CHAPTER-V
EVALUATION AND MONITORING MECHANISM

CHAPTER-V

EVALUATION AND MONITORING MECHANISM

Institutional arrangements for proper monitoring and evaluation of schemes under the *HGNJ yojana* were made through various resolutions and guidelines issued by GoB and the implementing departments. Important provisions for evaluation and monitoring of *HGNJ yojana* and findings therein are discussed in the following paragraphs.

5.1 Monitoring of water supply infrastructure in rural areas

5.1.1 Implementation and Monitoring Cell at PRD (State level)

Para 4.1 of the guidelines of *Mukhyamantri Gramin Peyjal Nischay yojana* under *HGNJ yojana* issued by PRD (June 2017), provided for the constitution of an Implementation and Monitoring (I&M) Cell under the Principal Secretary/Secretary of PRD to monitor the implementation of water supply schemes in an effective manner. The Additional Secretary, PRD, Chief Engineer (PHED) *etc*., were to be the other members of the I&M Cell. The Cell was to monitor the progress of *HGNJ* scheme at regular intervals as well as to review preparation and technical approval of standard estimates, capacity building and community participation activities *etc*.

Scrutiny of records revealed that while I&M Cell was initially constituted on 11 September 2017, however due to changes in its membership, the Cell was reconstituted in May 2018, and again in March 2019. Thus, while the field implementation of the *HGNJ yojana* began in 2017-18, (post its official launch in September 2016), I&M Cell was constituted with delays.

The I&M Cell was to meet at regular intervals however, minutes of meeting and other records relating to its functioning were not made available to Audit. Hence, the efficacy of I&M Cell's monitoring mechanism in overseeing the implementation of *HGNJ* schemes could not be verified by Audit.

5.1.1.1 Non-deployment of required manpower for monitoring

The I&M Cell setup at PRD level was to be supported in its monitoring and supervision work by the State Project Management Unit (SPMU) at the State level and the District Project Management Units (DPMU) at the district level. The SPMU was made up of IT Specialists, Engineers, Finance Managers, Media Specialists, Monitoring and Evaluation Specialists, Social Scientists *etc*. The main function of the SPMU was to monitor the progress of *HGNJ yojana* at the Departmental level and to provide technical support to the I&M Cell. The DPMU was headed by the District Magistrate and composed of people experienced in the field of Financial Management, Information Technology, Mass Communication/Media, Monitoring, Evaluation, *etc*. as advisers.

The GoB sanctioned (September 2018) 38[1] posts for SPMU, while 422[2] posts were sanctioned for DPMUs that included, 20 State Quality Monitors (SQM) and 268 District Quality Monitors (DQM). Further, PRD issued guidelines (October 2022), related to responsibilities to be discharged by SQM/DQM. As per this, the SQM at division level was to visit one Panchayat each from three different Blocks every week within their assigned Division to assess the implementation quality, compliance, and outcomes of various government schemes including *HGNJ yojana*. Similarly, each DQM at the district level was to visit one Panchayat each from three different Blocks weekly within their respective district to evaluate physical and financial progress, beneficiary feedback, and record maintenance.

Audit observed that even after five years of sanctioning the posts (September 2018) of 20 SQMs and 268 DQMs, only 17 SQMs and 88 DQMs were in place as of January 2023. Further, appointments against other posts *viz*. Finance and Accounts Specialist, Co-ordination and Convergence Specialist, Training (IEC[3]) Expert, *etc*., for SPMU and DPMU, were not carried out.

Thus, the required manpower to support I& M cell at State level and also for monitoring of schemes as envisaged in the scheme guidelines could not be ensured. Further, information on number of visits by SQM/DQM to ascertain the scheme's implementation were not made available to audit.

Further, both SQM and DQM were to upload their monitoring reports on the implementation status of the scheme on the online MIS Portal that was to be developed by PRD. However, as of May 2023, no such portal had been developed, due to which it could not be ascertained whether monitors (SQM/DQM) were regularly submitting the reports and whether any action was taken by the department on their reports.

5.1.2 Inadequate manpower at PH divisions for O&M

As per operation and maintenance guidelines for *HGNJ* issued by PHED (August 2021), the JEs and AEs were to inspect 25 and 20 scheme sites per month, respectively and upload their reports on the State MIS portal and also record their comments in the registers maintained at the pump stations.

