 3.6

Trends in utilization of the MPLADS fund

(Rs. Crore)

Date up to	Cumulative release of fund	Cumulative expenditure	Percentage utilisation
31.3.1997	2349.80	1285.50	54.71
31.3.1998	2837.80	1549.00	54.58
31.3.1999	3627.30	2315.40	63.83
31.3.2000	5017.80	3221.21	64.20

Source: Ministry of Statistics & Programme Implementation, Quoted in CAG report March, 2000

3.12 The fund under the scheme being non-lapsable a large amount of unspent balance has accumulated which is rising over the years. Reasons for this, cited by Collectors and development functionaries, include recommendation of fewer works by some MPs and inadequate allocation for individual works. A large part of the fund meant for developmental works is thus remaining idle. One solution to this problem, suggested by a few of the MPs, is to make the fund lapsable. If the concerned MP fails to recommend enough works to cover the substantial part, say 80 percent, of the fund for the year the unspent balance may be returned to the Ministry at the centre. This provision, if made in the guidelines is likely to motivate the MPs (and the PRIs) to recommend adequate number of works and also do away with the tendency to allocate inadequate fund for individual works. Consequently, the problem of unspent balance may be solved to a large extent.

Sanction of Works by the Collector

3.11 As per the Para 3.2 of the guidelines, all sanctions for works should be accorded within 45 days from the date of receipt of proposal from the concerned MP. Table 3.7 below displays the distribution of recommended works in sample districts by time taken by concerned Collector in processing for sanction.

Table 3.7**Distribution of Works recommended by time taken in processing for sanction**

(Number of Works)

Time taken in processing	No. of works recommended				
	1996-97	97-98	98-99	Total	Percentage to total
Within 45 days	1563	1034	2484	5081	75
Beyond 45 days	529	518	640	1687	25
Total No. of works	2092	1552	3124	6768	100

The concerned MPs indicated that in about 75 percent of the cases they received the feed back about sanction of works within the stipulated period of 45 days.

3.12 Efforts were also made to find out the action taken by MPs in case of their not receiving such feed back within 45 days. Table 3.8 below displays the different actions taken by MPs in such cases.

Table 3.8**Action taken by MP on non-receipt of feed back within 45 days**

(Number of MPs)

Sl. No	Type of action	Frequency	Percentage
1.	Request the Collector/Line Department to look into the matter	26	22
2.	Raise the issue in Implementation Committee at District Level	3	3
3.	Send reminders on telephone or in writing	41	35
4.	Personal visit of the representative	6	5
5.	Cases sanctioned on time	2	2
6.	No response	39	33
	Total	117	100

3.13 From the above table, it is observed that 41 (35%) MPs reminded the Collector and Development Functionary telephonically or in writing for expediting the work while almost an equal number 39(33%) did not do anything.

3.14 Out of 117 MPs, 38 (32%) reported that not all the works recommended by them were sanctioned. Out of these 6 (16%) MPs did not feel satisfied with the reasons given by the District Collector for not sanctioning the works, while 11 (29%) MPs felt partly satisfied. Two of these MPs failed to respond to this query. The details of the reasons cited by the concerned Deputy Commissioners/Development functionaries in such cases are displayed below in table 3.9.

Table 3.9**Reasons cited by the District Collectors for not sanctioning the work**

(Number of Collectors)

Sl. No	Reasons for not sanctioning the work	Frequency	Percentage
(a)	The recommendation not being as per Appendix-1 of the guidelines	15	39
(b)	The recommended work was one of the excluded items as per Appendix-II of the guidelines	4	11
(c)	Land dispute	6	16
(d)	Cost is higher than the prescribed limit	3	8
(e)	Proposals for the completing of particular work transferred to other scheme	2	5
(f)	Duplication of work	1	3
(g)	Local reasons	2	5
(h)	Non-response	5	13
	Total	38	100

On enquiry from the MPs about action taken by them in case of their not feeling satisfied with the reasons given by the concerned DC for not sanctioning the work recommended, the priority-wise action taken by such MPs is indicated in Table 3.10 below:

Table 3.10**Action taken by MPs in case of their recommended works not found feasible by the concerned district Collector**

No. of MPs not satisfied with the reasons given by the District Collector for not sanctioning the recommended works	No. of MPs having written to the Ministry for redressal of their grievances	No. of MPs having written to the MOS Planning & Programme Implementation.	No. of MPs who brought it to the notice of Speaker L.S or Dy. Chairman, Rajya Sabha.	MP who did not respond
19 (100%)	10 (52.63%)	5 (26.31%)	2 (10.53%)	2 (10.53%)

3.15 Thus it seems that 52.63% of the dissatisfied/partly satisfied MPs preferred to write to the Ministry for redressal of their grievances regarding non-sanction of the works by the concerned District Collector.

Receiving Status Report of the Work

The Table 3.11 below indicates the feedback received by MPs about the status of the work from the concerned district authorities.

Table 3.11

Number of MPs receiving status report of the works under execution once in every 2 months

Status report of the work sent to MPs:	No. of MPs	Percentage
Receiving once in every 2 months	52	44
Receiving the report some times	14	12
Not receiving the Report once in every 2 months	48	41
Not responding to this query	3	3
Total	117	100

3.16 Out of 117 MPs, 52 (44%) indicated that they received the report once in every two months while 14 (12%) of them received the report only occasionally. This reflects that in more than 50% cases the District Authorities failed to send the status report of the work to the concerned MPs once in every 2 months. It may be made mandatory for the heads of the districts to send the status report to the MPs because in absence of that the follow up/monitoring on the part of MPs may not be possible.

3.17 Of the 117 MPs in the sample, 38 MPs (32%) had the works recommended by their predecessors pending clearance for 627 works. Out of these 29 (91%) MPs reported to have given their concurrence to all the pending works of their predecessors. Thus, it is observed that about 9% of the MPs having the works recommended by their predecessors pending did not concur in all the pending works of their predecessors.

Sanction of Works

3.18 As per the guidelines, the head of the districts are directed to invariably get the concurrence of the Member of Parliament in identifying and selecting works and giving administrative sanction for the same. The guideline also observes that where the head of the district considers that a work suggested by an MP can not be executed, he should send a comprehensive report with reasons to the MP under intimation to the Department of the State Government dealing with the subject and to the Department of Programme Implementation at the centre. However, it is observed that this directive is not being strictly adhered to as explained in Table 3.11. Regarding the selection of executing agency, it was observed that out of 103 District Collectors only 57 (55%) solicited the advice of concerned MP for selection of executing agency.

3.19 While sanctioning the works under this scheme, the heads of the districts are supposed to follow the set procedure for working out the technical and economic feasibility of works. Table 3.12 below indicates the procedure followed by Deputy Commissioners in working out the technical and economic feasibility of work recommended under the scheme.

Table 3.12

Procedure followed by District Collector to work out the technical and economic feasibility of the works recommended by MP under MPLADS

Stage	Procedure adopted	No. of District Collectors adopting the procedure	Percentage
1	2	3	4
Technical feasibility	Examining technical feasibility of the project	29	28
	Preparation of plan estimate by the Line Department/concerned Department/Administration approval by DC/release of fund	27	26
	Examine the nature of work and local condition	14	13
	Verification of sites/location of work	15	15
	Examine the suggestions of the MP/Demand from Public Panchayat	15	15
	Follow the MPLADS guidelines	3	3
	Not responded	0	0
Cost estimates	Based on the schedule of PWD and the norms fixed by the concerned line Department	44	43
	Based on the annual rate fixed for material and other supplies	16	15
	Estimate prepared as per the suggestion of MP.	16	15
	Estimate prepared as per the suggestion of DM, DC, CDO, CCO or other officials of the implementing Agency.	20	20
	Examine the cost ceiling with reference to the MPLADS guidelines	4	4
	Not responded	3	3
Selection of executing agency	Examine the efficiency of the concerned Department under whose jurisdiction the work falls.	42	41
	Taking into account the recommendation of the MP	21	20
	Examine the site of the work/nature of work	9	9
	Follow the MPLADS guidelines	9	9
	Executing agency recommended by the DM, CDO, CCO, DC and implementing authority	16	15
	Not responded	6	6
Selection of monitoring agency	Periodical review meetings and field inspection conducted by District Collector/DM	51	49
	Physical verification by the officials of the Coordinating Agency.	9	9

	Monitoring by the Line Department which is executing the work by means of their previous work experience	20	19
	Physical verification by the technical staff nominated by the Implementing Agency	9	9
	MP himself/herself or through his/her nominee monitoring the work.	5	5
	Tendering norms as per State Govt. instructions	4	4
	Going through MPLADS guideline	3	3
	Not responded	2	2
Sanction of the scheme	Taking into account the MPs proposal	27	27
	Keeping in view the cost estimate	19	19
	As per the local needs and their demand	6	5
	Keeping in view the technical feasibility of the project recommended by the concerned department & DC sanctioning the scheme as per MPLADS guidelines.	26	25
	Keeping in view the infrastructure of the project	1	1
	Keeping in view the work site and map of the project/ Administration San.	21	20
	Not responded	3	3

3.20 From the above table 3.12, it is observed that with respect to the technical feasibility the heads of the districts adhered to preparation of plan estimates by Line Department/concerned departments. In case of cost estimate, the criteria adopted by them was based on the schedule of PWD and norms fixed by the concerned Line Department in majority of the cases. For selecting the executing agency, the heads of the districts reported to have consulted the concerned department under whose jurisdiction the works was found to be falling.

3.21 For monitoring the heads of the districts by and large depended on the line Department which is executing the work. As regards involvement of Development functionaries in working out the feasibility of work and cost estimates, it was found that 406 (69%) of the Development Functionaries were involved in such exercise.

Execution of Work

3.22 Para 3.3 of the guidelines reads: “So far as technical and administrative sanctions are concerned, decision making should be only at the district level. If need be for the purpose of implementation of this scheme, full and final powers should be delegated to the District technical and administrative functionaries.”

3.23 It is observed that by and large the main decision regarding sanction and execution of work are taken at the district level itself. Out the 103 District Collector in the sample 92 (89%) said that they have normally adequate fund at their disposal for taking up MPLADS works. However, out of 590 Development Functionaries covered in the sample, 76 (13%) said that the fund required for MPLADS works was not released to them in time. 165 (28%) of Development Functionaries said that they could not start the work immediately after receipt of fund due to various constraints.

Table 3.13 below indicates the type of constraints faced by the Development Functionaries in starting the work immediately after receipt of fund.

Table 3.13

Major Constraints Faced by Development Functionaries

Sl No.	Type of constrains faced by Development Functionaries	Frequency	Percentage to total
1	Delay in release of first instalment	22	13
2	Non availability of workers/skilled labour	34	21
3	Local disputes	26	16
4	Non availability of raw materials/equipments	26	16
5	Stay order of the court	2	1
6	Delay in getting the consent/approval of the concerned department	12	7
7	Protest by the local people/work not according to the felt needs of the people	3	2
8	Work cancelled by the M.P./Implementation Agency	5	3
9	Change of work site	6	4
10	Local climatic condition/feasibility/nature of work	13	8
11	Transfer of the executing officials	2	1
12	Delay in selection of executing agency contractor/calling tender	14	8
	Total	165	100

3.24 Regarding execution of the scheme Para 2.1 of the guidelines prohibits the engagement of contractor in execution of MPLADS works. It reads as follows:

“Each MP will give a choice of works to the concerned Head of the district who will get them implemented by following the established procedures, that is, he may be guided by the procedure laid down by the State Government subject to these guidelines. In regard to works in urban areas, their implementation can be done through Commissioners/Chief Executive Officers of Corporations, Municipalities, etc., or through the Heads of District concerned as per the option of the MPs. Implementing agencies can be either Government or Panchayati Raj institutions or any other reputed non-governmental organization that may be considered by the District Head as capable of implementing the works satisfactorily. Engagement of private contractors is prohibited, wherever extant guidelines do not permit such engagement. For purposes of execution of works through Public Works Department (PWD), wings not necessarily exclusively dealing with civil construction, but having competence in civil construction can be engaged-like for example, Public Health Engineering, Rural Housing Departments/wings, Housing Boards, Electricity Boards, Urban Development Authorities etc. The Head of the District shall identify the agency through which a particular work recommended by the MP should be executed.”

3.25 While 27 of the District Collectors, (26%) reported that they seek the advice of MP for the selection of executing agency every time, 30 (29%) of them said that they do so some times 45 (44%) of the Collectors said that they never sought the advice of the concerned MP for selection of executing agency. One District Collector did not respond whether he sought advice or not.

3.26 Almost all the District Collectors claimed that contractors were not engaged for MPLADS because guidelines prohibited that. However, the same is not corroborated by information gathered from the Development Functionaries and local people. As many as 272 (46%) of the Development Functionaries concerned that the concerned sample works were actually executed through a contractor. Since many of the Government departments often do not have adequate infrastructure to implement the assigned works there is no other option than engaging private contractors for the purpose. Though prohibited in the guidelines this is perhaps done by taking shelter behind some technicalities. It will be better if the guidelines are amended accordingly and precise procedures specified for the purpose. This will also eliminate scope for irregularities in the currently prevailing practice in many states. As many as 356 (60.34%) of the Development Functionaries reported that they involved Panchayati Raj Institutions and local bodies in designing, implementation and maintenance of assets. This fact was also corroborated by the village heads/knowledgeable persons of the village/urban wards during the field visits of the Evaluation team.

