Chapter 8: Monitoring and Impact Evaluation

i) Monitoring at District Administration / DPC level

The DM&C is responsible for monitoring the progress of implementation of various developmental programmes in the district and ensuring that these are executed within the specified timeframe and approved budget. While most of the Central and State plan schemes specify the monitoring requirements, in general, most schemes require that the DM&C monitor the progress on a monthly/quarterly basis. The members of the DPC also were to meet at least twice a year to review the developmental activities in the district.

Audit scrutiny revealed that monitoring and supervision of the progress of implementation of various schemes in the district was perfunctory. While the DM&C was conducting monthly meetings on various agenda regularly and also keeping watch on the follow up action on the decisions taken therein on priority basis, the District Planning Committee headed by him, supposed to discuss specifically on the developmental Plan schemes, did not convene any meeting since its constitution in September 2008.

ii) Monitoring at DRDA level

In respect of the rural developmental schemes, the DRDA was to monitor the implementation closely through obtaining periodic reports as well as frequent field visits for aiding both the pace and quality of implementation. In respect of NREGS and other rural development schemes, an MOU had been signed with a private agency for conducting Social Audits from April 2008. A six member Evaluation Committee headed by the Principal Secretary, R.D. Department constituted in September 2008 examined and verified the Social Audit Reports submitted by the agency from time to time. The GB of the DRDA was required to meet quarterly. As against 20 meetings due and also claimed to be held during the period 2004-09, copy of recorded minutes of only 11 meetings (3 in 2004-05, 1 in 2005-06, 3 in 2006-07, 1 in 2007-08 and 3 in 2008-09) could be made available to Audit. A review of the minutes of the GB meetings revealed that it had never discussed the progress of SGRY, indicating lack of proper follow-up action for the programme. It was further seen that the GB in its meetings mainly discussed on only one scheme viz. Swarnajayanti Grameen Swarozgar Yojana (SGSY).

iii) Monitoring at GP / Block level

Apart from the stipulated personal inspection and supervision, review of the execution of schemes was also to be done through periodical review reports and statements of expenditure (SOE) to be sent from various level viz. GPs to the Blocks, Blocks to the DRDA/DM&C, DM&C to the State Government and onwards to the Central Government, with regard to the Central schemes. Such inspection/review, though claimed to be conducted, were not duly documented through reports. Audit scrutiny of four sampled Blocks revealed that none of the Blocks or the GPs within these Blocks were sending the SOEs/ Progress Reports to the higher authorities on a regular basis and in the prescribed formats.

iv) Grievance redressal mechanism

There was no separate grievance redressal cell/unit created under the district administration for ameliorating complaints against deprival of any sort of benefits from the developmental programmes/ schemes. Although instructions for taking action on such petitions/ applications, if any were stated to be issued by the DM&C himself from time to time, in absence of a well organized mechanism, neither maintenance of systematic records nor proper follow up was undertaken.

To sum up, Monitoring and supervision of the progress of implementation of various schemes in the district was perfunctory. There was lack of proper follow-up action for the programmes taken up under various developmental schemes. Periodical review reports and statements of expenditure (SOE) were not duly submitted. Community participation in monitoring and evaluation was absent.

Recommendation

The forum of DPC and the other prescribed forums should be utilised effectively to ensure monitoring of the implementation of all development schemes taken up in the district. Records of all meetings/inspection/review etc should be properly documented for ensuring effective follow-up. Grievance redressal mechanism should be systematized and institutionalised.