

CHAPTER III

Implementation of Schemes

Central Government introduced several schemes viz. Indira Awaas Yojana (IAY), Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme (MGNREGS), Total Sanitation Campaign (TSC) and Backward Region Grant Fund (BRGF) for rural development and improvement of Human Development Index in rural areas. PRIs have been implementing these schemes in pursuance of guidelines framed by Government of India. Chapter-III deals with the various audit observations regarding implementation of MGNREGS and TSC schemes.

3.1 Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme

3.1.1 Introduction

Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme (MGNREGS) is one of the flagship programmes of Government of India (GoI). The aim of MGNREGS is to enhance the livelihood security of rural people by providing at least one hundred days of guaranteed employment in a financial year to every household in rural areas covered under the scheme. It also fosters conditions for inclusive growth ranging from basic wage security and recharging rural economy for transformative empowerment of democracy.

Government of West Bengal also notified 'West Bengal Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme (WBREGS), 2006' in February 2006. The Scheme is implemented as a Centrally Sponsored Scheme on a cost-sharing basis between the Centre and the State. The Central Government bears 100 *per cent* wage cost of unskilled manual labour and 75 *per cent* of the material cost and the wages of skilled and semi skilled workers. The State Government bears 25 *per cent* of the material cost and the wages of skilled and semi skilled workers.

3.1.2 Financial Management

3.1.2.1 Receipt and expenditure of funds in 18 districts

The total available fund and expenditure under the scheme in 18 districts of the State during 2011-14 are as follows:

Table 3.1: Receipt and Expenditure of MGNREGS fund of the State

Year	Opening balance	Receipt				Expenditure	Closing balance
		Central Share	State Share	Misc.	Total		
2011-12	35.37	2597.03	224.63	8.36	2865.39	2844.62	20.77
2012-13	20.77	3395.48	497.33	0.00	3913.58	3893.32	20.26
2013-14	29.18	2894.38	656.21	18.73	3598.50	3567.77	30.73

(Source: Records of P&RDD and nrega.nic.in)

3.1.3 Execution of scheme

3.1.3.1 Non-achievement of one hundred days guaranteed employment

The scheme guideline stipulates that every household in the rural area should be provided not less than 100 days of guaranteed employment in a financial year. Scrutiny revealed that 197 GPs and 1,569 GPs could not provide one hundred days of employment to any household during 2011-12 and 2012-13 respectively (**Appendix-X**). Further, these GPs provided only 22 and 29 average mandays per household during the respective period. Thus the primary objective of ensuring livelihood security of rural households by providing at least 100 days of guaranteed annual wage employment was frustrated.

3.1.3.2 More than 100 days employment provided to the household

The guideline also stipulates that a maximum of 100 days works may be provided per household in a financial year and GoI is liable for providing funds for unskilled employment up to 100 days per family in a financial year. Liability for employment in excess of 100 days has accordingly to be borne by the State Government. The State Government also issued instructions (March 2010) to adhere to the ceiling of 100 days work per household in a financial year strictly. Otherwise, erring GP would be liable to bear the cost of wages associated with the works in excess of 100 days.

Audit noticed that four²⁰ GPs extended works in excess of 100 days to 2,305 households during 2012-13 and paid ₹ 11.92 lakh from MGNREGS fund in contravention of above instruction.

3.1.3.3 Creation of durable asset

Creation of durable asset and strengthening livelihood resource base of rural people are auxiliary objectives of MGNREGS. It was observed that 90 GPs and 1,044 GPs (**Appendix-X**) expended ₹ 15.15 crore and ₹ 520.69 crore during 2011-12 and 2012-13 respectively but failed to create any durable asset.

As a result, the objective of strengthening rural infrastructure could not be achieved.

3.1.3.4 Issuance of Job Cards

The guideline specifies that GP should issue job cards to the registered households after making such enquiry as it deemed fit.