Time Limit for Completing the Work

3.27 The guidelines for MPLADS do not clearly indicate the specific time limit within which different type of works are to be completed. Of the 590 Development Functionaries covered in the sample, 222 (37.6%) said that their project could not be completed as per schedule. The main reasons cited by them are indicated in the table 3.14 below.

Table 3.14

Major Reasons for delay in completion of Works

Sl.No	Reasons for delay	Frequency	Percentage
1	Delay in sanction of work	5	2
2	Delay in release of fund	26	12
3	Delay in availability of material/equipments	59	27
4	Delay in selection of work site	10	4
5	Local dispute	33	15
6	Political interference	2	1
7	Delay in issue of work order from concerned line Department	11	5
8	Insufficient fund	15	7
9	Natural calamities	32	14
10	Preparation of estimates	12	5
11	No response	17	8
	Total	222	100

3.28 In the above table, the main reasons cited by Development Functionaries for delay in completion of works are delay in availability of material/equipments etc. (26%) and local disputes (15%). It may be observed here that if the heads of the districts ensure releasing fund to the development functionaries at right time i.e. before the onset of monsoon in large parts of the country or snowfall in case of hilly states the availability of labour as well as material would be easier while it would be more difficult in adverse seasons. Hence this factor needs to be given due attention. As regards the delay because of local disputes, it is observed that the larger involvement of Panchayati Raj Institutions and Local bodies would help in dealing with this problem.

Chapter 4

Mode of Funding and Utilization of Fund

The flow of fund under MPLADS passes through 3 stages. The fund is released by the Ministry to the head of the concerned district. The District Collector after getting the estimate releases the fund to the concerned implementing agency or official who gets the work executed at the ground level and finally it is released to the executant who is generally a local level functionary such as Assistant Engineer, Junior Engineer or Zila Parishad functionary.

Cost ceiling

4.2 Keeping in view the general nature of works taken up under MPLADS the guidelines provide a ceiling of cost per work. Para 4.1 of the guidelines issued by the Ministry reads as follows.

“Ideally it would be desirable that the MPs suggest individual works costing not more than Rs. 10 lakhs per work. However, the limit of Rs. 10 lakhs per work should not be too rigidly construed. Amounts higher than Rs. 10 lakhs per work can be spent depending upon the nature of the work. (For example a single check dam to provide minor irrigation or water supply or a sports stadium may cost more than Rs. 10 lakhs. In the case of such works higher amount can be legitimately spent”.⁴

Out of 17545 works the details of which were provided by the districts in sample constituencies it was observed that only 52 (0.30%) works were costing more than Rs.10 lakhs. Following is the sector wise and cost wise break up of works taken up in sample constituencies in the period 1994-1998:

Table 4.1

Sector and cost wise breakup of works undertaken in the sample constituencies

Sector	Works taken up under different cost range: (Rs. in lakhs) *				Total No of works in this Sector	Percentage of works in this Sector
	Up to 1 lakh	1-5 lakh	5-10 lakh	Above 10 lakh		
Roads & Bridges	3115 (57.67)	2044 (37.84)	225 (4.17)	17 (0.31)	5401 (100.00)	30.78
Irrigation	270 (50.47)	227 (42.43)	37 (6.92)	1 (0.19)	535 (100.00)	3.05
Drinking water & Sanitation	1576 (76.24)	437 (21.14)	45 (2.18)	9 (0.44)	2067 (100.00)	11.78
Community Works	3184 (79.28)	730 (18.18)	93 (2.32)	9 (0.22)	4016 (100.00)	22.89
Education	2124 (63.71)	1147 (34.40)	58 (1.74)	5 (0.15)	3334 (100.00)	19.00
Health	145 (43.15)	159 (47.32)	228 (8.33)	4 (1.19)	536 (100.00)	1.92
Others	1296 (69.83)	458 (24.68)	95 (5.12)	7 (0.38)	1856 (100.00)	10.58
All Sectors	11710 (66.74)	5202 (29.65)	781 (3.31)	52 (0.30)	17545 (100.00)	100.00

* Figures in parenthesis indicate percentage of works in the Sector getting this allocation.

⁴ This cost ceiling of Rs. 10 lakhs per work has been enhanced to Rs. 25 lakhs w.e.f. 26.5.2000, while this study was in progress.

Release of Fund

4.3 Para 4.2 of the guidelines further reads: “Fund shall be released to the districts each year immediately after the Vote on Account/Budget is passed. The fund released by the Government of India under the scheme would be non-lapsable. Fund released in a particular year, if they remain unutilized can be carried forward to the subsequent year without detracting from the allocation of rupees two crores per year per constituency. However, release of fund will be made with reference to the actual progress achieved in expenditure and execution of works. In other words, fund would be available in the budget to the extent of Rupees two crores per year per MP and works will not suffer for want of provisions. At the same time, release will be regulated according to progress. The idea is that at any given time no excessive money should remain outside the government treasury than is reasonably expected to be spent within a year.” For example, if out of Rs. 2 crore allotted for a constituency in a year, Rs. 1.50 crore is spent, the balance of Rs. 50 lakh can be carried over for the year when this amount together with fresh allocation of Rs. 2 crore (total of Rs.2.5 crore) would be the entitlement of the year and could be spent. But actual physical release of fund will be with reference to the amount expected to be spent. It should be seen, however, that unspent amounts do not excessively snowball into huge entitlements”.

4.4 The guidelines however, do not specify as to which authority/agency will ensure its compliance and fix the accountability or what will be the mechanism to ensure this. In absence of such clarity this part of the guidelines appears to be a mere theoretical proposition.

The following table 4.2 indicates the quantum of state wise unspent balance of MPLADS fund in 103 districts of 20 States and 2 UTs.

Table 4.2

State-wise sum total of the fund released for MPLADS, interest accrued and unspent balance in sample districts in the period 1993-94 to 1998-99

(Rs.lakhs)

Name of State	Principal Amount	Interest Accrued	Total (2+3)	Amount Spent on Work	Unspent* Balance	Percentage (6 as % of 4)
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
A & N Islands	775.79	15.96	791.75	325.58	466.18	58.88
Andhra Pradesh	3261.77	69.59	3331.36	2106.48	1224.88	36.77
Arunachal Pradesh	1893.17	21.40	1914.57	1641.41	273.16	14.27
Assam	2329.56	49.06	2378.62	1356.89	1021.73	42.95
Bihar	4346.71	57.70	4404.41	1802.28	2602.13	59.08
Chandigarh	873.56	11.82	885.38	212.13	673.25	76.04
Delhi	3242.91	23.07	3265.98	753.99	2511.99	76.91
Gujarat	3038.84	58.70	3097.54	1456.13	1641.41	52.99

Haryana	1399.48	16.38	1415.86	775.11	640.75	45.26
Himachal Pradesh	1888.21	23.04	1911.25	651.62	1259.63	65.91
Jammu & Kashmir	954.81	20.96	975.77	470.54	505.23	51.78
Karnataka	2315.98	23.82	2339.80	620.47	1719.33	73.48
Kerala	2125.63	65.89	2191.52	825.32	1366.20	62.34
Madhya Pradesh	3289.09	50.13	3339.21	1985.50	1353.71	40.54
Maharashtra	4378.17	103.66	4481.83	2134.1	2347.73	52.38
Orissa	1618.75	21.45	1640.20	1202.25	437.95	26.70
Punjab	1526.11	14.44	1540.55	520.41	1020.14	66.22
Rajasthan	2166.85	50.72	2217.57	1628.57	589.00	26.56
Sikkim	1872.00	18.25	1890.25	801.81	1088.44	57.58
Tamil Nadu	2972.85	24.81	2997.65	2390.72	606.93	20.25
Uttar Pradesh	5047.99	54.48	5102.47	3889.21	1213.26	23.78
West Bengal**	2586.19	50.96	2637.15	1302.69	750.26	28.45
Grand Total	53904.42	846.29	54750.69	28853.21	25313.29	46.23

* The figures under this column in case of a number of states are different from the one indicated by the concerned districts officials. The figures indicated reflect the balance left over after deducting the spent amount from the sum total of the Principal amount and interest accrued on that.

** The information was not furnished by concerned districts in an appropriate way. The sum total of fund spent during the year and balance lying with the Collectors in the period 1993-94 to 1998-99 do not add up to the fund received by the Collector from the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation.

4.5 An analysis of the above table leads to inference that about 54% of the amount received for MPLADS and the interest accrued thereon in the selected sample districts in the period 1993-99 have been spent leaving the remaining 46% as unspent balance lying with the concerned Collectors. The reasons of such a substantial sum of MPLADS fund remaining unutilized needs to be examined in details. The quantum of unspent balance however varies widely across states. It ranges from a low of 14% in Arunachal Pradesh to as high as about 77% in Delhi. Other States with high utilization rates include Orissa, Rajasthan Tamil Nadu and Uttar Pradesh while the states with low utilization included Andaman & Nicobar Islands, Punjab, Bihar, Chandigarh, Delhi, Gujarat, Himachal Pradesh, Jammu & Kashmir, Karnataka, Kerala and Maharashtra. This finding is akin to the findings of the report of the CAG of India for year ending March 2000 where it has been observed that “large unspent balance have remained with the implementing agencies after the sanction and release of fund by the Deputy Commissioners”. (Page 6 of the report). This evaluation team also found many pertinent examples reflecting the fact that in a number of cases the money released by a District Collector to an implementing agency for some specific work are neither utilized nor returned to the Collector or the sanctioning authority. Three illustrative cases are cited here:

- (i) In 1996-97, a sum of Rs. 1.25 lakhs was allocated from MPLADS fund for water supply in a ward under a Municipal Corporation in West Bengal. In the meantime the work was planned and completed by another agency. That amount of Rs. 1.25 lakh was lying unutilized with Executive Engineer of the

concerned region till the time of the visit of the Evaluation team in June – July 2000. Since this particular amount was released to the implementing agency it would have been treated as spent so long as it was not returned to the district Collector or the controlling authority.

- (ii) In Madhya Pradesh, a sum of Rs. 2 lakhs was released to a Development Authority in May 1999 for developing a vehicle parking facility. The said land belonged to the Nagar Nigam, which was not consulted at any stage. In the meantime, the Municipal Corporation also made a plan for a parking facility on the same land and completed the work, as a result of which the MPLADS fund released for the above mentioned work was lying unutilized with the Development Authority till the time of the field visit of the evaluation team.
- (iii) In a district town in Rajasthan fund was sanctioned in 1996-97 for construction of a badminton court in the city. The Nagar Palika of that city is reported to have used 50% of the fund for some other purpose. Though the work had not been initiated till the time of visit of the Evaluation team the record of the district authority was showing the work as completed.

4.6 It is interesting to note here that in normal operation the basis of release of subsequent instalment of fund is cost of all the works sanctioned. The fund should not be treated as amount spent only because the District Collector has released the amount to the concerned implementing agency. Hence there appears a need to introduce a control mechanism, which could ensure that a large amount of unspent balance does not remain with the implementing agencies after the release by the concerned District Collector.

4.7 Out of the 22 State Nodal Departments only 15 (68%) reported that the Ministry took appropriate and corrective measures from time to time to ensure timely utilization of unspent balance such as compilation of the progress report, physical monitoring and coordination & verification of works with district level officials. Of these the nodal department of only 14 states (64%) felt that the corrective measures taken by the Ministry were fully satisfactory. However, the findings of this study are not in conformity with such feelings. The measures taken by the Ministry seem to have failed to change the situation significantly and the unspent balance is rising year after year. This is also corroborated by the findings of CAG of India (See page 2 of the report March, 2000).

4.8 Para 4.3 of the February 1997 guidelines states that “the release of fund by the Department of Programme Implementation will be done twice a year on the basis of the physical and financial progress of the works under implementation and further requirement of fund for works.” The working season in a number of states (e.g. West Bengal, Himachal Pradesh) is limited to a few months due to weather conditions. If releases of fund are delayed, works are to be stopped inbetween on the onset of rainy season or snowfall and therefore cannot be completed in time. In view of this, a large number of MPs felt that the entire amount should be released in the beginning of the

financial year. Development Functionaries in a number of States also concurred for this. Table 4.3 below indicates the average time taken by the Ministry in releasing subsequent instalment of fund to District Collectors.

