

## Chapter 9: Monitoring Mechanism and Impact Evaluation

### 9.1 Inspection and Supervision

DC is responsible for monitoring the overall 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 DC closely monitors the progress on a monthly/quarterly basis. The District Planning and Development Committee is also required to review the progress of schemes every quarter. In addition, the State Government has also specified the extent of supervision to be carried out at various levels with regard to the developmental works/projects, as given in Table -41.

**Table-41: Extent of supervision to be carried out at various levels in the District**

Designated Officer	Percentage of Inspection to be carried out
Block Development Officer / Junior Engineer	100
District Planning Officer	15
Addl. DC / Addl. DM	5
Sub-Divisional Officer	10
Deputy Commissioner	4
Official from State Planning Department	1

*Source: Departmental figures.*

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 levels – GPs to the Blocks, Blocks to DRDA/DC, DC to the State Government and onwards to the Central Government, for the Central schemes.

Audit scrutiny, however, revealed that monitoring and supervision of the progress of implementation of various schemes in the District was perfunctory. The District Planning and Monitoring Committee convened only four meetings during 2007-12. DC held monthly meetings with BDOs and the district departmental heads to review the progress of execution of works/schemes. But the minutes of the meetings did not indicate the position of different schemes being implemented in the District.

The sampled Blocks did not send the Statements of Expenditure on a monthly basis to DC. Besides, no record regarding supervision and monitoring was maintained at any level in the absence of which, percentage of inspection/supervision actually carried out against the norms could not be ascertained.

### 9.2 Grievance Redressal

There was no mechanism in the District to redress the grievances of the public relating to the services/utilities provided by various departments and agencies of the State. Though complaints were received by DC and PD, DRDA, documentation of receipt and disposal of complaints/grievances was not done. In the absence of proper documentation of receipt and disposal of complaints/grievances, audit could not

verify the timely disposal of complaints/grievances received from people of the district. Thus, mechanism for redressal of grievances of the people was not in place and its effectiveness was also not ensured.

### **9.3 Lack of Documentation**

Though DRDA maintained funds receipt registers under different schemes indicating funds received from GoI/GoA and funds utilised/released to the implementing agencies, the test-checked Blocks did not maintain any corresponding register. Further, inventory of assets created under different schemes were not maintained at any level, in the absence of which DC was unaware of total assets created during the last five years in the district.

### **9.4 Sensitivity to Error Signals**

Irregularities in implementation of different schemes were found published in local dailies. The Deputy Director of Information and Public Relations, GoA is responsible for forwarding the news paper clippings to DC and other departmental heads for necessary action. The Deputy Director forwarded 6,691 paper clippings to DC and others during 2007-12. Details of action taken by DC on newspaper clippings, though called for, were not made available to Audit.

Further, irregularities like under utilization/ irregular utilisation of scheme funds etc., were mentioned repeatedly in earlier Inspection Reports issued from the Accountant General (Audit) to PD, DRDA, DC, Sonitpur and other departmental heads of the District. Repetition of similar irregularities, thus, indicates that DC and other departmental heads required to be more sensitive to error signals.

Monitoring and Supervision at various levels was deficient for which large number of works under different schemes remained incomplete. As a result, people were deprived of intended benefits of these developmental schemes. Documentation of receipts and disposal of complaints received was not done. Thus, timeliness of disposal of complaints/ grievances received from the people of the district could not be ascertained.

### **Recommendation**

➤ DC should strengthen monitoring, inspection and supervision through mandatory and properly documented review meetings, submission of periodical reports and returns, physical verification etc., in all the tiers of local administration to ensure that the programmes are executed in time and corrective action is taken timely in the cases of slippages.