

## Chapter 4: Poverty alleviation

### 4.1 Schemes at a glance

RLTAP adopted the strategies of “Building productive rural infrastructures”, “Developing programmes for income generation on sustainable basis” and “Mobilising and Energising the rural poor” for eradication of poverty in the region. The “Rural Employment” and “Afforestation” programmes were used as key tools to achieve the above objective.

#### **Rural Employment**

Rural Employment in RLTAP mainly consisted of Sampoorna Grameen Rozgar Yojana (SGRY) and Swarnajayanti Gram Swarozgar Yojana (SGSY); both being centrally sponsored schemes funded on cost sharing basis between Government of India and State Government in the ratio of 75:25. The SGRY scheme was launched by Government of India in the year 2001-02 with the objective of providing additional wage employment in all rural areas to ensure food security, to improve nutritional levels and provide at least 100 days of work to the unskilled rural unemployed people.

The objective of SGSY scheme was to bring the assisted poor families (Swarozgaris) above the poverty line by providing appreciable sustained level of income. The programme strategy was to organise the rural poor into Self Help Groups (SHGs) through social mobilisation, training and capacity building while providing them with income generating assets through bank linkages.

#### **Afforestation**

Afforestation Programme under RLTAP envisaged increasing forest cover, checking soil erosion and improving soil and moisture conservation. The programme was to be implemented by way of participatory action through Joint Forest Management (JFM) involving the Vana Samrakshana Samities (VSS) formed at the village level adjacent to the afforestation sites and the departmental officials through formulation of micro plans taking into account the needs and aspirations of the local people.

### 4.2 Programme implementation

#### 4.2.1 Receipt and utilization of funds

The details of funds received and expenditure incurred during the period 2002-07 were as under:

(Rupees in crore)

Name of the programme		Funds available during 2002-07 including opening balance	Expenditure incurred during 2002-07	Balance as on 31 March 2007
Rural Employment	SGRY/ NREGS <sup>1</sup>	829.09*	766.87	62.22
	SGSY	97.73	96.99	0.74
<b>Total Rural Employment</b>		<b>926.82</b>	<b>863.86</b>	<b>62.96</b>
Afforestation		100.61	97.47	3.14
<b>Grand Total</b>		<b>1027.43</b>	<b>961.33</b>	<b>66.10</b>

\*excluding food grains component

It could be seen from the table above that Rs 62.96 crore and Rs 3.14 crore could not be spent within the targeted time under the rural employment and afforestation programmes respectively.

#### 4.2.2 Physical targets and achievements

The following table shows the targets and achievements under different poverty alleviation schemes during the period 2002-07:

Districts	SGRY & NREGS (Number of works) (2002-07)		SGSY (Number of swarozgaries) (2002-07)		Plantations in hectare (2002-07)	
	Target	Achievement	Target	Achievement	Target	Achievement
1 Koraput	18306	18713	13220	14884	12580	12580
2 Malkangiri	9646	7211	5281	5155	5325	5325
3 Nowrangpur	17757	13448	10107	11281	5910	5910
4 Raygada	16324	14144	8287	8585	6565	6565
5 Bolangir	13043	11538	12543	12200	11495	11420
6 Sonapur	6891	5078	4901	4675	3385	3385
7 Kalahandi	12426	10430	10893	12422	9590	9550
8 Nuapada	12610	11329	6357	7002	6535	6505
<b>Total</b>	<b>107003</b>	<b>91891</b>	<b>71589</b>	<b>76204</b>	<b>61385</b>	<b>61240</b>
<b>Achievement in per cent</b>		<b>86</b>		<b>106</b>		<b>99.7</b>

It may be seen that against the target of 107003 works under SGRY and NREGS, the achievement was 91891 (86 per cent) leaving a shortfall of 15112 works (14 per cent) while the achievement was more than the target under SGSY scheme. The achievement was close to 100 per cent under afforestation programmes.

#### 4.2.3 Shortfall in generation of labour man-days under SGRY

RLTAP envisaged minimum 100 days of work to 50 per cent of the job seekers annually under wage employment programme (EAS/SGRY). The district-wise details of targets for generation of labour man-days set in RLTAP perspective plan and man days generated during the period 2002-07 were as below:

<sup>1</sup> The SGRY scheme was replaced by the National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme (NREGS) from February 2006.