Table 4.3

Average-time taken by the Ministry in release of subsequent instalment of fund to Districts

Period	(Number of Collectors)							
	Up to 1 month	Between 1 to 3 months	Between 3-6 months	More than 6 months	As and when approached	Irregular flow of fund	Not reported	Total
Number of District	36	38	17	2	3	2	5	103
Percentage	35	37	16	2	3	2	5	100

4.9 It may be noted here that though 83 (81%) of the District Collectors sent the progress report to the Ministry within a period of 2 months only 72 (70 %) of them reported to have got the instalments of MPLADS fund within the limit of 3 months while for 18 (17 %) of them it took more than three months time. The Collectors however, failed to see any valid reason for delay in release of different instalments by the Ministry except for the matter that it may be due to inherent problems faced by the Ministry.

4.10 As per para 4.4 of the guidelines “at the time of release of fund, the Department of Programme Implementation in consultation with the heads of the concerned districts will make an assessment of the fund required to complete the on-going works. Such requirements of fund will be met first and then only the balance allocation will be considered for new works. Instalment of Rs. 50 lakhs in respect of an MP would be released once the balance amount, after taking into account the cost of all the works sanctioned (unsanctioned balance), comes to less than Rs. 50 lakhs. The eligibility for the release of an instalment in respect of an MP will be decided on the basis of information furnished by the concerned District Heads in the format placed at Annexure -3 and 4 (of the guidelines) respectively, copies of which will also be sent by the District Heads to the concerned MPs.” The availability of the fund for implementing sanctioned works under MPLADS was also examined. Only 11 (11%) out of 103 District Collectors reported that they normally did not have adequate fund for implementing sanctioned works under MPLADS

4.11 Para 4.5 of the guidelines reads “Fund for individual works should be promptly released. 75% of the cost of the works can be released in the first instalment itself. The balance of 25% being released after watching progress. To the maximum extent possible, release of fund should be arranged through the administrative authority available nearest to the work spot, like for example a Block Development Officer.

The objective should be that release of fund also is made through decentralized administrative mechanisms already available on the ground and that implementing agencies have the quickest feasible access to such decentralized authorities.” However, as per the available data, 76 (13%) of the development functionaries said that the fund required by them for MPLADS work were not released to them in time. Another 165 (28%) of them said that they could not start the work immediately after receipt of fund. This data leads to logical inference that 40% of the sample works could not be started in time due to one reason or the other. This calls for giving special focus on monitoring of the works the lack of which is causing the delay in starting the works. The main constraints cited by the Development functionaries for delay in the start of work by them even after receipt of fund by them are the following:

Table 4.4

Constraints delaying the start of work by Development Functionaries

Type of constraints	Frequency (No. of Development Functionaries indicating constraints)	Percentage
Delay in release of first instalment	22	13
Non-availability of workers/skilled labour	34	21
Local disputes	26	16
Non-availability of raw materials/equipments	26	16
Stay order of the court	2	1
Delay in getting the consent of concerned department/granting approval	12	7
Protest by the local people/work not according to the felt needs of the people	3	2
Work cancelled by the MP/Implementing Agency	5	3
Change of work site	6	4
Keeping in view the local climatic condition/feasibility/ nature of work	13	8
Transfer of the executing officials	2	1
Delay in selection of executing agency/contractor/calling tender	14	8
Total	165	100

4.12 Out of the above mentioned constraints cited by the development functionaries there are two constraints which could be eliminated with the positive approach of the heads of the districts/implementing agency. Those are i) the delay in release of the first instalment and ii) Delay in getting the concerned department/granting approval. These two constraints account for 20% of the total. It is, therefore, observed that sincere efforts should be made by the heads the districts/implementing agencies to overcome these types of constraints.

Utilization of Fund

4.13 As per para 4.6 of the guidelines “In case the concerned MP is not interested in utilizing the fund, he may write to the Department of Statistics and Programme Implementation, so that the release of fund is withdrawn.” In case of non-availability of recommendation from concerned MP out of 103 District Collectors covered under the study 38 (36%) informed that they bring it to the notice of the concerned MP while 15 (14%) said that they request the Ministry for providing necessary instruction. This data also reveals that there were occasions when the concerned District Collector had to remind the MP about the need for utilization of MPLADS fund. It may be suggested here that before releasing the first instalment of fund for a newly elected MP, the Ministry should consult the concerned MP seeking confirmation from him whether fund should be released for him.

Operation of Fund

4.14 As per para 4.7 of the Guidelines “Fund released under the scheme shall be deposited in nationalised banks.” According to para 4.8 of the guidelines “interest accrued on the fund deposited in nationalized banks may be used for the works approved under these guidelines.” Through the schedules information was collected from nodal departments of the State Government about the amount received, the amount spent and unspent balance in the State under MPLADS in the period 1994-95 to 1998-99. The data received from the nodal departments of the State Government is given in Table 4.5.

Table 4.5
State-wise breakup of the amount received, amount spent and the unspent balance under MPLADS during the period 1994-95 to 1998-99

Sl. No	Name of the State	Fund (Rs. in lakhs)			Unspent balance as Percent of allocation
		Allocated	Expenditure	Unspent balance	
1.	A&N Island	350.00	318.73	31.27	8.93
2.	Andhra Pradesh	25538.78	16454.18	9084.60	35.50
3.	Arunachal Pradesh	NA	NA	NA	-
4.	Assam	NA	NA	NA	-
5.	Bihar	3740.00	2555.77	1184.23 [^]	31.66

6.	Chandigarh	450.00	295.81	154.19	34.26
7.	Delhi	200.00	NA	NA	-
8.	Gujarat	12500	7972.78	4527.22	36.22
9	Haryana	6620.00	5519.66	1100.34	16.62
10.	Himachal Pradesh	104.25	102.00	2.25*	2.16
11.	Jammu & Kashmir	2061.20	1080.20	980.90	47.59
12.	Karnataka	NA	NA	NA	-
13.	Kerala	13795.00	9153.84	4641.16	33.64
14.	Madhya Pradesh	2300.00	1694.13	605.87	26.34
15.	Maharashtra	2900.00	1689.40	1210.60@	41.74
16.	Orissa	13750.00	9554.80	4195.20\$\$	30.51
17.	Punjab	NA	NA	NA	-
18.	Rajasthan	2135.42	1861.43	273.99#	12.83
19.	Sikkim	1210.00	801.81	408.19	33.73
20.	Tamil Nadu	NA	NA	NA	-
21.	Uttar Pradesh	2850.00	2189.54	660.46\$	23.17
22.	West Bengal	4552.93	2379.80	2173.13	47.73
	Total	95057.58	63623.88	31233.60!!	32.86

* Indicates the amount only for RS MP for 1994-95 and 1998-99.

Indicates the amount only for 3 districts of the state.

\$ Indicates the amount only for 7 districts of the state.

^ Indicates the amount only for 4 districts of the state.

\$\$ Indicates the amount only for 2 districts of the state.

@ Indicates the amount only for 6 districts of the state.

!! Total for the states for which information is available.

4.15 State nodal departments of the four states namely Arunachal Pradesh, Assam, Karnataka and Delhi did not indicate unspent balance of MPLADS fund as on 31.3.99. However, as indicated in table 4.5. The total of unspent balance in remaining states on the given date was about Rs. 312.33 crore. Regarding the steps taken by the State Government for optimal utilization of unspent balance, the nodal departments of 7 (32%) State Government informed that progress of the scheme is being regularly monitored/reviewed at the level of DC/Secretary along with MP and necessary instructions are issued to the Collector to take necessary steps for utilization of unspent balance. Nodal Department of 3 (14%) State Government informed that progress of work is checked by field visits. According to para 4.8 of the guidelines "Interest accrued on the fund deposited in nationalized banks may be used for the works approved under these guidelines." The data collected from states covered under this evaluation study indicate that in 103 districts a sum of Rs.8.46 crore was accumulated as accrued interest during the period 1993-94 to 1998-99 (See Table 4.2).

Availability of Fund

4.16 Out of 117 MPs covered under the study, 46 (39%) said that their constituency covered more than one district. It is quite often observed that non-availability of fund is one of the reasons for the concerned District Collector who treated the recommended work as non-feasible. Out of 3200 works not found feasible by the

Collectors in the period 1993-94 to 1998-99, 1612 (50%) works were not found feasible due to non-availability of fund. Efforts were also made to find out the reasons for delay beyond the target date of completion laid down at the time of sanction. From the data gathered it was observed that in the period 1993-96 out of 16418 works sanctioned only 192 works (1.16%) were delayed beyond the target date of completion laid down at the time of sanction due to delay in flow of fund or inadequacy of fund.

4.17 Out of 103 Collectors contacted 11 reported that normally they did not have adequate fund for implementing works under MPLADS. Out of these 11 District Collectors, 8 (.07%) said that they postponed the implementation of sanctioned works till they received the fund for that.

Deduction of Contingency Charges

4.18 The guidelines issued by the Ministry do not permit deducting any contingency expenditure out of the fund released for works. However, a number of instances came to light where contingency expenditure was sanctioned/ approved by DRDA in a State. In some cases, even NGO, which were awarded the work were reported to have charged contractor profit to the tune of about 15%. Though the District Collectors in course of interview with them or in the filled in schedules did not admit the fact that the centages charges were deducted but in the interview with development functionaries and heads/knowledgeable persons at the village/urban ward level it was noted that in a large number of districts centages charges were deducted which resulted in reduction in the net availability of fund for the works taken up under MPLADS. This is in conformity with the findings of CAG of India in its report ending March, 2000 (see pages 17-18 of the report)

4.19 In a number of cases, the heads of the districts and the representatives of the DRDA suggested that there should be provision for contingency and maintenance of the assets created under this scheme.

Fund for Maintenance of Assets

4.20 Regarding the availability of fund for maintenance of assets created under MPLADS 12(54%) State nodal department, said that it is the State Government which provides fund for maintaining assets created under MPLADS while 3 (14%) said that Panchayati Raj Institutions/Urban Local bodies provide the fund. However, the nodal departments of only 5 (23%) State Governments were of the view that these fund are adequate for maintaining the created assets. Thus, this data also suggest a need to earmark some specific fund for maintaining the assets created under MPLADS. The durability of the assets created under MPLADS may not be ensured until they are supported with requisite fund for proper maintenance.

Chapter 5

Inter-agency Coordination for Implementation

Coordination

Keeping in view the basic character of the scheme coordination appears to be one of the most important aspects of the MPLADS. Out of the 103 District Collectors covered under the study 50(48%) said that their district covered more than one constituencies in terms of fund. Out of those 50 districts, 9 (8%) districts covered more than 3 constituencies. This itself indicates the need for inter-district coordination for release and utilization of fund for MPLADS. The works under this scheme are chosen by MP and recommended to the head of the districts or Municipal bodies who in turn sanctions the work and gets it executed through some implementing agency at the field level. This may be a Zila Parishad Engineer, Chief Executive of the Zila Parishad, an Assistant Engineer at the Sub Division level or BDO or a Junior Engineer at the block level. The role of these officials is crucial in examining the feasibility of works, preparing the cost estimate and finally, in executing the work. Obviously, the above set of exercise requires a systematic approach and a well defined coordination. The desired result from the MPLADS could be expected only through a proper coordination mechanism between the MP, the District Collector and the development functionary executing the work. On the contrary; lack of coordination may lead to delay in preparation of cost estimate or over or under estimation of cost, delay in sanction of works, delay in release of fund, allocation of inadequate fund for a particular work, delay in beginning the creation of asset, poor implementation in terms of quality and last but not the least inappropriate coordination may also lead to the released amount for works lying unutilized with implementing agencies. Only appropriate coordination could ensure elimination of above mentioned fallacies.

Non-utilization of Fund or Improper Utilization of Assets

5.2 Para 3.5 of the guidelines reads as follows: “since the works under this scheme would be implemented by different State Government agencies such as PWD, Rural Development, Irrigation, Agriculture, Health, Education, Area Development Authorities, Water Supply and Sewerage Boards, Housing Corporation etc. the Heads of the respective districts would be responsible for the coordination and overall supervision of the works under this scheme at the district level”. However, on many occasions the coordination of above mentioned kind was not observed during the field visits of the evaluation team. There are many examples of fund lying unutilized or created asset not being properly utilized due to lack of proper coordination between the Head of the district or Head of the Implementing Agency on the one hand and the executing agency or official on the other. Some instances of the outcome of lack of coordination among the various agencies observed during the field visit of the Evaluation team have been elaborated in para 4.5 of Chapter 4. The instances of non-

utilization of the money released for water supply works in West Bengal, for parking space for vehicles in Madhya Pradesh and for badminton court in Rajasthan are appropriate examples. Since particular amounts in these cases were released to the implementing agencies it would obviously have been treated as spent so long as it was not returned to the district Collector or the controlling authority. This kind of non-utilization may not affect the flow of fund till it is pointed out to the releasing authority or the Ministry. However, recurrence of such cases would obviously lead to excessive money remaining outside the government treasury for a period longer than a reasonable time or the money may not come back to Government treasury as it is often treated as spent. An important instance of improper utilization of the created asset due to lack of coordination was found in Uttar Pradesh where a school building with three rooms and a verandah was constructed with Rs. 1.5 lakhs. However, as the Education Department had reportedly not sanctioned a school in the said area, the building was being used for storing fodder and keeping cattle when the evaluation team visited the area.