In the test-checked PH divisions, while it was stated that inspections at the level of AE & JE were being carried out, no records substantiating this claim were

[1] *SPMU - Finance and Accounts Specialist, Co-ordination and Convergence Specialist, Media Specialist, MIS Specialist, Technical Specialist, IT Specialist, Programmer, Data Entry Operators, IT Boy, State Quality Monitor.*

[2] *DPMU - Finance and Accounts Expert, Co-ordination Expert, Training (IEC) Expert, Monitoring and Evaluation Expert, Technical Expert, IT Expert, Data Entry Operators, District Quality Monitors.*

[3] *Information, Education and Communication.*

maintained or produced before Audit. Therefore, Audit could gain no assurance regarding inspection of *HGNJ* schemes, as mandated by the guidelines.

Further, in 12 test-checked PH divisions, Audit noticed that against the sanctioned strength of 144 JEs and 50 AEs, only 53 JEs and 30 AEs were working leading to a vacancy of 91 (63 *per cent*) and 20 (40 *per cent*) posts of JE and AE, respectively. Considering the fact that schemes were to be implemented in 18,089 wards in these 12 PH divisions, one JE therefore, had to monitor schemes in approximately 113 to 631 wards and one AE, had to monitor schemes in 226 to 4,035 wards **(*Appendix 5.1*)**. This significant workload due to vacancies in manpower resulted in inadequate monitoring of schemes.

5.1.3 Reporting of Physical Status of Schemes

5.1.3.1 Physical progress of schemes as reflected in Panchayat Nischaysoft

The Panchayati Raj Department had established (November 2018) the *PRD Nischaysoft* (*prdnischaysoft.bihar.gov.in*) for online monitoring of *HGNJ* scheme for rural wards implemented by the department. On *Nischaysoft,* up-to-date data on progress of the Scheme was to be entered by Technical Assistant of GPs and progress/achievement was to be monitored at the District and State levels.

Based on review of data/information uploaded on *Nischaysoft,* the following deficiency was noticed by Audit:

Non-functional schemes shown functional: In case of 187 test-checked rural wards, 36 number of schemes that were shown as functional on the *Nischaysoft* portal, were found to be non-functional during joint physical verification carried out (June to November 2023) by Audit along with official of GPs concerned. Details of the same have been summarised in ***Appendix 5.2***. Besides this, 12 non-functional schemes were not being reflected on *Nischaysoft*, as detailed in ***Appendix 5.3***.

Thus, the information/data reflected on *Panchayat Nischaysoft* regarding functioning of scheme was not consistent with findings of field audit.

5.1.3.2 Discrepancies in the data reflected through Monthly Progress Report

Bihar Vikash Mission (BVM), a Society registered under the Societies Registration Act, 1860 was established in January 2016 by GoB to ensure proper monitoring and implementation of the *Saat Nischay* schemes in mission mode. As per PHED scheme guidelines (September 2016), the monitoring of water supply schemes under *HGNJ yojana* was also to be conducted by BVM. Bihar Vikash Mission issued directions to PHED (June 2022) to watch over incremental progress of schemes under *Saat Nischay* and to submit a Monthly Progress Report (MPR) to BVM.

However, Audit noticed that the data reflected in the MPR submitted by PHED to BVM (April 2023), was not reliable as observed from comparison on verification against records of five test-checked PH divisions by audit as detailed in **Table 5.1**.

Table 5.1: Deficiencies noticed in MPR of PHED

PH Division	Coverage of wards as per records of test-checked divisions			Coverage as per MPR (April 2023)		
	Arsenic	*Iron*	*Fluoride*	*Arsenic*	*Iron*	*Fluoride*
Darbhanga	10	17	--	30	17	--
Gaya	--	--	181	--	--	200
Bhagalpur East	530	372	75	535	378	75
Bhagalpur West	121	--	147	133	--	173
Jamui	--	--	685	--	--	711
Total	**661**	**389**	**1,088**	**698**	**395**	**1,159**

(Source: MPR and records of test-checked units)

It is evident from **Table 5.1** that the information contained in the MPR received from these five PH divisions regarding coverage of quality affected wards, was inconsistent with the information reflected in the records of test-checked units, as seen during audit. Thus, the actual status of coverage of quality affected wards was not being communicated to BVM by the implementing department.