Scrutiny of Registration cum Employment register of the GPs revealed that 14 GPs and 160 GPs did not issue job cards to 2,425 and 24,775 registered families though they had applied for the same (**Appendix-XI**) during 2011-12 and 2012-13 respectively. Reason for non-issuance of job cards was not found on record.

Photographs of adult members of households were required to be affixed on job cards. But photographs were not affixed on any job card issued during 2011-12 and 2012-13 in 21 GPs and 250 GPs respectively (**Appendix-XI**).

3.1.3.5 Employment not provided to job seeking families and unemployment allowance not paid

Guideline stipulates that every applicant should be provided unskilled manual work within 15 days of receipt of application seeking employment or from the date on which employment was sought in case of advance application, whichever was later. In case of failure of adhering to the said provision, the applicant was entitled for a daily unemployment allowance by the State Government.

Audit noticed that 7 job applicants of Ghoshpukur GP of Darjeeling during 2011-12 and 13,412 job applicants in 85 GPs of 12 districts during 2012-13

²⁰ Ramnagar (₹ 1.33 lakh), Rajnagar (₹ 4.33 lakh), Bhabanipur (₹ 3.77 lakh) and Rishi Bankim Chandra (₹ 2.49 lakh).

were not provided any employment (**Appendix - XI**) and no unemployment allowance was also paid to those applicants in contravention of the provisions of the scheme guideline.

3.1.3.6 Delay in payment of wages

Guideline stipulates that wages should be paid to labourers on a weekly basis or in any case not later than a fortnight after the date on which the work is done. In case of failure, the labourers are entitled to receive compensation. Delays ranging from 15 to 90 days in disbursement of wages were noticed in 14²¹ GPs and 375²² GPs during 2011-12 and 2012-13 respectively, but no compensation was paid. Reasons as evident from records were late submission of muster rolls by supervisors, delay in receipt of funds, late disbursement of wages by banks and post offices etc. The labourers were thus, deprived of getting their dues in time and they were also not compensated as per the provisions of the guideline for delayed payment.

3.1.3.7 Works taken up without technical and administrative approval

The Programme Officer (PO) would accord technical and administrative approval of works under MGNREGS. In violation of the said provision, nine GPs and 60 GPs executed works under the scheme in 2011-12 and 2012-13 respectively without obtaining the technical and administrative approval of the respective POs (**Appendix- XII**).

3.1.3.8 Maintenance of Measurement Book / Measurement Sheet

Maintenance of Measurement Book (MB) / Measurement Sheet (MS) is necessary to ensure proper accountability of the works done or being done under the scheme. Scrutiny revealed that Kelepara GP (of Pursurah PS) and Jitpur-Uttarrampur GP (of Salanpur PS) did not maintain the MB / MS in respect of works valuing ₹ 5.83 lakh and ₹ 2.37 lakh respectively during 2012-13. In the absence of any record in the MB / MS, quantum of work executed could not be ensured, besides, the GPs failed to justify the payment made against the works executed by them.

²¹ **ZPs:** Hooghly- 01 GP, Malda- 01 GP, Murshidabad -08 GPs, North 24 Parganas -01 GP, Purba Medinipur -01 GP, South 24 Parganas- 01 GP and Uttar Dinajpur- 01 GP.

²² **ZPs:** Bankura -16 GPs, Bardhaman -46 GPs, Birbhum -32 GPs, Cooch Behar- 16 GPs, Dakshin Dinajpur -09 GPs, Hooghly- 35 GPs, Howrah -02 GPs, Murshidabad -26 GPs, Nadia -28 GPs, North 24 Parganas - 25 GPs, Paschim Medinipur- 67 GPs, Purba Medinipur -50 GPs and South 24 Parganas- 23 GPs.

3.1.3.9 Progress reports of works with photos not forwarded to PO

According to scheme guideline, the GPs should send completion reports along with photographs of all the works undertaken to the PO. This helps PO in monitoring the progress of the scheme. Scrutiny revealed that three²³ GPs did not send completion reports along with photographs of 34 works undertaken to the PO during 2011-12. Similarly 53 GPs did not send completion reports along with photographs of 2,749 works undertaken to the POs during 2012-13 (**Appendix- XIII**).