Role of State Nodal Departments and Heads of Districts in Coordination

5.3 The MPLADS Guidelines also spelt out the role of the Ministry, the concerned Nodal Departments of the State Governments and the Heads of the Districts. Para 3.6 of the Guidelines reads “The Department of Programme Implementation, would have the nodal responsibilities for this scheme at the centre. The Department concerned of the State Govt. will issue general instructions to all the Planning and implementing agencies at the district level to cooperate, assist and implement the works referred to them under this scheme by the Heads of the districts, copies of such instructions shall also be sent to the MPs at their constituencies and at their Delhi address” The data collected from the heads of the Districts with respect to the above indicate that according to 26% of the Districts the state nodal department compiled the progress Report, according to 45% of the districts, the nodal departments do physical monitoring and coordination with district level officials. Though 21% of the district heads observed that the role played by the state nodal departments is quite satisfactory, 30% of them felt that the state nodal departments should conduct review meetings with district level officials and line departments. This is a clear indication that such a thing is essentially felt in 30% of the sample districts.

5.4 The Guidelines *inter alia* also states that “the head of the district should also involve the MPs in such inspections and monitoring to the maximum extent feasible. They should also furnish monitoring reports once in two months to the MPs and the Department of Programme Implementation”. This para calls for a closer coordination between the heads of the districts and the MPs. From the information collected from the District Collectors it was found that out of 2074 review meetings held in the period between 1996-99 the MPs took part in 398 (20%) review meetings, whereas the representatives of the executing agencies attended 1943 (93%) of the review meetings in the given period. Due to the commitment of the MPs being far wide covering a sprawling area and large population their presence in 20% of review

meetings holds significance. Moreover, the presence of the representatives of the executing agencies in as many as 93% of the review meetings shows a healthy trend. However, while grading the coordination between the concerned MP, the District Collector and the development functionaries for implementing this scheme, 16 out of the 22 states nodal Departments graded it as highly satisfactory and 5 as Partly satisfactory. This indicates that there is a need of better coordination in at least 20% of the states. Still, there are some cases reflecting weaker side of the coordination. A sum of Rs. 4 lakhs was recommended by an MP for the building of a Government High School of a rural block in Kerala as early as on 30.11.96. The concerned District Collector forwarded the proposal for estimate preparation on 8.1.1997 (after 38 days). The BDO in turn forwarded the estimate to DRDA for approval on 24.2.97 (after 46 days). DRDA accorded its approval on 11.7.97 (after 130 days). The Collector then accorded the administrative sanction to the work on 9.3.98 (after 250 days). The Block Level Beneficiary Committee which had to execute the work was constituted on 15.10.98 (after 220 days) and it expressed its inability to undertake the work, because by the time the lengthy procedure of estimate preparation, technical sanction and administrative sanction was completed, the allocated amount appeared to be insufficient for the work. As a result, a school which was in the pressing need of a building failed to get it even after a gap of two and a half years from the date of the recommendation of the MP. Such cases reflect complete absence of coordination and monitoring. If the cases of works under MPLADS are monitored even bi-monthly the completion of works would not take as long as two and a half years as it was seen in this case. The Ministry may consider some remedial measure to overcome ordeals of the above nature.

Coordination Committee

5.5 On enquiry about the coordination committee for smooth functioning of the MPLADS consisting of District Collector, Development Functionaries and Members of Parliament only 31 (30%) out of 103 districts Collectors said that there was such a Committee while it was reported to be non - existent in 72 (70%) of the districts. It may be observed here that such a Committee ought to be there invariably in every district, which could work as a watchdog for proper review and monitoring of the scheme at the district level. The Ministry may consider taking a policy decision to this effect.

5.6 In the light of the above, it may be considered to have a Coordination Committee at the District level consisting of the MP, MLA, the District Collector, Chief Executive of the Zila Parishad and the concerned Development Functionaries including PRI functionaries. Such a Coordination Committee would not only ensure a proper coordination among various channels but would also lead to convergence of development activities by pooling of resources from central as well as State fund and thereby eliminating overlapping or duplication of works under MPLADS and MLA Development schemes prevalent in a large number of the states of the country.

Chapter 6

Monitoring, Supervision and Feedback

Effective implementation of the works undertaken in a scheme requires proper monitoring, supervision and feedback. Proper monitoring and supervision will ensure adequate and timely progress of the works. Any bottleneck can then be removed by appropriate intervention in time so that the progress is smooth and the work is completed in time. This will also ensure better quality of assets created and its maintenance, upkeep and proper use when the work is complete.

The Guidelines

6.2 The Ministry in the guidelines for the scheme suggested some norms for monitoring, supervision and feedback for the works undertaken. These suggestions include the following:

- The head of district should visit and inspect at least 10 per cent of the works every year. He is also expected to involve the MPs in such activities.
- The head of the district is to furnish monitoring reports once in two months to the MP and the Department of Programme Implementation.
- Annual review meetings involving the MP and the head of the district should assess the progress of works under the scheme.
- The Department of Programme Implementation should always have a complete and updated picture of the works under implementation. To facilitate this the information may be communicated on the Internet.
- Periodic teleconferences may also be organised.
- The Bureau of Parliamentary Studies and Training may arrange training of district officials in batches involving and bringing about interaction with the MPs.

Scope of Analysis

6.3 In this chapter an attempt is made to find out whether these suggestions are being followed at the grass root level, deviations if any, the reasons therefore and consequences thereof. The findings are based on the data gathered from the selected MPs, state and district officials and local people. Observations of the evaluation team have also been analysed for this purpose. Visits by evaluation team to the site of works and their discussions with the concerned officials and local people revealed

some interesting and significant facts. Quite a few of these findings seem to be the consequences of inadequate monitoring and supervision of the works while in progress. While citing a few of these as illustrative examples, suggestions flowing in from various quarters to improve the situation have also been discussed and commented upon.

The Ground Reality

6.4 The data collected in the sample survey has been analysed to find out the reality at the grass root level vis-à-vis the suggestions in the guidelines regarding monitoring and supervision of the works in progress.

Despite suggestion in the guidelines, number of visits to the sites by the head of the district was far short of the prescribed norm. Out of the 103 districts in the sample only 4 districts Collectors claimed to have personally visited 10 percent or more of the works. However, as many as 93 of them have taken appropriate action on finding the progress as not satisfactory. These Collectors seem to have depended on other development functionaries for monitoring instead of personal visits. The appropriate actions taken include issuing reminders/instructions to the implementing agencies and also disciplinary actions in a few cases.

Information gathered from the development functionaries of the 590 sample works indicate that in 373 (63%) cases the officials of the line departments and the executing agencies shouldered the task of monitoring and supervision perhaps, to lessen the burden on the Collectors. Monitoring and supervision was done by the respective Collectors only in case of 90 (15%) works while the SDOs took the responsibility in another 127 (21%) cases. The concerned Members of Parliament visited the site in 212 cases only and of these in 132 (22%) cases the visit was not more than once. The concerned Collectors visited the site in 143 (24%) cases of which in 88 cases the visit was only once.

Out of the 103 Collectors interviewed 92 claimed to have sent the monitoring reports in the prescribed format to the Department of Programme Implementation as suggested in the guidelines. Three of the Collectors conceded their failure to do so while eight Collectors failed to respond to this query. Of those who are sending the monitoring reports 26 did not receive any feed back from the Ministry.

The guidelines also suggested that the head of the district should send the monitoring reports to the concerned MPs once in two months. A large number of Collectors seem to have failed to conform to this norm. Out of the 117 MPs interviewed, as many as 48 claimed to have not been receiving the reports while another 14 received it only occasionally.

Of the 590 development functionaries, 516 (87%) claimed to be appraising the higher authorities about the progress of works and out of these, 450 (76%) do it every

month. The higher authorities are generally the Collector, the head of the division and the concerned line department.

As many as 95 out of 103 Collectors failed to put the updated status of works on the Internet while only three reported to have done so. As many as 82 of the Collectors disclosed that they have no arrangement for teleconferencing, another 18 are not aware of any such facility. However, 72 of the Collectors are of the opinion that such arrangements when made available will prove helpful to monitoring and supervision of works under the scheme.

Among the MPs interviewed 84 are not aware of any teleconferencing facilities. Discussions by evaluation teams revealed that Internet and teleconferencing facilities do not exist in majority of the states. It seems even the Ministry that formulated the guidelines and expected others to follow it, have failed to follow the part pertaining to it. Ambition of the Ministry to *always have a complete and updated picture of the works under implementation* could not be achieved due to its own failure to provide facilities for Internet and teleconferencing. Thus, the object of *instantaneous monitoring of constituency wise progress using information technology* remained a goal yet to be reached. The Bureau of Parliamentary Studies and Training also failed to arrange for any training for the district officials⁵.

As many as 45 MPs felt that performance of the Ministry as the nodal agency for this scheme is deficient in various aspects while 25 out of these mentioned weaknesses of the monitoring mechanism developed and expected to be followed.

Heads of the sample villages/wards rated the quality of only 376 (63%) out of 590 assets created as good while maintenance was assessed to be good only in 216 (37%) cases. The evaluation teams also have observed poor monitoring and supervision in a large number of cases during their field visits. Poor quality of monitoring and supervision coupled with lack of interaction and coordination among various agencies have led to a number of deficiencies in the quality of assets created, their maintenance and use as revealed during field visits and discussions by the Evaluation teams

Allocation of Inadequate Fund

6.5 It seems there is a general tendency on the part of the MPs to allocate the fund for individual work insufficient amount and in an *ad hoc* manner, despite the fact that there is a large unspent balance in MPLADS fund which is rising year after year (See table 3.6). The funds thus allocated often prove inadequate for completion of work leading to non-durable assets. A few observations by evaluation teams are presented and commented upon here. The list is illustrative only and by no means exhaustive.

⁵ The responsibility of training the district officials has been transferred to the State Government while this study was in progress.

- In a higher secondary school in Assam a gymnasium has been constructed out of MPLADS fund. The concerned MP sanctioned Rs. 10 lakhs for this purpose. With this amount the Sports Council of Assam could construct only a building on 196 Sq.mtrs spending Rs.9.6 lakhs. The work is recorded as *complete*. The constructed gymnasium has no sports infrastructure and therefore cannot be used for this purpose.
- For construction of an auditorium in a district in West Bengal, the MP sanctioned Rs. 5 lakhs only. The estimated cost has been reported to be around Rs. 1.55 crore. The work remains incomplete.
- The estimated cost for extension of a girl's school building in West Bengal was Rs. 2.40 lakhs. The MP allocated only Rs. 0.75 lakhs. The work has been *completed* within this budget.

In a number cases allocation of fund by the MPs seems to be done without taking into consideration the asset intended to be created and the required cost. This coupled with the tendency to spread the fund thinly keeps a large number of works incomplete and the assets not usable, largely due to inadequate allocation of fund. The money thus spent is virtually wasted. The heads in 132 villages/wards out of 590 indicated that the funds are not allocated according to required costs of the works and consequently many of the works either remain incomplete or lead to creation of poor quality assets (see table 8.5). A good number of Collectors also corroborated this. As many as 23 of the Collectors are of the explicit opinion that the quantum of fund allocated by MPs for individual works is not enough in many cases to maintain the desired quality of the assets created.

In addition to this, thin spread of fund increases the number of works creating problems for monitoring and supervision and fail to create any useful and durable asset. The workload of monitoring and supervision increases when several MPs select the same district for recommending works. Among the sample districts, 10 Rajya Sabha members, in addition to the Lok Sabha member, have selected the district Muradabad in Uttar Pradesh. There are quite a few other districts in the sample that attracted a large number of Rajya Sabha members to recommend developmental work there (See Table 3.2). A disproportionately large amount of money is flowing into these districts out of MPLADS fund alone. In addition, there are similar schemes in many states with fund at the hands of the MLAs. Apart from leading to unequal (iniquitous) distribution of development fund across the districts, this increases the workload for these Collectors and their officials. As many as 43 Collectors out of 103 interviewed complained of shortage of staff to look after the MPLADS works and consequent poor monitoring and supervision.

In view of the above, it has been suggested by an overwhelming majority of the respondents during discussions with the evaluation teams that the State nodal department needs to be properly strengthened by providing adequate staff and other

infrastructure to deal with all aspects relating to MPLADS. The large numbers of states have similar development schemes with fund at the hands of MLAs. The strengthened State nodal department may be given the responsibility of looking after those works as well so that there is enough co-ordination among various developmental activities.

The MPs while allocating fund should keep in view the nature of asset to be created and its estimated cost and ensure enough funds for completion of the works. Estimated cost of the proposed works should be made available to the MP before he allocates fund.

Lack of Inter-agency Coordination

6.6 In developmental activities there are other actors apart from the Ministry, the MPs, the Collectors and the Development Functionaries. To implement the scheme successfully and derive maximum benefits out of it, it is often essential to have interaction and coordination with other related agencies as well. Failure to do so may result in wastage of money by creating useless assets as revealed by the examples selected from the observations of the evaluation team.