5.1.4 Awareness activities in quality affected rural areas

As stipulated in the scheme guidelines of *HGNJ yojana* (September 2016) issued by PHED, the implementing units were to conduct community-based activities[4] to create awareness amongst citizens regarding safe water consumption sources. However, Audit observed that these directions were not adhered to by the test-checked implementing units as discussed below:

(i) In water quality affected wards, a *Lavuk* Committee was to be constituted under the chairmanship of the ward member to create awareness and motivate the local community to use treated/safe drinking water. The quality of water supplied in rural habitations was also to be monitored by the said Committee. However, it was observed that the *Lavuk* Committee was not constituted in 8 out of 11 quality affected PH divisions while three[5] divisions did not provide any records/reply relating to constitution of this Committee.

(ii) A *Jal Choupal* consisting of ward members was to be organised on a quarterly basis at the ward level and twice a year at the GP level, to discuss the implementation and maintenance of the scheme and to identify quality affected water sources. As per information received from the 11 test-checked PH divisions, *Jal choupals* were organised in only four[6] out of 190 wards of such

[4] *Such as creation of Lavuk Committee, organising of Jal Choupals and Health camps.*
[5] *Aurangabad, Bhagalpur East, and Bhagalpur West.*
[6] *Ward 09 of GP Gopalpur under Khaira Block of Jamui, Ward no. 04 of GP Abhiya Pachgachiya under Gopalpur Block of Bhagalpur, Ward no. 07 & 12 of GP Dhanga under Benipatti of Madhubani.*

PH divisions. However, no records related to the conduct of *Jal Choupal* meetings were produced by the aforesaid four wards of the test-checked PH divisions.

Thus, community-based activities, to make the beneficiaries aware of quality of water supply scheme, as envisaged, were not ensured.

5.1.5 Third Party Inspection for Quality Control

5.1.5.1 Schemes implemented by PHED

As per the bidding document of PHED, materials used in water supply schemes such as UPVC/HDPE/MDPE[7] pipe, pump motor, transformer were to be in accordance with Indian Standards (I.S.) specification/ Council of Scientific and Industrial Research (CSIR). Further, quality of UPVC/HDPE/MDPE pipe was to be inspected and certified by Quality Assurance Inspecting Wing of Central Institute of Petrochemicals Engineering and Technology (CIPET). In this regard, Audit observed the following discrepancies:

- **Non-certification of MDPE/UPVC pipes**: Quality of MDPE and UPVC pipes used for extending connection of piped water to households was not certified by CIPET in any of the test-checked PH divisions. Hence, the possibility of installation of inferior quality MDPE and UPVC pipes could not be ruled out.

- **Use of HDPE pipes before quality certification/rejected by CIPET:** In four test-checked PH divisions[8], it was observed that CIPET had rejected (July 2020) 2,747 meters HDPE pipes worth ₹ 6.28 lakh, but despite this, the same pipes were utilised in the schemes implemented by PH division Khagaria. These pipes were laid before the inspection report of CIPET could be received by the division. Further, the other PH divisions including Khagaria utilised 62,591 meters HDPE pipes worth ₹ 3.07 crore before conduct of quality certification by CIPET (***Appendix 5.4***).

Thus, it is evident that use of materials of the specific quality in the *HGNJ yojana* were not fully ensured by the four sampled PH divisions.

No reply was given by the department on this issue (June 2025).

5.1.5.2 Non-performance of quality check of materials at the WIMC level

As per PRD directions (August 2016 and June 2017), the responsibility for ensuring quality of materials used in the schemes rested with the WIMCs, concerned JEs, and Vigilance Committees at the GP level. An independent third-party agency should be appointed by the WIMCs to ensure verification of the quality of materials used. Further, a list of local suppliers of various

[7] *UPVC – Unplasticised Polyvinyl Chloride (used for connection from water tank to motor pump, HDPE – High Density Polyethylene (used for distribution pipe line), MDPE – Medium Density Polyethylene (used for house connection).*

[8] *Khagaria, Chhapra, Sherghati and Supaul.*

materials and corresponding market rates was to be prepared by the DPRO, BDO, and *Mukhiya* at the respective levels.

However, as per the information furnished by the test-checked units, neither third-party verification nor checks by Vigilance Committees of GPs were carried out. It was also noticed that, Vigilance Committee was constituted only in 10 out 35 test-checked GPs.

Thus, use of appropriate quality of materials by WIMCs in *HGNJ Yojana* was not ensured.

