

Chapter – XII Conclusion

Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme is slowly picking up the momentum in the State after initial hiccups. A network of professional agencies for technical support and quality control measures were not established and panel of accredited engineers was not constituted for effective implementation of MGNREGS.

There were deficiencies in planning, execution, fund management, grievance redressal mechanism, monitoring and training in implementation of MGNREGA in the state. The long term District Perspective Plans were not prepared and the Annual Plans were also delayed inordinately. Further the Plans were prepared without labour projection and identification of work to meet demand. There was considerable delay in submitting labour budget and even then the labour budgets were not realistic, resulting in wide variation between actual and the projected demand. Considerable differences were observed between Monthly Progress Reports (MPR) of expenditure and creation of jobs reported to the government and data in Management Information System (MIS).

The primary objective of the scheme to provide 100 days guaranteed employment to every registered applicant on demand was not met as only one to seven *per cent* registrants were provided 100 days employment in the State. Further, the percentage of registrants who were provided job declined from 75 to 20 *per cent* during 2007-12. Female workers were provided only 28 *per cent* job at state level. Also, there were several cases of non and delayed payment of wages ranging from 17 to 660 days in districts. At the Gram Panchayat level, complaint register was not maintained and hence the position of complaints lodged by the workers (if any) whether properly addressed or not, was not ascertainable.

The State Government had not devised Schedule of Rates for MGNREGS works and the lowest prioritised works were given highest priority and top prioritised works were less covered. Unspent balance of grant, non transfer of balance amount of SGRY grants into MGNREGA account and frequent use of machine in works affected creation of mandays.

The works taken under the scheme were not dovetailed with other rural sector scheme and objectives of integrating the MGNREGS with other activities could not be achieved.

Key records such as application register, muster roll register, asset register and employment register were not maintained. The aforesaid shortcomings were the hurdle in achieving the intended objectives of the MGNREGS

The works were not supervised by the State Government and district authorities. Training was not imparted to stakeholders which resulted in major shortcomings in execution of scheme. General and RTI complaints (District and Block level) were not disposed off within prescribed time and 15 to 70 *per cent* complaints were pending for disposal. At Gram Panchayat level complaint register was not maintained and social audit was conducted in limited case.

The State Government not only failed to establish Internal Audit Cell but, also failed to appoint Ombudsman for grievance redressal mechanism. Local Vigilance and Monitoring Committee was not set up in most of the works at village level and Quality Monitors at district and state level were not appointed. MNREGS workers were nor covered under Rastriya Swasthya Bima Yojna.

PLACE : PATNA
DATE : 01 May, 2013



(P.K.Singh)
Accountant General (Audit),
Bihar

COUNTERSIGNED

PLACE : NEW DELHI
DATE : 06 May, 2013



(VINOD RAI)
Comptroller and Auditor General of
India