- A parking space has been a long felt need in a city in Madhya Pradesh. The MP recommended the work and an amount of Rs. 2 lakhs was released to the Development Authority of the city. However, the Nagar Palika to whom the land belongs was not consulted at any stage. This being a long felt need, the Municipal Corporation of the city also made a plan and completed the work before the Development Authority of the city could start the work. The fund released is lying with the Development Authority.
- There is a hospital in a village in Madhya Pradesh. There is no space for the patients and their attendants to wait or take rest. To solve this problem an amount of Rs. 1 lakh has been spent out of MPLADS fund to construct a concrete platform near the hospital. The hospital authorities were not consulted at any stage. The constructed platform is not suitable for this purpose. People living nearby are using the platform to defecate, making the area dirty.
- A school building with three rooms has been constructed in a village in Uttar Pradesh spending Rs. 1.5 lakhs out of MPLADS fund. However, no school has been sanctioned by the Department of Education. Consequently, the building cannot be used for the purpose of a school. It is being used as a cattle shed and for storage of fodder.

The above situations arise largely due to lack of co-ordination among various Government Departments and other agencies involved apart from poor monitoring and supervision. The task of monitoring and supervision become easier if the local

people are effectively involved. They are also the beneficiaries having a stake in the quality of the asset created, its maintenance and proper use. However, the information gathered from development functionaries indicate that only in 356 of the 590 works surveyed PRIs had some involvement in design, implementation and/or maintenance of assets created. The development functionaries also indicated that only 323 out of 590 of the works could be completed as per schedule while the Collector disclosed that about 303 out of 30430 works had to be abandoned midway during the period 1993-99. Both have cited local disputes as one of the major reasons for this. Such disputes can perhaps be avoided or resolved easily when PRIs are involved. An overwhelming majority of the MPs claimed to have taken the felt needs of the people into account while recommending works out of MPLADS fund. On the other end, the heads in 148 (25%) of the 590 villages/wards sampled indicated that this is not always so. Perhaps, as a consequence of this only 497 of the assets created found use for the intended purpose. A large number of the villagers suggested that the MPs should propose works according to the felt needs of the people. Such discrepancies would be easily resolved when the villagers enter into the scene as actors through PRIs. With such involvement of the PRIs it will perhaps be easier for the MPs to judge the felt needs of the people while recommending developmental works. Involvement of PRIs should be made mandatory preferably right from the stage of recommendation and sanction through monitoring, supervision and maintenance of the assets created. Villagers as watchdog can also ensure the quality of the assets created. An illustrative example in this context has been observed by the evaluation team in Bihar. A building for a primary school has been constructed out of MPLADS fund. While the work was in progress, the villagers observed that inferior quality of bricks are being used by the contractor. The Villagers objected and even went to the extent of demolishing the walls constructed with inferior quality of bricks. The villagers with their watchful eyes succeeded in ensuring the quality of the construction.

Inadequate monitoring and supervision leads to a number of other undesirable consequences. These often tend to create an atmosphere in which various types of irregularities crop up and thrive. In many cases, the evaluation team failed to identify the assets claimed to have been created and in many others the asset created did not seem to be worth the expenditure incurred. Misreporting of status of work is also not infrequent. The evaluation team observed several cases where the work is yet to be started, but Collector's record showed these to be complete.

Lack of Awareness

6.7 The evaluation team during its visits observed widespread lack of awareness about the scheme. Even a board displaying the relevant information including that the work is under the scheme of MPLADS was absent in the site of the work in majority of the cases. Out of 590 Developmental Functionaries as many as 353 (60%) conceded that such a board could not be displayed at site for one reason or the other. Among them about 61(10%) seemed to be not aware of this suggestion in the guidelines. Displaying the details at the worksite will add to the publicity of the scheme and will help people to derive benefit out of it. Full details about all the

works under MPLADS (and other such schemes) in progress in the district may be displayed conspicuously in Collector's office, in addition to the work site. This will also expose the scheme to public scrutiny, which is likely to improve its performance. Other methods of publicity using electronic and print media may be explored. Explaining the scheme in a meeting of *Gram Sabha* for the benefit of those who can not read and write is likely to be very effective.

Chapter 7

Quality and Maintenance of Assets

Creation of assets is the essence of the MPLADS. Para 2.2 of the guidelines reads: “The works under the scheme shall be developmental in nature based on locally felt needs. The emphasis is on creation of durable assets” The evaluation study was designed to assess, among other things, compliance of the provisions made in the guidelines for ensuring the quality of the assets created, utilization of assets for identified purpose and the existing arrangement for maintenance of assets created under the MPLADS. Para 2.9 of the guidelines of the scheme reads: “The heads of districts should ensure that provision for maintenance and upkeep of the works to be taken up under this scheme is forthcoming from the concerned local body or the relevant agency that is, Government aided institutions, registered society etc.” The guideline, however, neither contain any details of the methodology to be adopted by heads of the districts nor is any institutional mechanism spelt out to ensure the firm provision of fund for the maintenance or upkeep of the assets created under MPLADS. The moot question, which arises here, is how could an asset created under MPLADS be durable if there is neither a well defined mechanism to maintain it nor is there any fund specially provided for the same. Such inadequacies in guidelines render it very difficult for the heads of districts to arrange for fund and fix accountability for maintenance of created assets. They also cannot delay implementation of works recommended by the MPs indefinitely for lack of fund for maintenance.

Pre Sanction Measures for Creation of Assets

7.2 Mere creation of assets is not the ultimate objective of MPLADS. What is inherent in the creation of various assets under this scheme is that these should be useful to the people and last long. The longevity of the assets created could be possible only through regular and systematic maintenance. Keeping this fact in perspective, the views of Collectors regarding ensuring the arrangement for maintenance of assets created were obtained during evaluation. Only 55 (53%) District Collectors said that they ascertained the assurance of the concerned department/agency for maintenance of the assets before sanctioning the work.

Maintenance of the Assets

7.3 To assess the adequacy and appropriateness of the existing institutional facilities and the availability of fund for maintenance of assets created the relevant information was obtained from State level nodal departments, District Collectors of the sample districts, Development Functionaries, Heads/ knowledgeable persons of the village/urban pocket and also the local people. In addition, the observations of the

field staff of PEO regarding maintenance and quality of assets were made use of in the analysis that follows.

7.4 Regarding the arrangement for maintenance of assets, 54 (52%) of the District Collectors felt that the arrangement for maintenance of assets were not adequate. This data itself indicates that in about half of the cases neither District Collectors ascertained the assurance of the concerned department/agency for maintenance of the assets being created nor were there adequate arrangements for maintenance of such assets. Furthermore, 95 (92%) out of 103 District Collectors said that they maintained the list of assets created. However, in many districts, the lists were not readily available. In some cases, despite the works shown as completed the assets created could not be located. Such aberrations have been observed in a number of districts. For instance, in a district in Rajasthan 204 hand pumps were recommended by an MP in 1999. Till the time of visit of the evaluation team in June-July, 2000, not a single hand pump was installed. It was reported that Nagar Palika in that town was diverting fund for other works. In the same district, funds were sanctioned in 1996-97 for construction of a Badminton court for the city area. The executing agency, Nagar Palika, reportedly had used 50% of the fund released for this work for something else. The evaluation team did not find any trace of the court while the records provided by the district show it as complete. The inconsistency in the information received from various sources points to weaknesses in maintenance of records and in monitoring of the ongoing works. Once a District Collector sanctions a work and releases fund for the same there is generally a tendency to treat the work as executed. Very often, the factual position is not ascertained about the completion of the work awarded to a local body/PRI or an NGO.

Quality of Institutional Facilities Available for Maintenance of Assets

7.5. Regarding the quality of institutional facilities available for proper maintenance and utilization of the assets created only 10 (45%) of the State Nodal Departments said that these institutional facilities were good while 4 (18%) each rated it as average and poor. The nodal departments of the remaining four states namely Bihar, Punjab, West Bengal and Assam did not respond to this question. It is thus observed that in less than half of the States /UTs facilities for maintenance of assets were found to be satisfactory. There is need to pay special attention for creating the institutional facilities for satisfactory maintenance and utilization of the assets. In absence of these neither the assets would be utilized satisfactorily nor would they have a prospect to last long.

Fund for Maintenance of Assets

7.6 The information was also obtained from the Nodal Departments of the 22 State Governments regarding the agencies providing fund for maintaining the assets created.

Table 7.1

**Agencies Providing Fund for Maintenance of Assets
(As per State Nodal Departments)**

Agency	Frequency	Percentage
State Govt.	12	54
PRIs/Urban local bodies	3	14
None	3	14
No response	4	18
All	22	100

7.7 The above table shows that in only about half of the states assets created covered under the study the State Governments were reported to be providing fund for maintaining the assets created under MPLADS. In 14% cases the fund was reported to have been provided by PRIs/Urban Local bodies who in the present situation are themselves resource starved. In 32% of the States covered under the study there was no firm source identified for funding the maintenance of the assets. Furthermore, only 5 (23%) of the State Nodal Departments said that such fund provided for maintenance of assets are adequate. In the light of this, it may be suggested that the availability of fund for maintenance of the assets should be made a precondition for the sanction for creation of assets.

People's Involvement in Maintenance of Assets at the Village Level

7.8 Of the 590 village level head/ knowledgeable persons to whom the schedules were canvassed only in 174 (29%) cases it was reported that the local people participated in the maintenance of assets. Of those who participated in the maintenance of assets; 73(42%) contributed by providing services, 82 (47%) participated in upkeep and guarding the asset and 14 (8%) contributed in cash for maintenance of the assets created.

Village Level, Development Functionary Level and District Level Assessment of Maintenance of the Assets

7.9 Efforts were made in the evaluation to obtain the opinion of the heads/knowledgeable persons of the villages/representatives of local bodies, Development Functionaries and the Heads of the Districts regarding the institutional arrangement for maintenance of the assets created under MPLADS. The following table illustrates the information obtained from the above sets of the people.

Table 7.2

Maintenance Responsibility as Indicated by Different Agencies *

Institution responsible for maintenance of assets	No. of village heads/ Representatives of urban bodies indicating the Institution	No. of Dev. Functionaries indicating the Institutions	District Collector indicating the institution
1. Implementing Agency/ Executing Department	33 (6)	-	9 (9)
2. Line Department	108 (18)	152 (26)	54 (53)
3. Local people/ local bodies/ Gram Panchayat/ Zila Parishad / Nagar Nigam	257 (44)	275 (46)	20 (19)
4. Local Association/ NGOs	94 (16)	47 (8)	-
5. No arrangement of maintenance	37 (6)	35 (6)	20 (19)
6. No response/do not know	61 (10)	81 (14)	-
Total	590(100)	590(100)	103(100)

* Figures in parentheses indicate percentage to total.

7.10 A comparative analysis of this table brings interesting revelations. While District Collectors were of the view that 53% of the assets were maintained by Line Departments, it was only 18% according to the village level respondents and 26% according to Development functionaries. The village level and Development Functionary level respondents said that more than 40% assets were maintained by the local people/local bodies/PRI, the District Collectors said that only 19% of the assets were maintained by such institutions. This shows a contrast in perception of the local level functionaries and the heads of the Districts about the role of PRIs and local bodies. While the local level functionaries consider the contribution of local level institutions more important, the perception of the District Collector is that the line departments play a greater role in maintenance of the assets. It is difficult to pass a judgment about the correctness of information emanating from alternative sources. However, it does reinforce the observation made earlier about the weaknesses in implementation, maintenance of records and monitoring of MPLADS.

Assessment of the Quality of Maintenance and Quality of Assets

7.11. Regarding the assessment of the quality of maintenance of assets 216 (36%) head of village/knowledgeable persons rated the maintenance as good, 123 (21%) rated it as average while 52 (9%) rated it as poor. 116 (20%) reported non-maintenance of the concerned assets while 83 (14%) did not indicate their opinion. As regards the quality of assets, in 374 (63%) cases at the village level the heads of the village/urban ward or the knowledgeable persons rated the quality of assets as

good, in 131 (22%) cases it was average and in 33 (6%) cases it was rated as poor. While 52 (9%) did not indicate their opinion. This data itself provides a clear indication that about half of the sample assets created had either no maintenance or had maintenance below satisfaction level. On the other hand, the quality of the asset also would need some attention to bring it to the level of complete satisfaction. It would, however, be appropriate to obtain confirmed commitment from the agencies to whom the assets are handed over that they have the fund as well as the mechanism to maintain the assets.