Sl. No.	Name of the district	Number of agricultural labour in the district	Labour man-days targeted in RLTA (in lakh)	Reported generation of man days (in lakh)
1.	Koraput	132248	330.62	169.66
2.	Malkangiri	24525	61.31	141.11
3.	Nowrangpur	117030	292.58	162.69
4.	Raygada	121147	302.87	161.23
5.	Bolangir	131447	328.62	119.34
6.	Sonepur	58686	146.72	81.92
7.	Kalahandi	174906	437.27	167.11
8.	Nuapada	52933	132.33	106.18
	<b>Total</b>	<b>812922</b>	<b>2032.32</b>	<b>1109.24</b> <i>(55 per cent)</i>

It could be seen from the table that, against target of 2032.32 lakh man days (812922 X 50 per cent X 100 days X 5 years) the actual number of man days generated was only 1109.24 lakh leaving a shortfall of 923.08 lakh man days. Thus, in the execution of the SGRY/ NREGS programmes, the main objective of provision of employment to the job seekers could not be achieved.

**Huge shortfall in generation of employment under SGRY programme**

### 4.3 Sampoorna Grameen Rozgar Yojana (SGRY)

#### 4.3.1 Diversion of funds earmarked for weaker sections

The SGRY scheme envisaged that 22.5 per cent of total annual allocation of funds at Zilla Parishad (ZP) and Panchayat Samiti (PS) levels was to be earmarked for individual beneficiary schemes of SC/ST families living below poverty line (BPL). During 2002-06, out of a total allocation of Rs 325.02 crore consisting cash component of Rs 230.37 crore and food grain component of Rs 94.65 crore, the implementing agencies incurred expenditure of Rs 58.42 crore (18 per cent) and diverted Rs 14.71 crore for schemes not intended for SC/ST beneficiaries which was a clear violation of GOI guidelines.

**Rs 30.58 crore meant for individual SC/ST beneficiaries and rural infrastructure in the SC/ST habitations were diverted by the implementing agencies**

Further, the guidelines prescribed that a minimum of 50 per cent of allocation was to be earmarked for creation of need based village infrastructure in SC/ST habitations in the case of implementation through the Gram Panchayats. During 2002-06, against the allocation of Rs 320.15 crore (cash: Rs 228.17 crore and food grain: Rs 91.98 crore) the implementing agencies incurred expenditure of only Rs 144.20 crore (45 per cent) and diverted Rs 15.87 crore for projects not meant for SC / ST categories in violation of SGRY guidelines and as a result the targeted beneficiaries were deprived of the benefit of rural infrastructure.

#### 4.3.2 Engagement of contractors/middlemen in execution of works

The SGRY scheme guidelines specified that works shall be executed through beneficiary committees enabling the rural poor in getting wage employment and in no case, contractors shall be engaged. Test check of 324 case records in 20 selected blocks showed that SGRY works (200 numbers) worth Rs 2.75 crore were executed through contractors. A village labour leader (VLL) selected under the pretext of a beneficiary group executed the works on behalf of the contractors.

**SGRY works worth Rs 2.75 crore were executed through contractors**

Normally beneficiary groups are given advances before execution due to their poor economic status. These village labour leaders, however, were found to have executed the works without obtaining advances.

#### ***4.3.3. Denial of enhanced wages due to the poor labourers***

**Denial of wages at enhanced rates to the SGRY beneficiaries in the test checked blocks**

The State Government fixed minimum wage rates for unskilled, semi-skilled, skilled and highly skilled labourers at the rates of Rs 50, Rs 60, Rs 70 and Rs 80 per day respectively with effect from January 2002. Subsequently, these rates were enhanced twice by Rs 2.50 for each category of labourers effective from January 2004 and 2006. However, in 104 out of 324 test checked SGRY works, the labourers were not paid their wages at the enhanced rates during 2001-06 resulting in short payment of Rs 2.66 lakh to wage earners. The BDOs concerned stated that the wages were paid as per the wage rates included in the work estimates. The replies were not tenable, as the BDOs and the engineering staff should have prepared the estimates adopting revised wage rates.