3.1.3.10 Estimated mandays vis-à-vis actual generation

Scrutiny revealed that during 2011-12, 182 GPs and during 2012-13 1,634 GPs prepared annual action plan with an estimate to generate 1.98 crore and 491.16 crore mandays respectively. But the GPs could generate only 0.03 crore and 9.54 crore mandays (1.52 *per cent* and 1.94 *per cent*) while an amount of ₹ 3.18 crore and ₹ 23.92 crore remained unutilised at the end of March 2012 and 2013 respectively (**Appendix- XIV**).

This indicates tardy programme implementation.

3.1.3.11 Observation on Social audit

Guideline stipulates that in order to maintain transparency and accountability in MGNREGS works, Gram Sabhas should conduct regular social audits of all the projects under the scheme taken up at the GP level and social audit forum should be constituted for this purpose. Scrutiny revealed that social audit forums were not formed in 12 GPs and 60 GPs during 2011-12 and 2012-13 respectively. Further social audit was also not conducted in 15 GPs and 60 GPs (**Appendix-XV**) respectively during 2011-12 and 2012-13 respectively. Even where social audit was conducted (in 10 GPs and 102 GPs during 2011-12 and 2012-13), the objections raised during audit were not followed through.

3.1.3.12 Excavation or re-excavation of private ponds without making any agreement with the owner

The State Government stipulates that in order to carry out any work of excavation / re-excavation of a private pond, an agreement should be entered into with the owner of the pond to the effect that water of the private pond so excavated or re-excavated could be utilised by local people. In absence of any agreement, the owners of these private ponds may debar the local people from

²³ Dadpur (of Beldanga-II PS), Jetia (of Barrackpur-I PS) and Radhapur (of Shyampur-I PS) GPs.

utilising water of these ponds. The information about use of such ponds was not available from the records of the concerned GPs.

In violation of the said guidelines, 18²⁴ GPs spent ₹ 7.45 crore towards excavation or re-excavation of private ponds during 2012-13 without formalising any agreement with the owner of those ponds.

3.1.3.13 Retention of Sampoorna Grameen Rozgar Yojana (SGRY) funds

Panchayat and Rural Development Department (P&RDD) endorsed (November 2007) the instruction of the Ministry of Rural Development, GoI, wherein it was intimated to transfer balance amount of fund and food grains of SGRY to MGNREGS account (after 2008) as SGRY scheme was abolished and NREGA came into effect.

Scrutiny of cash book, subsidiary cash book and cash analysis report revealed that five PSs and one GP²⁵ did not adhere to the said instruction and unspent balance of SGRY fund of ₹ 7.85 lakh was not transferred to MGNREGS till March 2014.

When pointed out, Bankura-II (March 2014), Barasat-II (December 2013), Chanchol-II (March 2014) and Harishchandrapur-I (April 2013) PSs and Rammohan-I GP (November 2013) admitted the fact and stated that retention of SGRY fund occurred due to lack of knowledge about the government directive and assured to transfer the unutilised fund at the earliest. But Jhalda-I PS did not furnish any reply.

Thus, ₹ 7.85 lakh was left idle with PRIs, which otherwise could have been used for generation of 5,772²⁶ unskilled mandays under MGNREGS.