7.12 The views of local people regarding quality and maintenance of the assets created under MPLADS were also obtained. More details of the findings of analysis of this data set are available in Chapter- 8. However, following are some key observations:

- i) According to the local people 32% of the assets are maintained by PRIs, 28% each are maintained by Urban Local Bodies and self help groups while there is no arrangement for maintaining 12% of the assets. The data presents a completely different picture from what is presented through the information collected from the district Collectors. According to them only 19% of the assets are maintained by PRIs/Local bodies/local people. The moot question, which arises here, is whether does the District Collector ensure that there is adequate fund available with these agencies for maintaining the assets created under MPLADS.
- ii) Regarding quality of maintenance 53% of the people interviewed rated it as good, 26% consider it average, and 21% found it as poor quality.
- iii) The quality of maintenance was rated as good by 75% of respondents in case of assets created in education sector, 66% in health sector and 64% in the Community works.
- iv) Only 32% of the respondents under Roads and Bridges Sector reported the quality of maintenance of assets in that sector as good, 28% reported it as average and 40% rated it as poor. Therefore, the upkeep of the assets created under this sector needs to be provided special attention, which is lacking.
- v) It also leads to inference that under other sectors such as education, health and community works there is natural agency for maintenance of assets which is lacking in Roads & Bridges and therefore it needs to be considered as to how could the maintenance of assets under this sector be made more effective.

Handing Over of the Assets

7.13. Efforts were also made to find out the institutional arrangement for handing over the assets created under MPLADS for future maintenance and upkeep. Regarding handing over the assets after their creation, the views of executants, development functionaries at the local level was obtained to find out the agencies to whom the various assets are handed over for maintenance. Table 7.3 provides the details of the same.

Table 7.3

Agency wise break up of assets handed over by executants for maintenance

Agencies	Frequency	Percentage
Municipal cantonment board/ Zila Parishad	68	12
NGO/Social Organisation/ Local People association	256	43
Concerned line department	124	21
None	46	8
Not reported	96	16
Total	590	100

7.14 As it is clearly observed from the above table only 21% of the assets are handed over to Line Departments for maintenance but according to Collectors 53% of the assets are maintained by the Line Department. This shows the ignorance on the part of the concerned District Collector and the information provided by them is far away from the ground reality. Probably the sanctioning authorities are in a large number of cases unaware of who is maintaining the assets and who should actually maintain it.

Use of Assets

7.15. Out of 590, Development functionaries, 497 (85%) reported that the assets were being utilized for the purpose for which they were created. Hence, the need is to ensure that the quality of assets created is maintained to keep them fit for use. There must be a properly formulated scheme for maintenance and upkeep of the assets. The involvement of PRIs and Urban Local Bodies in the maintenance exercise would be a positive idea. However, there must be some provision of fund earmarked for each asset created.

Suggestions of Development Functionaries for Better Maintenance

7.16 The views of Development Functionaries were also obtained regarding measures needed for prolonging the life of assets. The details of these measures are given at table 7.4.

Table 7.4

Measures suggested by development functionaries for prolonging the life of assets

Suggestion	Frequency	Percentage
i) Fund should be allotted for maintenance of the assets	204	35
ii) Assets should be handed over to line departments etc. for maintenance	137	23
iii) Repair work should be done through MPLADS fund	72	12
iv) NGOs/local peoples' associations should be involved	10	2
v) A committee should be formed to look after the assets	17	3
vi) No response	150	25
Total	590	100

Observations About Quality and Maintenance of Assets

The following inferences flow from the analysis of data in this Chapter:

- i) The records of the assets created under MPLADS are not maintained in a systematic way, which results in making the monitoring of this scheme difficult. The issue of maintenance of assets created under MPLADS has not been paid as much attention as it ought to have been.
- ii) It is felt at all levels that the institutional facilities needs to be strengthened and the fund should be provided for satisfactory maintenance and proper utilization of assets created through MPLADS.
- iii) As reported by the local people 88% of the assets are maintained by PRIs and Local bodies and 53% of them rated the maintenance as good. This being the ground reality the question arises as to why should such bodies not be provided fund for maintaining assets created under MPLADS. For this, a mechanism needs to be evolved. This question also flows from table 7.4.

Para 2.9 of the Guidelines reads: “ The Heads of the Districts should ensure that provision for maintenance and upkeep of the works to be taken up under this scheme is forthcoming from the concerned local body or the related agency, that is, Government-aided institution, registered society etc.” However from the information provided by the District Collectors it is obvious that they are not aware of a large percentage of MPLADS assets being maintained by PRIs/Local bodies and they may not have tried to ensure whether the fund are available with these institutions for maintaining the assets created under MPLADS.

- iv) Of all the works in the sample constituencies the largest number of works (30%) is from *Roads & Bridges*. However, the maintenance of assets under this sector was reported to be of comparatively poor quality. It needs to be found out as to what popular method of maintenance could be introduced under Roads & Bridges, which could make it as satisfactory as other sectors mentioned above.
- v) About 20% of the sample assets covered under study were reported to be not maintained by any agency. This is a clear indication that the District Collectors are not strictly following the directive laid down in para 2.9 of the MPLADS guidelines
- vi) It is presumed that this is happening because maintenance is not getting due attention at the time of sanction of work.
- vii) It would be appropriate to obtain confirmed commitment from the agencies to whom the assets are handed over that they have the fund as well as the mechanism to maintain the assets.
- viii) The evaluation team has got many instances where the assets have been shown in the record though they are yet to take a shape. When the assets did not come into being what to talk of their maintenance.
- ix) However, the District Collectors may not be squarely blamed for poor maintenance of assets under MPLADS. In the guidelines there is no exclusive provision of fund or institutional mechanism for maintenance of assets created under MPLADS. To expect a substantial amount of fund available with resource starved Local Bodies/PRIIs for maintenance of assets created under MPLADS is not a logical idea.

Chapter 8

Impact of the Schemes as Perceived at the Grassroot Level

Analysis in Chapters 3 to 7 focused attention on implementation of the scheme, its physical and financial performance, conformity to and deviations from guidelines. Deficiencies in the guidelines, administration of the scheme at various levels and implementation at grass root level have been pointed out and some possible remedies suggested in the appropriate context.

This chapter looks into the impact of the scheme as perceived by the people at the grassroots level. Opinion and perception of the local people and the head of the sample villages/wards about various aspects of the scheme have been analysed here. The questions raised and attempted to answer include the following.

- What is the process by which the MPs select works for recommendation, as seen by people at the grassroots level? Is it likely that locally felt needs are adequately taken account of in this process?
- How is the nature and quality of the assets created under this scheme rated by the local people for whose benefit these have been created and how these are being maintained?
- To what extent the assets already created have benefited the local people as perceived by themselves?

Profile of the Respondents

The analysis in this chapter is based on the information and opinions gathered from the local people and the head of the sample village/ward where the asset has been created. A profile of the local people, numbering 2892, disaggregated by sector of the sample works is displayed in table 8.1.

Table 8.1**Profile of the Local People Interviewed**

Sector	Number of respondents	Social Category				Educational Status				Occupation				Size of Landholding		
		SC	ST	OBC	Others	Illiterate	Primary	Below Matric	Matric & above	Cultivation	Agricultural Labour	Service	Others	Nil	Less than 2 Hect.	2 Hect. and more
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
Road & Bridges	785	16.56	9.94	29.94	43.57	22.17	6.37	35.54	35.92	37.71	20.13	21.40	20.76	34.90	22.55	42.55
Irrigation	140	10.71	23.57	34.29	31.43	17.14	10.00	45.00	27.86	67.14	11.43	10.70	10.70	15.70	16.40	67.90
Drinking Water and Sanitation	385	14.29	10.65	20.52	54.55	18.70	5.97	39.22	36.10	26.50	17.70	24.20	31.70	48.60	23.90	27.50
Community Works	495	19.60	10.91	25.66	43.84	22.63	6.06	34.14	37.17	30.30	21.62	21.41	26.67	41.62	25.45	32.93
Education	479	15.24	12.73	26.10	45.93	12.11	5.22	34.86	47.81	29.94	15.87	32.99	21.71	35.07	26.30	38.62
Health	205	17.56	2.93	24.39	55.15	16.10	3.90	39.02	40.98	22.93	25.85	27.32	23.90	44.88	22.44	32.68
Others	403	13.65	17.37	17.35	51.61	15.63	5.71	38.46	40.20	26.30	16.63	29.03	28.04	42.18	24.81	33.00
All Sectors	2892	15.94	11.86	25.38	46.82	18.54	5.98	36.79	38.69	32.45	18.85	24.66	24.14	38.69	23.87	37.45

Similar profiles of the local people interviewed for each of the seven sectors disaggregated by states are shown in Annexures 8.1 to 8.7.

The head of the village interviewed were Sarpanch/Pradhan/ Patel of the Village, and Municipal Councilor in urban areas. These two categories together constituted more than two third of the total respondents. In case such respondents were not available on the days when the evaluation team visited the site, other persons were interviewed. Table 8.2 displays the profile of the 590 such persons interviewed – one from each sample village/ward.

Table 8.2**Profile of the Heads of the Sample Village /Ward Interviewed**

Designation	Number
Sarpanch/Pradhan/Patel	333
Municipal Councilor	78
Social Worker	55
Teacher in Village School	45
Executive of Trust/Committee/NGO	44
Doctor/Compounder	7
Others	28
Total	590

Composition of the Sample Works

A total of 590 works were selected for detailed scrutiny. The method of selection has already been explained in Chapter 2. Though an attempt was made to select an equal number of works from each of the seven sectors the effective sample contains disproportionately large number of works in a few sectors such as *Roads & Bridges* and *Community Works*. This has happened largely because of non-availability of works in certain sectors and substitution by works in other sectors in the selected districts⁶. Attempt was made to interview 5 local people for each of the 590 sample works. However, in a few cases this could not be done due to operational and other difficulties. The Evaluation team could gather information and opinions from 2892 of the local people which falls short of the targeted number, $590 \times 5 = 2950$, by 58. Composition of the sample works scrutinized and the number of local people interviewed by sector are displayed in table 8.3.

Table 8.3

Sectoral Composition of sample works and number of local people interviewed

Sector	Number of works	Number of persons interviewed
Roads & Bridges	164	785
Irrigation	27	140
Drinking water & Sanitation	76	385
Community works	106	495
Education	95	479
Health	40	205
Others	82	403
All Sectors	590	2892

Origin of the Sample Works and Felt Needs

In an attempt to trace the origin of the proposal for the sample work under scrutiny the head of the village/ward was asked whether he knows who initially approached the MP for recommending the sample work in his village/ward. Only 5 percent of them conceded their ignorance on this. Others identified the agency proposing the work to MP for recommendation. The answers are classified and displayed in Table 8.4

⁶ It is perhaps necessary to caution the reader that the sample proportion of works in various sectors derived from this sample are not close to (unbiased estimates of) the corresponding proportions in the universe due to the way this sample has been selected. Unbiased estimates of the proportions of works in various sectors in the universe have been presented in Table 3.3 derived from an appropriate sample.

Table 8.4**Origin of the sample works as indicated by head of the village/ward**

(Number of sample work)

Panchayat Executives	Municipal Councilor	Teacher of the village school	Executives of locally functioning NGOs.	Others	Not known	All
352 (59.7)	84 (14.2)	30 (5.0)	57 (9.7)	38 (6.4)	29 (5.0)	590 (100.0)

Figures in parentheses are percentages to total.

Data displayed in table 8.4 indicate that nearly three fourth of the sample works had originated from either the Panchayat Executives or the Municipal Councilors. One may therefore expect that a majority of these works are in conformity with the felt needs of the population. However, about 25 per cent of the respondents are of the opinion that this is not always so. When asked to indicate steps to be taken to improve performance of the scheme, as many as 148 heads of the village/ward out of 590 suggested that *MPs while recommending works should take locally felt needs into account*. A few of the more frequent suggestions flowing in from this set of respondents are displayed in table 8.5. The question put to the respondents was an open-ended one. We shall comment on the other suggestions in the appropriate context.

Table 8.5**Some of the more frequent suggestions flowing in from head of the village/word.**

Suggestions	Number of persons suggesting
MPs while recommending works should take locally felt needs into account	148
Responsibility of maintenance of assets should be ensured while sanctioning the works	147
MPs should allocate enough fund according to assets intended to be created so that the resulting asset is complete and usable	132
Target date for completion of work should be fixed and adhered to	65
Common people should be made aware of the scheme	44
Only pucca roads and bridges should be constructed	45

Felt need perhaps, varies across socio-economic groups comprising the society. A small group having easy access to the MP at times may impress upon him to recommend work according to *their* felt needs. The works thus recommended may not always correspond to the pressing needs of the larger section of the population. To avoid such undesirable situation the PRIs may be asked to provide a list of works for recommendation to the MP every year. This list may also be displayed conspicuously for public information. With such a list in hand it will be easier for the MP to prioritize the felt needs of various groups according to importance.

Execution of Works

Information gathered from the head of the village/ward indicate that about 49 per cent of the sample works have been executed through Government departments and another 9 percent through PRIs. In about 27 percent of the cases private contractors were engaged. The executing agencies for about 7 percent of the works were not known even to the head of the village/ward interviewed. These data are displayed in table 8.6.

Table 8.6

Executing Agency as indicated by head of the village/ward

(Number of Sample works)

Government departments	Private contractor	PRIs	School authority	Others	Not known	Non-response	All
288 (48.8)	161 (27.3)	51 (8.6)	18 (3.1)	31 (5.3)	19 (3.2)	22 (3.7)	590 (100.0)

Figures in parentheses are percent to total.