5.2 Monitoring of the *HGNJ yojana* in urban areas

Resolution and scheme guidelines related to *Mukhyamantri Shahri Peyjal Nischay yojana* (under *HGNJ yojana*) issued by UD&HD in February 2016 and October 2016 respectively, provided the following directions for monitoring of the Scheme:

- Financial and physical progress reports of the scheme were to be uploaded by ULBs on the *Nagarsewa*[9] website and status of implementation was to be reviewed at the departmental level.

- For quality control, engineers deputed for the schemes had to check the quality of materials before utilising the same. Further, the quality of materials was also to be checked by SQM and DQM. Third party inspection was mandatory for HDPE, MDPE and UPVC pipes, pump, motor, transformer *etc*. being used in the urban water supply schemes. Subsequently, as per directions (December 2018) of UD&HD quality of the pipes was to be certified by the CIPET, at Hajipur, Bihar.

Audit observed that in the test-checked ULBs, HDPE pipes utilised in the distribution pipelines were certified by CIPET but other materials like MDPE pipes, UPVC, WTPs, motors *etc*. were not being cross checked *via* third party evaluation. Hence, quality of materials used for *HGNJ yojana* schemes could not be assured due to lack of quality control.

Further, ULB stated that the *Nagarsewa* website was not operational since July 2023. Due to this non-operational status, physical progress of schemes was not being monitored by UD&HD through the website.

5.3 Survey and Surveillance

As per PRD and PHED instructions in November 2019 and August 2021 respectively, water supply schemes under *HGNJ yojana* for rural areas was to be monitored with the Internet of Things (IoTs) device[10] (equipment with IT technology). The IoTs devices were to be installed to capture the status of water supply services, *viz.* pumping hour, supply hour, storage of water, *etc.,* being

---

9 *Nagarsewa website was developed by UD&HD for online monitoring of water supply schemes implemented by the department.*

10 *IoT is a device which provides real time online information through a SIM card enabled technology. IoT shall collect details of extraction of per day quantity of water from bore well, consistent functionality of the equipment installed, etc. for ensuring water supply.*

delivered to the households. The discrepancies observed in installation of IoTs are as discussed below.

5.3.1 Non-standardisation of cost of installation of IoT by the Department

Rule 126 of Bihar Financial Rules specified that every authority delegated with the financial powers of procuring goods in public interest shall have the responsibility and accountability to bring efficiency, economy, transparency in matters relating to public procurement.

For effective monitoring of the *HGJN yojana*, PRD took a decision (November 2019) to install, the IoTs in all piped water supply schemes. For installation of IoTs, the DPROs at district level were to invite tenders, based on template of Request for Proposal (RFP) issued by PRD.

This RFP consisted of the specification of IoTs to be followed by the districts while conducting the tendering process. During September 2020 to March 2022, PRD sanctioned funds of ₹45.56 crore for installation of 67,511 IoTs in 29 districts[11], based on demands received from DPROs of the concerned districts.

Scrutiny of sanction orders issued by concerned DPROs indicated that each district had finalised different rates for installation of IoTs, due to which cost variations were noticed. There were substantial variations in cost of installation of each IoT ranging between ₹7,915 (Muzaffarpur) and ₹19,800 (Sitamarhi). This issue was also pointed out by the Internal Financial Controller of the Department (May 2022) who stated that there were variations of 250 *per cent* between the lowest (₹7,915: Muzaffarpur) and the highest (₹19,800: Sitamarhi) costs of installation of IoTs in 29 districts. This was despite the fact that specification of IoTs was the same for all districts of the State.

Based on the advice of the Financial Controller, a high-level committee was constituted by the Department (June 2022) to review differences in the cost of IoTs. The Committee submitted its report to Department (July 2022) and mentioned the following reasons for variation of cost of IoTs:

(i) installation of IoT was new in nature and tenders for installation of IoTs were published (between January 2020 and December 2020) on different dates by the concerned DPROs. Hence, in the initial phase, due to lack of competition, the cost of IoT was higher while later on, it was lower.

(ii) among firms participating in the bid, some were residents of Bihar while others were from outside the State, so, the difference was possibly due to huge transportation cost.

(iii) difference in cost of data charges due to use of SIM card of different telecom companies and difference in cost of server charges.