3.2 Total Sanitation Campaign

3.2.1 Introduction

GoI introduced Total Sanitation Campaign (TSC) with emphasis on creating awareness among rural people on sanitary facilities and to bring about a change

²⁴ **Bardhaman** – Barsul-I (₹ 38.40 lakh), Sribati (₹ 100.26 lakh), Singhi (₹ 109.93 lakh), Karui (₹ 70.18 lakh), **Birbhum** - Loba (₹ 119.89 lakh), **Dakshin Dinajpur** – Ganguria (₹ 7.65 lakh), **Darjeeling** – Naxalbari (₹ 2.18 lakh), **Hooghly** – Aiyaa (₹ 83.68 lakh), Beraberi (₹ 27.84 lakh), Masat (₹ 107.30 lakh), **Howrah** – Haturia-I (₹ 8.65 lakh), Bangalpur (₹ 0.36 lakh), Binola-Krishnabati (₹ 1.60 lakh), **Purba Medinipur** – Dubda (₹ 1.95 lakh), Khodambari-II (₹ 7.51 lakh), Kumirda (₹ 28.99 lakh), Amdabad-II (₹ 24.67 lakh) and Debendra (₹ 3.92 lakh).

²⁵ **PSs**- Bankura-II (₹ 0.95 lakh), Barasat-II (₹ 0.90 lakh), Chanchol-II (₹ 2.14 lakh), Harishchandrapur-I (₹ 0.67 lakh), Jhalda-I (₹ 2.03 lakh) and **GP**: Rammohan-I (Hooghly ZP) (₹ 1.16 lakh).

²⁶ Total fund @ ₹ 7,85,000.00/ Mandays @ ₹ 136 per head=5,772.

in attitude towards practices of hygienic life style. Erstwhile Central Rural Sanitation Programme was restructured to "Total Sanitation Campaign" in the year 1999.

3.2.2 Poor Performance

Scrutiny of records of five PSs during 2013-14 revealed that the overall performance in construction of sanitary latrines in HHL/ School/ SSK/ MSK/ ICDS, sanitary toilets within the jurisdiction of the PSs during 2011-13 was far from satisfactory as would be evident from the following table:

Table 3.2 : Targets and achievements of PSs in selected category

Name of PS	Category	Target		Achievement			
		2011-12	2012-13	Number		Percentage	
				2011-12	2012-13	2011-12	2012-13
Mathurapur-I	IHHL	31415	30988	400	1010	1.27	3.26
	Latrines of SSK and MSK	NA	51	NA	Nil	NA	Nil
	School Toilets	NA	77	NA	Nil	NA	Nil
Jhalda-I	School Toilets	108	NA	56	NA	52	NA
	ICDS	8	NA	Nil	NA	Nil	NA
Ketugram-I	IHHL	29695	29695	Nil	556	Nil	1.87
	Latrines for school, ICDS and IAY	1089	1473	453	932	42	63
	Sanitary Complex	2	2	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil
Baraboni	IHHL	NA	1230	NA	66	NA	6.00
Mahishadal	IHHL	NA	1250	NA	Nil	NA	Nil

(Source: Records of PSs)

It was evident from the above table that

- Achievement of target in respect of construction of IHHL ranged between nil and 1.27 *per cent* during 2011-12 and between nil and 6 *per cent* during 2012-13 respectively in four PSs;
- Mathurapur-I PS could not construct any latrines (for SSK and MSK) and school toilets during 2012-13;
- Jhalda-I PS could not even construct targeted eight ICDS latrines during 2011-12;
- Ketugram-I PS could not construct four sanitary complexes targeted during 2011-13 and

- Mahishadal PS did not construct any IHHL during 2012-13 though there was a target of 1,250.

When reasons for shortfall in achievement were enquired, Mathurapur-I PS stated (December 2013) that effective measures would be taken to achieve the target in future. Jhalda-I (April 2013) and Barabani (January 2014) PSs admitted the facts but did not cite any reason for poor performance. Ketugram-I PS (October 2013) stated that due to scarcity of manpower, performance of TSC was poor, while Mahishadal PS did not furnish any reply.

Thus, it was evident that the performance of the PSs was far below the optimal level and sanitation facilities did not reach rural people.