Similar information gathered from the local people is summarized in Table 8.7. Out of 2892 persons interviewed 534 did not know the agency executing the work. The rest constituting 82 percent of the total had knowledge of the executing agency. Sector wise number of respondents who had knowledge of the executing agency is also shown in table 8.7.

Table 8.7

Knowledge about Executing Agency among the local people

Sector	Number of Respondents*	Work Executed by		
		Government Departments	PRI	Others
Road & Bridges	654 (83)	58.0	14.8	27.2
Irrigation	123 (88)	27.7	21.1	51.2
Drinking Water and Sanitation	317 (82)	33.7	22.1	44.2
Community Works	416 (84)	26.0	19.5	54.5
Education	361 (75)	33.4	22.7	43.9
Health	135 (66)	24.3	18.3	57.4
Others	352 (87)	35.8	20.9	43.3
All sectors	2358 (82)	38.4	19.3	42.3

* Out of 2892 persons interviewed only 2358 constituting 82 per cent, had knowledge about the executing agency. Figures in parentheses are the corresponding percentages in the respective sectors.

Out of 2892 persons interviewed only 2358 indicated some executing agency, the rest constituting about 18 percent conceded their ignorance on this. Of those who responded 38 per cent indicated Government departments to have executed the work while 19 percent indicated this to have been done by the PRIs. .

A comparative view of table 8.6 and 8.7 reveals that the percentage of works executed by PRIs is about 19 according to local people while it is only 9 according to heads of the village/ward. This discrepancy is perhaps a reflection of lack of detailed knowledge about the scheme among local people. The village heads, because of the position they held, often had associations with the works taken up under the scheme and thus, are expected to have more knowledge about the scheme. Findings of the evaluation team also corroborate this. An important source of knowledge for the local people –a board displayed at the site of the work –was found to be absent in 353 cases out of 590. This perhaps explains the discrepancy, at least partly.

Involvement of Local People in Execution of Works

To assess the extent and nature of involvement of the local people in execution of works undertaken in the scheme the respondents were asked whether he or any member of his family was involved in execution of the sample work in his village/ward. He was also requested to elaborate the nature of involvement. Their answers are summarised and displayed in table 8.8.

Table 8.8

Involvement of local people in execution of works

Sector	Number of Persons		
	Interviewed	Responded*	Involved in the work**
Road & Bridges	785	773 (98)	171 (22)
Irrigation	140	140 (100)	60 (43)
Drinking Water and Sanitation	385	379 (98)	68 (18)
Community Works	495	478 (97)	139 (29)
Education	479	456 (95)	98 (21)
Health	205	205 (100)	25 (12)
Others	403	390 (97)	102 (26)
All sectors	2892	2821 (98)	663 (24)

* Figures in parentheses are percentage of persons responding.

** Figures in parentheses are number of persons involved as percentage of persons responding.

As the data displayed in table 8.8 indicate, the response rate to this query is quite high, ranging from 95 to 100 percent across sectors. The percentage of people involved is highest in *Irrigation*, followed by *Community works* and *others*. It is lowest in *Health*. The nature of involvement ranged from working as wage earner, in monitoring and supervision to maintenance of the assets created.

Maintenance of Assets

Maintenance of the assets created is another important aspect of the scheme. Information gathered from the head of the village/ward is displayed in table 8.9. According to this about 17 percent of the sample assets are reported to be not maintained by any agency. Every fourth of the respondents suggested that *responsibility of maintenance of assets should be ensured while sanctioning the work* (see table 8.5). This points to the grassroots reality of inadequate arrangement for maintenance of a large number of assets.

Table 8.9

Agency maintaining the Assets created as Reported by head of the village/ward

(Number of assets)

PRI	Municipal Corporation	Local Association	College/School authorities	Others	None	All
191 (32.4)	66 (11.2)	81 (13.7)	33 (5.6)	121 (20.5)	98 (16.6)	590 (100)

When asked to comment on the quality of maintenance of the assets about 14 percent of the head of the village/ward did not offer any comment. About 37 percent of them rated maintenance of the corresponding asset to be good while another 21 percent rated this to be average. It seems that for about a third of the assets in this sample either there is no maintenance or it is rated to be poor. The aggregate picture covering all sectors in all states is displayed in table 8.10.

Table 8.10

Assessment of Quality of Maintenance by head of village/ward

(Number of assets)

Good	Average	Poor	No. Maintenance	Non response	All
216 (36.6)	123 (20.8)	52 (8.8)	116 (19.7)	83 (14.1)	590 (100.0)

Figures in parentheses are percentages to total

Similar information gathered from the local people are summarized and displayed in Table 8.11 and 8.12.

Table 8.11**Agency Maintaining the assets as reported by local people**

(Percent of respondents)

Sector	Number of respondents*	Asset maintained by			
		Panchayat	Municipality	Self help group	No maintenance
Road & Bridges	744 (95)	39.7	9.5	27.4	23.4
Irrigation	140 (100)	35.0	0.0	46.4	18.6
Drinking Water and Sanitation	348 (90)	33.0	24.4	37.4	5.2
Community Works	438 (88)	33.1	55.3	11.6	0.0
Education	411 (86)	23.1	65.5	5.6	5.8
Health	176 (86)	25.6	0.0	65.3	9.1
Others	366 (91)	27.6	18.6	41.2	12.6
All Sectors	2623 (91)	32.2	28.0	28.2	11.6

* Out of 2892 persons interviewed only 2623 constituting 91 percent responded to this query. Figures in parentheses are the corresponding percentages in the respective sectors.

Table 8.12**Quality of Maintenance as assessed by local people**

(Percent of respondents)

Sector	Number of Respondents *	Good	Average	Poor
Road & Bridges	598 (76)	32.1	27.6	40.3
Irrigation	140 (100)	41.5	32.1	26.4
Drinking Water and Sanitation	334 (87)	50.9	26.9	22.2
Community Works	384 (78)	63.8	20.8	15.4
Education	372 (78)	75.0	21.8	3.2
Health	150 (73)	66.0	18.0	16.0
Others	301 (75)	53.8	31.6	14.6
All Sectors	2279 (79)	52.8	25.7	21.5

* Out of 2892 persons interviewed only 2279 constituting 79 percent responded to this query. Figures in parentheses are the corresponding percentages in the respective sectors.

Both head of the village/ward and the local people rated a high percentage of assets being poorly maintained in each of the sectors except perhaps *Education*. In education however, there is a *natural* agency to use and look after the assets. Assets in this sector are generally created for existing hospitals, schools and other institutions. After completion the asset is handed over to the institution for use. In the process the institution also takes the responsibility of its upkeep. Table 8.11 and 8.12 presents the aggregate picture covering all states.

Maintenance and upkeep of assets seem to have received less attention than it deserves. The information displayed in tables 8.8 to 8.11 and similar information gathered from other sources and reported in earlier chapters are at variance with each other. In fact, no body seems to know how and by whom the assets are being looked after. For some of the assets there is a *natural* agency for maintenance, upkeep and use. For example an asset created for an existing school or hospital will be used and looked after by the school or the hospital after its creation. For other assets, it will be necessary to locate an appropriate agency to maintain these. This should preferably, be done before the work is sanctioned. Availability of adequate fund for this purpose will also need to be ensured either from public fund or user charges to be collected.

Quality of the Assets Created

What about the quality of the assets created under MPLADS? Various deficiencies in the scheme often leading to poor quality of the assets created have already been commented upon. Assessments of the quality of assets created by the head of in villages/ wards are displayed in table 8.13. Out of 590 sample works, the quality of only 376 has been rated to be good. These constitute about 64 percent of the total. Another 22 percent have been rated as average. A closer look at the data displayed in table 8.13 reveals wide variation across states. There are 10 states where none of the assets has been rated to be of poor quality. These include many states where Panchayati Raj Institutions are known to be functioning well. At the other end states like Bihar, Delhi, Karnataka, Madhya Pradesh and Rajasthan have a high proportion of assets rated to be of poor quality. Performance of various actors in any scheme can perhaps, be effectively influenced by watchful eyes of and vigilance by the general public (PRIs). What the MPs, Collectors and other development functionaries end up doing largely depend on the pressures put on them by the public. Making the PRIs work well and ensuring their involvement in different stages of the scheme assume importance in this context.

Table 8.13**Assessment of Quality of Assets Created by head of village/ward Across States**

(Percentage of respondents)

States Name	Quality of assets created					Total No. of works
	Good	Average	Poor	Non-response	All	
A&N Islands	85.7	0.0	14.3	0.0	100.0	7
Andhra Pradesh	83.3	11.9	2.4	2.4	100.0	42
Arunachal Pradesh	57.1	42.9	0.0	0.0	100.0	21
Assam	85.7	14.3	0.0	0.0	100.0	21
Bihar	35.7	52.4	11.9	0.0	100.0	42
Chandigarh	57.1	42.9	0.0	0.0	100.0	7
Delhi	42.9	42.9	9.5	4.8	100.0	21
Gujarat	64.3	21.4	7.1	7.1	100.0	28
Haryana	61.0	28.6	0.0	9.5	100.0	21
Himachal Pradesh	17.4	9.5	0.0	19.0	100.0	21
Jammu & Kashmir	52.4	33.3	9.5	4.8	100.0	21
Karnataka	46.4	25.0	10.7	17.9	100.0	28
Kerala	76.2	4.8	0.0	19.0	100.0	21
Madhya Pradesh	45.2	35.7	11.9	7.1	100.0	42
Maharashtra	54.8	26.2	0.0	14.3	100.0	42
Orissa	57.1	9.5	0.0	33.3	100.0	21
Punjab	58.7	14.3	11.9	0.0	100.0	21
Rajasthan	47.6	19.0	4.8	14.3	100.0	21
Sikkim	71.1	7.1	0.0	21.4	100.0	14
Tamil Nadu	69.0	16.7	7.1	7.1	100.0	42
Uttar Pradesh	78.7	10.6	6.4	4.3	100.0	47
West Bengal	79.5	7.7	0.0	12.8	100.0	39
All States	63.8	22.0	5.6	8.6	100.0	590

Perception of the local people interviewed about the quality of the assets created have been summarized and displayed in table 8.14.

Table 8.14**Assessment of Quality of Assets created by Local People**

(Percent of respondents)

Sector	Number of respondents*	Quality of Asset		
		Good	Average	Poor
Road & Bridges	751	51.1	36.8	12.1
Irrigation	140	69.3	22.9	7.9
Drinking Water and Sanitation	371	72.2	20.2	7.5
Community Works	459	79.3	15.0	5.7
Education	436	58.0	28.0	14.0
Health	188	77.7	21.3	1.0
Others	368	79.6	17.4	3.0
All Sectors	2713	66.5	25.0	8.5

Taking all sectors together about 67 percent of the respondents rated the corresponding assets to be of good quality. Maintenance of the corresponding assets has been assessed to be good by 53 per cent of the respondents (See table 8.12). There are variations across sectors that are visible in the data displayed in table 8.14. Assessment of the quality of asset by local people is only marginally different from those by the heads of the villages/wards at the aggregate level. However, opinions about quality of maintenance seem to differ widely. About 37 per cent of the head of village/ward assessed maintenance of the corresponding asset to be good while as high as 53 per cent of the local people interviewed did so. (See tables 8.10 and 8.12). This discrepancy is perhaps explained, at least partly, by differences in the knowledge and information available to these two sets of respondents leading to differences in their perception. However, consistent with the observations made elsewhere on the basis of other data sets, this also points to the grassroots reality that for about half of the sample assets there is scope for improvement in maintenance.

Usefulness of the Assets

To assess the perceived impact of the scheme the local people interviewed were asked whether the asset created has met their felt needs and whether it has improved their quality of life. An overwhelming majority of the local people interviewed has voted the assets created to be useful to them. They also felt that these assets have improved their quality of life. Their perception has been summarized and displayed in table 8.15.

Table 8.15

Usefulness of Assets as Assessed by Local People

Sector	Number of Respondents	Asset has met the felt needs		Number of Respondents	Asset has improved the quality of life	
		Yes	No		Yes	No
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Road & Bridges	785	92.2	7.8	785	82.8	17.2
Irrigation	140	93.6	6.4	140	70.7	29.3
Drinking Water and Sanitation	385	91.9	8.1	167	83.2	16.8
Community Works	485	95.1	4.9	102	84.3	15.7
Education	466	99.6	0.4	446	88.3	11.7
Health	200	98.0	2.0	184	74.5	25.5
Others	391	94.9	5.1	349	86.5	13.5
All Sectors	2852	94.7	5.3	2173	83.1	16.9

One aspect of the impact of the scheme, not less important by any means, is perception of the common people for whose benefit the assets have been created. If they feel happy about it a part of the job is perhaps, well done. As perceived by the local people the assets created under the scheme of have met their felt needs and also

improved their quality of life. However, it is another issue to scrutinize what has been really achieved and what can be achieved with this quantum of fund when the existing deficiencies in the scheme are removed.