---

[11] *(i) Arwal, (ii) Aurangabad, (iii) Banka, (iv) Begusarai, (v) Bhagalpur, (vi) Bhojpur, (vii) Buxar, (viii) Darbhanga, (ix) East Champaran, (x) Gaya, (xi) Gopalganj, (xii) Jamui, (xiii) Jehanabad, (xiv) Kaimur, (xv) Lakhisarai, (xvi) Madhubani, (xvii) Munger, (xviii) Muzaffarpur, (xix) Nalanda, (xx) Nawada, (xi) Patna, (xii) Rohtas, (xiii) Samastipur, (xiv) Saran, (xv) Sheohar, (xvi) Sitamarhi, (xvii) Siwan, (xviii) Vaishali, (xix) West Champaran.*

However, audit noticed that reasons cited by the Committee for variation in rate of IoTs were not proper, as during the same month of publication of tender, variation of cost was noticed in two test-checked districts, *viz.* Darbhanga and Gaya, RFP was published in February 2020, however, cost of IoT in Darbhanga (₹16,640) was 11.83 *per cent* higher than Gaya (₹14,880). Even, during the period from March 2020 to December 2020 (*i.e.* 10 months) of publication of tender, variation of cost was also very high as, per IoT cost was ₹7,985 in March 2020 and ₹10,271 in June 2020.

Audit further analysed the possible differences in transportation costs. It was noticed that Aurangabad is 185.90 km away from Patna, however, cost of each IoT in this district was finalised at ₹16,800 (September 2020) while for Jehanabad, which is just 45 km from Patna had finalised IoTs costing ₹17,600 each (September 2020) which was 4.76 *per cent* higher than the cost of IoT in Aurangabad despite being situated at a closer distance. Thus, the point of huge transportation costs as stated by the Committee cannot be substantiated.

Despite being aware regarding the cost variations, Department did not take any corrective measures to ensure standardisation of costs for installation of IoTs.

Hence, had the Department taken action at the time of sanction of funds to bring standardisation in installation costs of IoTs in nine test-checked districts, payment of ₹3.12 crore could have been avoided ***(Appendix-5.5)***.

No reply has been given by the department to the audit observation.

5.3.2 Non-functioning of IoTs in test-checked WIMCs and PH divisions

In twelve test-checked PH divisions and nine DPROs[12], 42,145 IoT devices were to be installed to cover 41,985 wards under *HGNJ yojana*. However, the firms installed 29,020 (69 *per cent*) IoTs after incurring an expenditure of ₹22.12 crore against the target of 42,145 IoT devices. Installation of IoTs was carried out between August 2021 to July 2023.

Audit observed the following deficiencies:

- The work of installing IoT devices along with setting up the dashboard[13] was awarded to different firms by the concerned units *i.e.,* PH divisions and DPROs during the period from July 2020 to June 2021. This work was to be completed within three to nine months from the date of agreement/work orders and the firms had to maintain the IoT devices for a period of five years, after carrying out installation and trial run. However, in all test-checked units (except DPRO, Aurangabad), the work of installation of IoTs remained incomplete as of November 2023. Further, as observed from records available at PHED (August 2022) and at test-checked units, the 13,490 IoTs (installed) were not functioning since July 2022 and firms did not maintain the IoT thereafter (except DPRO, Jamui).

[12] *DPRO was responsible for procurement and installation of IoTs in PRD schemes.*
[13] *Dashboard was to be installed in DPROs to monitor the functioning of schemes.*

- In case of Bettiah district, against 3,327 IoTs to be installed, only 2,002 (60.17 *per cent*) IoTs were installed and 1,325 IoTs were not installed by the executing firm. Further, as per the agreement with the firm, a dashboard for monitoring of schemes was also to be installed at the district level. It was noted that this dashboard was also not installed and instead only a monitor was installed in the name of the dashboard, and work was abandoned midway.

Further, as per reply furnished (November 2023) by DPRO, Bettiah the dashboard was not active and reports were not being generated. Action was initiated against the firm by District Magistrate, Bettiah (11 February 2023), results of which are pending till date (November 2023).

Thus, Reports regarding functioning of schemes could not be generated through IoTs already installed (as on July 2022). Therefore, monitoring through IoT as envisaged, could not be ensured despite incurring a total expenditure of ₹22.12 crore in installing 29,020 IoTs in 21 test-checked units.

At the time of Exit Conference, PRD accepted that there were some issues in installation of IoTs in Madhubani and West Champaran districts.

5.4 Public Grievance

HGNJ yojana guidelines (June 2017) issued by PRD provided for Mobile phone-based application and other mechanisms which were to be developed by Department for effective monitoring and to enable citizens to lodge complaints regarding *HGNJ yojana*.