#### ***4.3.4 Non-payment of both food grains and cash component to labourers***

The SGRY scheme provided for payment of wages partly in food grains (minimum five kgs per day up to October 2005 and three kgs thereafter) and partly in cash (minimum 25 per cent of wages) to a labourer for ensuring food security and improving nutritional standard of the poor families. However, contrary to the provisions of the scheme, in 44 (14 per cent) out of 324 works, payments were made to the labourers only in cash. Thus, food security for rural labourers could not be ensured. Similarly in five works, wages were paid to the labourers in shape of food grains without any cash payments depriving the labourers from liquid cash required for their daily needs.

#### ***4.3.5 Tampering of Muster Rolls***

**Cases of tampering (41) and non-maintenance (21) of muster rolls were noticed**

Test check of records of these 324 works also showed that no muster roll was prepared and appended to the case files in support of payment made to the labourers in 21 cases while in 41 cases, tampering of names of labourers, corrections in the amount figures and in the quantity of food grain issued were noticed in the muster rolls. Further, in 13 works, the thumb impressions of the labourers, involving payment of wages of Rs 4.21 lakh were not attested by the VLL. Hence, payments through such muster rolls raised doubts about their authenticity.

#### ***4.3.6 Delay in completion of works***

**Delay in completion of SGRY works worth Rs 94.96 lakh ranged between two and 42 months**

As per the work orders, the SGRY works were to be completed within three months of their commencement. However, in six blocks (Bhawanipatna, Dharamgarh, Bolangir, Belpara, Koraput and Nuapada) 71 out of 153 SGRY works (46 per cent) valuing Rs 94.96 lakh were completed with delays ranging from two to 42 months leading to denial of timely benefits to people.

### 4.3.7 Non maintenance of works registers

SGRY scheme guidelines provided for creation of durable community assets in rural areas, such as rural roads, culverts, school buildings, primary health centers, Anganwadi centers, renovation of water sources etc. It was seen that out of 1,10,272 works taken up during 2001-06 in KBK districts, 99,649 works were completed and 10,583 works (10 *per cent*) remained incomplete as of March 2006. It was, however, seen that works registers were either not being maintained or were not updated by the executing agencies. As a result, the status of reported completion of works, the age-wise analysis of the incomplete works and idle expenditure made on them could not be verified in audit.

**SGRY work registers were either not being maintained or were not updated by the executing agencies**

## 4.4 Swarnajayanti Gram Swarozgar Yojana (SGSY)

### 4.4.1 Excess payment of subsidy

SGSY guidelines provided that the amount of subsidy for a group of swarozgaris would be at the rate of 50 *per cent* of the project cost subject to per capita subsidy of Rs10000 or Rs 1.25 lakh per group which ever is less. Subsidy was not admissible to people whose income fell above poverty line (APL). In three DRDAs, there was excess payment of subsidy of Rs 4.56 lakh during 2003-04 as detailed below in violation of the provisions of the guidelines:

District	Number of SHGs	Number of Swarozgaris		Subsidy paid	Subsidy due	Excess payment
		BPL	APL			
Rayagada	6	63	1	7.34	6.30	1.04
Balangir	9	91	16	10.34	9.10	1.24
Nuapada	13	136	4	15.88	13.60	2.28
<b>Total</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>290</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>33.56</b>	<b>29.00</b>	<b>4.56</b>

### 4.4.2 Poor performance of self help groups

The strategy of the SGSY was to organize the rural poor into self help groups (SHGs) through the process of social mobilization by providing them with income generating assets through bank linkages. For this, the SHGs should be subjected to tests in two different stages. SHGs which demonstrate their potential as a viable group during the grading tests are treated as Grade-I and shall enter the third stage for being eligible for revolving fund of Rs 25,000 from bank as cash credit facility. Of this, a sum of Rs10,000 would be given to the bank by the DRDA for adjustment against the loan at the end of cash credit period on the request of the group. The SHGs which are found to have successfully demonstrated certain prescribed attributes at the end of third stage are treated as Grade-II to become eligible for assistance in the form of loan and subsidy to take up economic activities through higher level of investments.