In sum, analysis of the data collected from the grassroots level and analysed here indicate the following:

- Involvement of the local people through PRIs at the stage of recommendation will make it easier for the MPs to take better care of locally felt needs.
- Allocation of fund for individual works is often inadequate to complete the work and creation of usable assets.
- For about 50 percent of the assets created there is scope for improvement in maintenance.
- Awareness campaign for the scheme among the people needs to be taken up.
- Well functioning PRIs and its involvement in various stages of the scheme will lead to creation of assets of good quality.

Many of these findings are in conformity with the findings in earlier chapters. Analysis in earlier chapters indicated some deficiencies at various stages of the scheme. Appropriate steps to remove these deficiencies will lead to better utilization of the fund, improve the performance of the scheme and thus lead to more benefits to the common men.

A n n e x u r e s

List of Rajaya Sabha MPs interviewed and Sample District

Sl. No	Name of State	Name of Member	Current/ Ex-MP	Selected District	Nodal District
1	Andhra Pradesh	Sh.C.Ramachandraith	Current	Cuddapah	Cuddapah
2	Andhra Pradesh	Dr.D. Venkateswara Rao	Current	Prakasam	Prakasam
3	Arunachal Pradesh	Sh. Nabam Rebia	Current	Papum Pare	Papum Pare
4	Assam	Dr. Manmohan Singh	Current	Kamrup	Sibsagar
5	Bihar	Sh.Naresh Yadav	Ex-MP	Katihar	Katihar
6	Bihar	Smt. Kamla Sinha	Ex-MP	Patna	Patna
7	Delhi	Pro. Vijay Kumar Malhotra	Ex-MP	Delhi	Delhi
8	Gujarat	Dr. Y. K. Alagh	Current	Vadodra	Ahmedabad
9	Haryana	Sh.B.D.Gupta	Current	Bhiwani	Bhiwani
10	Himachal Pradesh	Sh.Sushil Barongppa	Ex-MP	Lahul & Spiti	Lahul & Spiti
11	Jammu & Kashmir	Dr.Karan Singh	Ex-MP	Jammu	Jammu
12	Karnataka	Sh. Oscar Farnandes *	Current	Udipi	Udipi
13	Kerala	Sh.S.Ramachandran Pillai	Current	Alappuzha	Alappuzha
14	Madhya Pradesh	Miss. Mabel Rebello *	Current	Bhopal	Bhopal
15	Madhya Pradesh	Sh.Dilip Singh Judev	Current	Raigarh	Raigarh
16	Maharashtra	Sh.Suryabhan Vahadane	Current	Ahmednagar	Ahmednagar
17	Maharashtra	Sh.V.N.Gadgil	Ex-MP	Pune	Pune
18	Orissa	Sh. Rama Chandra Khuntia	Current	Jajpur	Jajpur
19	Punjab	Sh.Guru Charn Singh Tohra	Current	Patiala	Patiala
20	Rajasthan	Sh.Bhuvnesh Chaturvedi	Ex-MP	Kota	Kota
21	Sikkim	Sh.Karma Tapden	Ex-MP	East Sikkim	East Sikkim
22	Tamil Nadu	Dr.D Masthan	Current	Thiruvallor	Kancheepuram
23	Tamil Nadu	SH.Margabandu	Current	Vellore	Vellore
24	Uttar Pradesh	Sh.Devi Prasad Singh	Current	Deoria	Deoria
25	Uttar Pradesh	Sh. Jayant Kumar Malhotra*	Current	Kanpur Dehat	Kanpur Nagar
26	Uttar Pradesh	Dr. Ranbir Singh	Ex-MP	Muzaffar Nagar	Meerut
27	West Bengal	Sh Ramnarayan Goswami	Ex-MP	Burdwan	Burdwan
28	West Bengal	Sh. Jibon Roy	Current	Calcutta	Calcutta

* Indicates that MPs not replied.

Annexure -3.1

**Statement of release/expenditure of Lok Sabha & Rajya Sabha MPs as on 31
March 2000**

(Rs. In lakh)

Sl. No	State/UTs	1993-2000				
		Release by G.O.I.	Amount sanctioned	Expenditure incurred	Percentage Sanctioned over Release	Percentage Utilization over Release
1.	Andhra Pradesh	40345	36383.0	25948.1	90.2	64.3
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	1815	1620.9	1315.6	89.3	72.5
3.	Assam	12905	10795.0	8848.6	83.7	68.6
4.	Bihar	46210	40165.0	30541.5	86.9	66.1
5.	Goa	1665	1225.1	1041.3	73.6	62.5
6.	Gujarat	25185	27989.0	14075.7	111.1	55.9
7.	Haryana	9175	8014.1	6710.6	87.3	73.1
8.	Himachal Pradesh	4885	4461.5	3599.6	91.3	73.7
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	3350	2664.7	1264.4	79.5	37.7
10.	Karnataka	28050	25043.0	18056.5	89.3	64.4
11.	Kerala	17595	15253.0	9789.9	86.7	55.6
12.	Madhya Pradesh	36975	32133	25962.4	86.9	70.2
13.	Maharashtra	43025	37607.0	23771.9	87.4	55.3
14.	Manipur	2165	2014.8	1823.9	93.1	84.2
15.	Meghalaya	1815	1869.2	1583.1	103.0	87.2
16.	Mizoram	1460	1374.1	1214.1	94.1	83.2
17.	Nagaland	1260	1110.0	1110.0	88.1	88.1
18.	Orissa	20250	17801.0	11051.0	87.9	54.6
19.	Punjab	11705	9981.5	6323.4	85.3	54.0
20.	Rajasthan	22875	19169.0	13721.3	83.8	60.0
21.	Sikkim	1610	1615.9	1407.6	100.4	87.4
22.	Tamil Nadu	44485	42170.0	32622.6	94.8	73.3
23.	Tripura	1965	1737.3	844.1	88.4	43.0
24.	Uttar Pradesh	78045	68091.0	53501.6	87.2	68.6
25.	West Bengal	31685	27295.0	19961.1	86.1	63.0
26.	A & N Islands	405	327.1	327.1	80.8	80.1
27.	Chandigarh	555	385.3	320.4	69.4	57.7
28.	D & N Haveli	605	403.5	242.8	66.7	40.1
29.	Daman & Diu	505	429.6	429.6	85.1	85.1
30.	Delhi	7395	7071.7	4239.5	95.6	57.3
31.	Lakshdweep	655	567.7	217.2	86.7	33.2
32.	Pondicherry	1060	867.6	254.8	81.8	24.0
	Exp. In r/o two MPs reconciled subsequently as intimated vide Ministry letter No. C/28/2000 MPLADS dated 16.2.2001	100	-	-	-	-
	Grand Total	501780	447635.6	322121.3	89.2	64.2

Source: Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation, Quoted in CAG Report, March 2000.

Regional Variation in Utilization of MPLADS Fund

Percentage utilization	Number of States/ UTs	Name of the States/UTs
Less than 50	5	Jammu & Kashmir, Tripura, Dadar Nagar & Haveli, Lakshadweep, Pondicherry
50-60	8	Gujarat, Kerala, Maharashtra, Orissa, Punjab, Rajasthan, Chandigarh, Delhi
60-70	7	Andhra Pradesh, Assam, Bihar, Goa, Karnataka, Uttar Pradesh, West Bengal
70-80	5	Arunachal Pradesh, Haryana, Himachal Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh, Tamil Nadu
More than 80	7	Manipur, Meghalayaa, Mizoram, Nagaland, Sikkim A&N Islands, Daman & Diu

Source: Prepared from Annexure 3.1.

Project Team

Project Directors

1. Shri Kishore Narayan Pathak, Deputy Adviser
2. Dr. S.M. Sirajuddin, Deputy Adviser

Consultant

1. Shri G. Chakrabarty,

Headquarter

Technical Team		
Sl. No.	Name of Officer/Staff	Designation
1.	Shri M.I. Farooqui	Senior Research Officer
2.	Mrs. Roohi Siddiqui	Senior Research Officer
3.	Shri B.L. Rangroo	Economic Investigator Gr-I
4.	Shri Shri L.N. Meena	Economic Investigator Gr-I
5.	Shri V.K. Sharma	Statistical Investigator Gr-I
6.	Shri A.R. Tripathi	Economic Investigator Gr-II
7.	Mrs. Kanta Kalia	Upper Division Clerk
8.	Shri Bhuvan Chander	Tabulation Clerk
9.	Shri Dharmender Singh Sajwan	Tabulation Clerk
10.	Mrs. Nalini Borker	Tabulation Clerk
11.	Shri K.P. Kalshyan	Tabulation Clerk
12.	Mrs. Rita Popli	Stenographer
13.	Mrs. Neera Kapoor	Stenographer
14.	Mrs. Neelam Bhasin	Stenographer
Technical Coordination		
1.	Shri F.U. Khan	Senior Research Officer
NIC COORDINATION		
1.	Officers & Staff of the National Informatics Centre	Yojana Bhavan Unit

Field Team – field units

SL. NO	Regional Evaluation Office / Project Evaluation Office	Officer In charge		Field Staff	
		Name	Designation	Name	Desig.
1.	R.E.O., Hyderabad	Sh.G.R. Reddy	Director	Shri M.Kanthaiah	EIGr-II
		Sh.K. Kayantha	Research Officer	Shri G.Kullayappa	EIGr-II
				Shri C. Venkaiah	EIGr-II
				Shri C.G.Deshmukh	EIGr-II
2.	P.E.O. Bangalore	Sh. B.C.Narsimhulu	Sr. Research Officer	Shri Raj Kumar	EIGr-I
		Sh. Georgy Kutty,	Research Officer	Shri K.V.Suresh	EIGr-I
3.	R.E.O. Kolkata	Sh. B.C.Malik Sh. Subendu Ganguly	Deputy Adviser	Shri C. Bose	EIGr-I
			Research Officer	Shri Basudeb Das	EIGr-I
			Shri G.C. Das	EIGr-II	
			Shri D.K. Banik	Steno	
4.	P.E.O., Guwahati	Sh. D. Khound,	Sr. Research Officer	Shri A.K. Thakur	EIGr-I
				Shri L.N.Kachari	EIGr-II
5.	P.E.O., Bhubneswar	Dr. R.C.Dey		N.C. Samal	EIGr-I
				S. Routray	EIGr-I
6.	R.E.O., Jaipur	Sh. Om Parkash	Deputy Adviser	B.R.Gawali	SEI
				Sheela K.Choudhary	SEI
				Suresh Sharma	O.S.
				P.C. Yadav	EIGr-II
				Prem Datt Gehlot	STENO
7.	P.E.O., Bhopal	Sh. V.K. Kulshrestha	Sr. Research Officer	Virndra Singh	SEI
				A.K. Rai	EIGr-I
				A.C.Sheikh	EIGr-II
8.	R.E.O., Lucknow	Mrs. Sangeeta Verma	Director	N.S.Rawat	SEI
		Sh. G.R.Khanna	Research Officer	A.Bhatnagar	SEI
CENTRE FOR DEVELOPMENT STUDIES, LUCKNOW*					
9.	P.E.O., Patna	Shri Rajeev Kumar Sh. Kamla Pande	Sr. Research Officer Research Officer	Shahid Rasool	SEI
				Omesh Paul	SEI
				A.K. Singh	LDC
ASIAN DEVELOPMENT RESEARCH INSTITUTE*					
10.	R.E.O. Mumbai	Mrs. Nutan Raj Late Sh. S.K.Ashtekar Mrs. Sushma Monga	Deputy Adviser Research Officer Research Officer	D.K.Bangar	EIGr-I
				D.N.Mothghare	EIGr-I
				P.G.Kulkarni	EIGr-I
11.	P.E.O., Ahmedabad	Sh. K.S. Kalasua	Sr. Research Officer	D.J.Kushwah	EIGr-I
				A.R.Dodia	EIGr-I
				J.P.Bhatt	EIGr-II
				C.C.Pradhan	EIGr-II
12.	R.E.O.Chennai	Sh .M.Mathisekaran Sh. P.K.Abdul Kareem	Director	G.Subramany	EIGr-I
			Research Officer	P.S.Ragavan	EIGr-I
				P. J. Radhakrishnan	EIGr-I
				Portia Louis	EIGr-II
				M. Parthasarthy	EIGr-II
T.C. Sundaramani	EIGr-II				
13.	P.E.O. Trivandrum	Mrs. Rekha Verghese Mrs. A.Sirija	Sr. Research Officer	V. Nagarajan	EIGr-I
			Research Officer	T. Velayudhan	EIGr-II
				Sreedevi Narayanan	EIGr-II
14.	R.E.O. Chandigarh	Sh. Yash Pal Bhagat	Director	C.S. Verma	SEI
				Raj Pal Singh	SEI
				Om Parkash	EIGr-II
15.	P.E.O. Shimla	Sh. Rajesh Thakur	Sr. Research Officer	M.S. Chandel	SEI
				M.L. Sharma	SEI

* These are NGOs.