

CHAPTER VII

MONITORING



Tamil Nadu Government Secretariat

CHAPTER VII

MONITORING

Monitoring is essential to evaluate on a regular basis the progress made so as to achieve the milestones envisaged, by intervention and corrective action.

7.1 Monitoring the implementation of Second Master Plan

7.1.1 Insufficient monitoring of implementation of recommendations by line agencies

In order to monitor implementation of SMP, CMDA formed five sector-wise committees in 2009. Two of these committees *viz.*, (i) Land Use and Environment Committee, and (ii) Investment and Infrastructure Planning Committee¹ were to deal with implementation of recommendations relating to flood control measures.

As these committees were non-functional during 2009 to 2012, CMDA reconstituted these committees in October 2013. The reconstituted committees were to meet at least once in three months and their main functions were as under:

- Advise about the action to be taken to achieve the objectives of SMP relating to land use planning
- Prioritise the policies, programmes and action plans recommended in SMP and advise the departments/agencies
- Recommend detailed studies to draw up programmes for effective implementation of the Master Plan
- To frame detailed policies for Government's approval and adoption
- Review the progress of implementation and recommend timely corrections, if any, for effective implementation
- To identify measurable indicators to evaluate and monitor the progress made in achieving the objectives of SMP

Audit scrutiny of functioning of these committees revealed the following:

The two Monitoring Committees, comprising of heads of line departments, never held any meetings during 2009 and 2012. After reconstitution in October 2013, till December 2016, they should have held ten meetings²; against which, they held only two meetings. We noticed that the members who attended the first meeting did not attend the second meeting. The meetings were attended by lower level officers of the agencies. Line departments were to furnish action taken report on the decisions reached. We noticed that out of eight line departments, only TN Pollution Control Board

¹ Original name was Investment and Planning and Governance Committee. Renamed in 2013

² At one meeting every quarter

furnished an action taken report for the first meeting of Land Use and Environment Committee. Similarly, only Chennai Metropolitan Water Supply and Sewerage Board and TN Pollution Control Board furnished action taken report for the second meeting of the Committee.

We observed that infrequent meetings, non-participation of senior officers of line departments and lack of response from line departments/agencies, hampered monitoring of land use planning and infrastructure planning functions of CMDA as discussed below.

(a) One of the recommendations of SMP was to preserve water bodies and to prohibit developments in O&R zone including Redhills catchment area. Reclassifications of water bodies, O&R zone and catchment area were approved by CMDA during the period 2009-16 against the SMP recommendations. These reclassifications were not discussed by CMDA in the Land Use and Environment Committee to evolve an alternate action plan to achieve the objectives of SMP.

(b) One of the objectives of SMP was to protect water bodies from encroachments. CMDA did not bring the subject of encroachments in water bodies and about the periodical check exercised by local bodies in preventing encroachments for discussion by the Committee. The Committee did not prioritise the action plans recommended in SMP which was one of its main functions.

(c) One of the important policies in SMP was to use excess flood water for augmenting urban water supply through creation of additional storage capacity. We observed that against the target of creating three new reservoirs with a capacity of one TMC each, the achievement was nil as construction of one reservoir was dropped, capacity of one was reduced and another one was yet to be completed (**Paragraph 3.1.1**). WRD did not bring the constraints in implementation to the notice of the Investment and Infrastructure Planning Committee for evolving a solution.

(d) SMP stated that the role of CMDA was to evaluate on a regular basis the progress made towards achieving the objectives for which CMDA was to identify measurable indicators in several sectors to monitor the progress made by the stakeholders.

(e) The committees did not identify and employ measurable indicators to monitor the progress made by various stakeholders, which was one of their main function.

Thus, we observed that the above deficiencies in monitoring had impacted the implementation of SMP as discussed in **Chapter II**.