As per information made available to audit by the DRDAs, 34367 SHGs were formed during 2001-06 out of which 16,167 (47 *per cent*) was inactive and 18,200

**Out of 34367 SHGs formed under SGSY, only 4868 (14 per cent) of them entered into economic activities**

(53 per cent) graduated to Grade-I entitling themselves for the revolving fund. Out of them, 7,679 (22 per cent) SHGs entered to the Grade-II category making themselves eligible for taking up economic activities through higher level of investments availing bank loan and subsidy. However, only 4,868 (14 per cent) of them actually entered into economic activities. Although the scheme envisaged utilisation of up to 10 per cent of the total outlay for orientation and skill upgradation of the swarozgaries, only Rs 3.47 crore (four per cent) out of the total outlay of Rs 89.50 crore under SGSY were spent for the purpose. The low rate of transition of SHGs into potential groups reflected inadequate capacity building measures.

**4.4.3 Income generated under SGSY were not monitored**

**Progress of the SHGs and the number of swarozgaries achieving the desired level of income not monitored**

According to the SGSY guidelines, the DRDAs were to monitor the progress of the SHGs regularly through physical verification of assets of the SHGs and their progress towards income generation. Six DRDAs (Bolangir, Koraput, Nuapada, Rayagada, Suvarnapur) did not conduct any physical verifications to evaluate the progress of the swarozgaries and the number of swarozgaries achieving the desired level of income of Rs 2000 per month. In Nowrangpur district, out of 2,279 SHGs financed under the scheme only three groups could reach the desired level of income.

Case study made by the XIMB also showed that most of the SHGs formed did not seem to be properly functioning because of the heterogeneity in literacy levels of members, age and economic status. Members of most of the SHGs were illiterate; lacked expertise and were vulnerable to deception in financial matters by different parties including the credit linked banks. In case of construction activities through SHGs, the middlemen and not the targeted poor people were the key beneficiaries.

**4.4.4 Repayment of loan by swarozgaries**

As per the information available with DRDAs, cases of non-repayment and delayed repayment were noticed. Against Rs 2.07 crore (inclusive of subsidy component of Rs 75 lakh) disbursed to 80 SHGs in four out of the eight test checked DRDAs during 2003-06, the SHGs repaid only for Rs 5.78 lakh (four per cent) as detailed in the table below:

*(Rupees in lakh)*

**Poor repayment of loan availed by the test checked swarozgaries under SGSY**

	<b>Year of disbursement</b>	<b>Number of SHG involved</b>	<b>Amount of loan disbursed</b>	<b>Amount of loan repaid</b>	<b>Amount of subsidy consumed</b>
Bhawanipatna	2003-06	18	38.53	0.03	18.40
Nuapada	2003-05	14	38.89	Nil	14.30
Malkangiri	2003-05	28	77.74	5.75	20.64
Rayagada	2003--05	20	51.85	Nil	21.44
<b>Total</b>		<b>80</b>	<b>207.01</b>	<b>5.78</b>	

Besides, instances were also noticed that the SHGs repaid their loan during lock-in period and subsidy was adjusted against repayment of loan although the same

was required to be adjusted at the end of the cash credit period. Some instances are given below:

(Rupees in lakh)

Name of the SHG	Loan disbursed	Date of disbursement	Date of repayment	Loan repaid	Moratorium period
Saibaba SHG, Kolnara, Rayagada	3.00	2 March 2005	9 March 2005	0.44	NA
Bansadhar SHG, Khilamaunda,	5.85	31 March 2005	17 June 2005 to 2 January 2006	2.77	one year
Maa Mangala SHG, Khaman,	2.30	18 December 2004	4 January 2005	1.00	6 months
Agnigangama SHG, Gadiseskhal	2.80	31 March 2005	30 May 2005 to 9 June 2005	0.97	NA
Dubey sahi, SHG	2.90	3 March 2005	Nov 2005	1.80	NA
Maa Annapurna SHG, Bhairbgad	2.30	2 December 2004	8 January 2005	0.87	3 months
Sabita SHG, Kutunipadar,	2.50	22 November 2003	1 March 2004	2.50	NA

**Premature repayment of loan by the swarozgaries indicated lack of interest in their business activities**

The premature repayment of loan within the moratorium period indicated erroneous selection of beneficiaries or non-creation of the assets by the swarozgaries reflecting lack of interest among swarozgaries in their business activities. The above fact was corroborated by the Director, Special Project, Panchayati Raj Department in his letter (July 2005) addressed to the Project Directors of all DRDAs.