Further, as per PHED resolution (June 2021), for *HGNJ yojana* in rural area, a complaint register was to be maintained at pump stations for the public to lodge complaints regarding non-supply of water in their areas and/or, necessary minor/major repairs required.

All complaints were to be entered in this register and whether the redressal was satisfactory or not was to be certified through feedback obtained from the beneficiaries concerned (through a satisfaction certificate[14]). For the redressal of public grievances, the Centralised Grievance Redressal System was also to be strengthened by PHED and UD&HD and SMS/Toll free numbers were to be provided for registering complaints.

Status of complaints received and their disposal during 2017-23 in 11 test-checked PH divisions was as given in **Table 5.2**.

Table 5.2: Status of receipt and disposal of CGRC complaints

Sl. No.	PH divisions	Complaints (CGRC)	Complaints attended/resolved	Balance
1.	Supaul	1,538	1,515	23
2.	Aurangabad	15	15	0
3.	Darbhanga	859	854	5
4.	Madhubani	697	243	454
5.	Jhanjharpur	154	60	94
6.	Khagaria	1,780	1,553	227

[14] *A document was to be obtained from the beneficiary stating that the redressal was satisfactory.*

Sl. No.	PH divisions	Complaints (CGRC)	Complaints attended/resolved	Balance
7.	Saran	3,453	3,321	132
8.	Gaya	1,181	932	249
9.	Bettiah	2,014	1,623	391
10.	Bhagapur East	106	89	17
11.	Katihar	1,607	1,553	54
	Total	**13,404**	**11,758**	**1,646**

(Source: Information furnished by 11 test-checked PH divisions)

It is evident from **Table-5.2** that 1,646 (12 *per cent*) out of 13,404 complaints were pending for disposal. However, the aforesaid status of disposal of complaints could not be verified as related Complaint Registers were not being maintained by any of the test-checked PH divisions. Further, during the JPVs, it was observed that complaint register was available in only 72 out of 190 pump stations.

- The mobile phone-based app for monitoring of the water supply service was not available for the public in any of the test-checked GPs.

- During JPV of 209 schemes implemented by PRD, complaint register was found in only one scheme at the pump station/scheme site. Besides, during the beneficiary survey it was noted that, 872 of 890 beneficiaries were not aware of the means of lodging complaints.

- There was also no mechanism of receiving complaints, except the complaint registers to be maintained at pump stations in ULBs. During JPV of 135 schemes implemented by ULBs, complaint registers were found maintained in nine schemes only, at the pump station/scheme sites. In the absence of complaint registers, the status of complaints received, and their disposal could not be checked by Audit.

Conclusion

Institutional provisions and guidelines for monitoring and evaluation of *HGNJ yojana* across rural and urban areas were marred by systemic deficiencies. The Implementation & Monitoring Cells, State/District Project Management Units, and Quality Monitors faced critical manpower shortages, adversely impacting oversight. Monitoring platforms like *Nischaysoft* and *Nagarsewa* were either unreliable or non-functional. Community engagement through *Lavuk* Committees, *Jal Choupals* was minimal, while quality control mechanisms both third-party and local were grossly underutilised.

The installation and maintenance of IoT devices for real-time scheme monitoring suffered from non-standardised procurement practices, cost inconsistencies, and poor post-installation follow-up. Moreover, public grievance redressal systems were weak, with most beneficiaries unaware of complaint mechanisms and inadequate documentation of grievance disposal. These lapses collectively hindered effective monitoring of implementation, and service delivery under the *HGNJ yojana*.

Recommendations

Recommendation 10: The State Government may ensure strengthening institutional and field-level monitoring by filling key vacancies (State Quality Monitors, District Quality Monitors, JEs, AEs), ensuring regular functioning of Monitoring Cells, and operationalising MIS portals for reliable data reporting.

Recommendation 11: The State Government may ensure quality control and transparency through mandatory third-party certification of materials, standardised IoT procurement and maintenance and activation of community-based monitoring mechanisms like Vigilance Committee, Lavuk Committees and Jal Choupals.

Recommendation 12: The State Government may ensure improving grievance redressal by establishing accessible complaint systems and ensuring timely resolution with proper documentation and oversight.

Patna **(HAUTINLAL SUANTAK)**
The 27 January 2026 **Accountant General (Audit-I), Bihar**

Countersigned

New Delhi **(K. SANJAY MURTHY)**
The 02 February 2026 **Comptroller and Auditor General of India**