7.1.2 Lack of monitoring of local bodies by CMDA review team

In order to review and advise the local bodies on planning permissions, CMDA's Review Team inspects local bodies. We noticed that during such inspection, the Review Team did not ensure that the local bodies abided by the provisions of DR on preservation of water bodies. Scrutiny of files relating to

seven inspections conducted during 2013-15 in Kundrathur Panchayat Union and Kundrathur, Thiruneermalai and Perungalathur Town Panchayats revealed that the Inspection Reports did not cover examination of files relating to layout approvals along water bodies. On being asked, CMDA replied (November 2016) that the Review Team verified Planning Permission/Building permits issued by local bodies and not that issued by CMDA. The reply was not tenable since it was the responsibility of CMDA to ensure that local bodies took actions on the conditions stipulated by CMDA.

7.1.3 Lack of action by Technical Advisory Committee

Based on CWC instructions, GoTN revived (January 1985) the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) with functions *inter-alia* included:

- identification of flood prone areas and formulation of schemes to contain the flood and recommending to Government,
- devising measures to evict encroachment in vulnerable areas and safe guarding the flow ways and flood places,
- evolving a methodology for the flood warning system in the State.

The TAC was reconstituted (October 2010) under the chairmanship of Engineer-in-Chief, WRD and again reconstituted (December 2011) under the nomenclature 'State TAC', by including one member from the Regional Central Water Commission. The committee was to meet as and when necessary, but not less than once in six months.

However, the Committee met only twice³ during 2011-16 against the required minimum 10 times, contrary to the GoTN instructions. Despite availability of ₹ 400 crore under XII Five year plan (2012-17), the Committee had neither identified flood prone areas nor formulated any schemes to contain the flood. TAC failed to devise any measures to prevent encroachments and to evict encroachment in vulnerable areas and safeguarding the flow ways and flood places and for the flood warning system in the State. Further, lack of monitoring by TAC denied an opportunity to WRD to regulate issue of NOCs for constructions and to ensure adherence to NOC condition.

7.1.4 Monitoring achievement against Service Level Benchmark

GoI, Ministry of Urban Development determined (2008) Service Level Benchmarks for Urban local bodies for water supply, sewage, solid waste management and storm water drainage. Details of achievement against the benchmarks in provision of SWDs by the selected zonal offices of GCC and suburban local bodies are given in **Appendix 7.1**, which revealed that there was shortfall in achievement in providing SWD ranging from 13 to 100 *per cent* and shortfall of 100 *per cent* in prevention of water logging. GoTN/Commissioner of Municipal Administration failed to monitor the achievement by GCC/local bodies in providing SWD and preventing water logging.

³ 8 March 2013 and 30 January 2015

7.2 Absence of monitoring in leasing of land

Para 172 of WRD 'D' Code envisaged the granting lease of land including the land in river margins (river berms) of waterways and water bodies for non-agricultural purpose *viz.*, construction of bridges/culverts and laying of pipe lines, etc., upon collection of lease rent charges. The manual also envisaged maintenance of Miscellaneous Property Register by the Sub-Divisional Officers, to record the details of the period of grant of lease, lease rent to be recovered, actually recovered, etc. As per GoTN instructions (December 2012), WRD was to issue NOC for granting right of way. The NOC was to stipulate essential conditions for maintenance of existing status quo of the drains without any hindrance to free flow of water.

We observed that WRD did not possess consolidated details of adjoining areas of water bodies leased to private individuals or other organisations. We further noticed that in one of the three WRD Divisions (Lower Palar Basin Division) audited, lease register was not maintained. In the two other Divisions (Araniyar Basin and Kosasthalaiyar Basin Divisions), lease registers, though maintained were not monitored for periodical renewal of lease agreements and collection of lease rent. In the three Divisions, out of 44 cases of leasing of land by WRD, only 15 were periodically renewed, leaving the balance 29 not renewed or revoked.

Thus, non-availability of consolidated details of the lease agreements resulted in non-ensuring the adherence to NOC conditions. GoTN accepted the audit findings and stated (February 2017) that remedial steps would be taken.

7.3 Analysis

CMDA, after preparing the detailed Master Plan for regulated urbanisation, failed to monitor implementation of the plans despite specific provision in the SMP to monitor through various committees. The Technical Advisory Committee of WRD failed to monitor identification of flood prone areas and formulate schemes to contain floods.