#### 4.4.5 Low coverage of population under SGSY scheme

The SGSY programme envisaged coverage of 30 per cent of BPL families for formation of self help groups (SHGs) within five years. However, it was seen that the coverage of BPL families by all the DRDAs under the scheme during the five years 2001-06 was only 6 per cent. The district-wise details are given below:

**Only 6 per cent of BPL families covered under SGSY as against the required 30 per cent**

Sl No	Name of the district	Total BPL families	Number of BPL beneficiaries covered under SGSY scheme	
			Required coverage of 30 per cent	BPL families covered (per cent)
1.	Koraput	223846	67153	14365 (6)
2.	Malkangiri	79138	23741	4810 (5)
3.	Nowrangpur	158684	47605	11089 (7)
4.	Rayagada	135785	40735	7716 (6)
5.	Bolangir	201310	60393	11112 (6)
6.	Sonepur	80396	24119	4569 (6)
7.	Kalahandi	193054	57916	10898 (6)
8.	Nuapada	108864	32659	6711 (7)
<b>Total</b>		<b>1181077</b>	<b>354351</b>	<b>71270 (6)</b>

The coverage of BPL families under the SGSY scheme in the 20 test checked blocks ranged from 3.6 per cent (Bolangir) to 8.4 per cent (Kolnara) excepting Koraput which had 12.4 per cent overall coverage.

The case study conducted by the XIMB disclosed that the improvement and earning capabilities of targeted people, long-term sustainability of micro enterprises and the overall improvement in quality of life of the targeted people through the SGSY scheme did not seem to be significant in the field.

#### **4.5 Afforestation programme**

##### **4.5.1 Delayed release of funds**

As per the schedule of operation for plantations under Afforestation programme, major activities involved in plantation were required to be completed before onset of monsoon (July) and therefore the timely release of the funds to the forest divisions was to be ensured. During 2001-06, the release of funds to seven<sup>2</sup> out of 12 test checked forest divisions by the end of July was only Rs 14.50 crore (56 per cent) against Rs 25.75 crore required for the major activities. The balance funds were released during the fag end of the financial years (February). The Divisional Forest Officers stated (June 2006) that such delayed release of funds affected the soil conservation measures and maintenance operations of the existing plantations. Besides, peoples' participation through entry point activities could not be ensured. This apart, delay in release of funds led to surrender of Rs 64.82 lakh by two divisions in Balangir and one division in Sonepur district during 2001-05.

##### **4.5.2 Irregular expenditure on establishment**

Though the funds earmarked for a scheme could not be utilized for establishment expenditure, an amount of Rs 7.10 lakh was spent by the Principal Chief Conservator of Forests (PCCF) towards telephone charges (Rs 6.36 lakh), electricity (Rs 0.12 lakh) and other contingent expenditure (Rs 0.62 lakh) violating the scheme guidelines. The PCCF replied that such expenditure was made due to administrative exigency. The amount was not recouped till December 2006.

##### **4.5.3 Shortfall in achievement under NTFP plantation**

As per Annual Action plans, the plantation under 'Non Timber Forest Produce' (NTFP) was to be undertaken so as to increase the forest products and to ensure generation of employment on a sustainable basis. During the years 2002-06, as against the target of 10000 hectares, only 6175 hectares of NTFP plantations were undertaken resulting in shortfall of 3825 hectares (38 per cent).