3.2.3 Diversion of funds

Scrutiny of records of Uluberia-I and Satahata-II PSs revealed that they spent ₹ 10.01 lakh (2010-11) and ₹ 0.91 lakh (August 2012) towards implementation of Swajaldhara and Rural Water Supply (RWS) schemes respectively from TSC fund which were beyond the purview of TSC guidelines. When pointed out, Uluberia-I PS did not furnish any reply while Satahata-II PS admitted the fact (December 2013) and assured to recoup the amount to TSC fund soon.

3.2.4 Payment of incentive directly to Rural Sanitary Mart (RSM)

Guideline stipulates that the construction of household toilets should be undertaken by the BPL household themselves. On completion and use of the toilet by the BPL household, some cash incentive can be given to them. Scrutiny revealed that during 2010-12, Bishnupur-II, Patashpur-I and Gazole PSs paid incentive of ₹ 0.64 lakh, ₹ 3.93 lakh and ₹ 75.77 lakh respectively directly to RSM instead of paying it to the individual household in violation of the guideline. In all the above cases, no checks exercised by the PSs before payment of incentive were on record.

Bishnupur-II PS certified (2010-12) that the construction of the toilets had been completed but no record in support of usage of toilets by the beneficiaries before payment of incentive was found during audit. Besides, signature of beneficiaries was not obtained in the register maintained by the RSM in support of the claim for incentive of ₹ 0.64 lakh in 29 cases. In Patashpur-I PS (May 2013), no record of date of installation of toilets in respect of 114 beneficiaries was found. Where signatures of the beneficiaries were available in the muster rolls, they were not identified by the competent authority. Gazole PS admitted the fact (March 2014) and assured to take action immediately.

In view of the above irregularities, construction of latrines and bona fide payment of incentive to BPL families were not ascertainable.

3.2.5 Incomplete/Doubtful/Same BPL ID

In respect of household latrine construction by BPL/IAY beneficiaries in Diamond Harbour-I PS, it was seen that incentive payments were made more than once to beneficiaries with the same ID as enumerated below:

Table 3.3 : BPL IDs against incentive payments

Sl. No.	Name of GP	BPL ID No.	Amount (₹)
1.	Basuldanga	0N96	4600.00
2.	-Do-	0N96	4600.00
3.	-Do-	9576	4600.00
4.	-Do-	9576	4600.00
5.	-Do-	1N81	4600.00
6.	-Do-	1N81	4600.00
7.	-Do-	9583	4600.00
8.	-Do-	9583	4600.00
9.	-Do-	9583	4600.00

(Source: Records of Diamond Harbour-I PS)

Further, incentive amounting to ₹ 0.29 lakh was also paid to 13 persons (March 2013) the eligibility of which could not be established by supporting evidence. In reply, Diamond Harbour-I PS admitted the fact (March 2014). Similar cases were found in Nabagram PS involving payment of ₹ 0.46 lakh in respect of 21 persons (2010-11) and Bhatar PS involving ₹ 1.28 lakh paid to 40 persons (2012-13). Further similar discrepancies were noticed in Uttar Dinajpur ZP in respect of ₹ 0.82 lakh paid to 29 persons involving three PSs: Goalpokher-I (₹ 0.62 lakh), Itahar (₹ 0.10 lakh) and Kaliaganj (₹ 0.10 lakh).

When enquired, Uttar Dinajpur ZP (January 2014) and Nabagram PS (May 2013) admitted the fact while Bhatar PS did not furnish any reply.

3.3 Conclusions

I. **Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme (MGNREGS)** – Failure to provide at least 100 days of guaranteed employment in a financial year, shortcomings in creating durable assets, delayed payment of wages, underachievement in generation of estimated mandays, non-

formation of social audit forums and retention of Sampoorna Grameen Rozgar Yojana (SGRY) funds without transferring it to MGNREGS account as per instruction of the Government indicated deficiencies in the implementation of MGNREGS.

II. **Total Sanitation Campaign (TSC)** – Poor performance as well as irregularities like diversion of funds, payment of incentive directly to marts, doubtful payment of incentives etc. were noticed.