##### **4.5.4 Non-supply of fuel-efficient chullahs**

Annual Action plans sought to promote use of fuel-efficient chullahs among the rural households to reduce the demand on forest for firewood. Accordingly, the PCCF Orissa (January 1999) instructed all forest divisions to distribute such chullahs to all the families of the fringe villages (8203) out of the funds under entry point activities. Scrutiny of records of 12 forest divisions showed that only one division (Khariar) supplied fuel-efficient chullahs to 1703 (60 per cent) families out of the total 2850 families in Nuapara district while the remaining 11

---

<sup>2</sup> Forest Divisions: (i) Bolangir west, (ii) Kalhandi north, (iii) Kalahandi south, (iv) Koraput, (v) Jeypore, (vi) Malkangiri and (vii) Nowrangpur.



divisions did not supply fuel-efficient chullah at all. Thus, the demand on forest for firewood could not be stemmed.

#### 4.5.5 Deviation from scheme guidelines and resultant loss

**Loss of Rs 56.40 lakh due to high mortality of plantation outside the watershed catchment areas**

The schemes<sup>3</sup> of IAEP, AOFFP and NTFP provided taking up plantation on watershed / catchment area to prevent high mortality in drought-like situation. Deviating from the scheme guidelines two divisions (Sambalpur South and Bolangir East) took up plantation outside the watershed catchment areas during 1999-2003 by incurring expenditure of Rs 56.40 lakh. The plantations did not, however, survive due to drought condition.

#### 4.5.6 Joint Forest Management system

For ensuring better management of forest, the Government constituted Vana Smarakshana Samitees (VSS) in July 1993 comprising officials from Forest & Environment Department and representatives from households living in adjoining forest area for joint forest management (JFM) in all the 8203 villages. The work of VSS included protection of forests against grazing, fire, illicit felling, theft and encroachment of forest land through patrolling. A review of the functioning of the VSS during 2001-06 disclosed the following:

- Against 8203 number of VSS scheduled to be formed; only 3160 were formed as of March 2006. Of these only one VSS had been registered under the Societies Registration Act. Thus, the VSS, barring one which was registered, did not have legal status for enforceability.
- Out of plantations raised in 73615 hectares by 12 Forest Divisions in the KBK districts during 2001-06, the survival of plantations in 11558 hectares was partially (below 50 per cent) successful as of March 2006.
- Plantations raised over 1160 hectare during 2001-06 under three divisions<sup>4</sup> were damaged by drought conditions (820 hectare), destroyed by the cattle (140 hectare) and internal conflicts of VSSs (200 hectare). Evaluation (January 2005) by Conservator of Forest, Bhawanipatna over 38 sites<sup>5</sup> indicated that growth of plantation over 210 hectare was poor and the survival was only 10 per cent due to non-involvement of the VSS.
- Though it was the duty of the VSS to protect the forest from destruction through voluntary patrolling, in eight<sup>6</sup> Forest Divisions an amount of Rs

**Irregular payment of wages of Rs 1.34 crore to VSS**

<sup>3</sup> IAEP :Integrated Afforestation and Eco Development Project, AOFFP : Area Oriented Fuel and Fodder Programme, NTFP : Non Timber Forest Produce.

<sup>4</sup> Sambalpur-South, Rairakhol and Rayagada

<sup>5</sup> Bolangir East: 12, Bolangir West: 7, Kalahadi south: 6, Kalahandi north: 6 and Khariar: 7.

<sup>6</sup> Bolangir East :Rs 12.94 lakh, Bolangir West : 16.13 lakh, Koraput : Rs 9.32 lakh, Jeypore : Rs 27.01 lakh, Kalahandi North : Rs 22.93 lakh, Kalahandi South : Rs 10.10 lakh, Malkangiri : Rs 14.98 lakh and Nowrangpur : Rs 20.63 lakh..

1.34 crore were paid to them as wages. In fact, this fund was for creation and maintenance of assets like renovation of ponds, creation of water bodies etc. Besides, by engaging them for security and treating as paid labourers, the spirit of beneficiary ownership could not be developed.

#### **4.6 Monitoring**

The guidelines of CSP schemes viz. SGRY and SGSY clearly provided that the officers from State level were required to visit the districts and the district level officers in turn should visit the Blocks. Field level monitoring were to be made for ascertaining the progress of implementation of the programmes, deviations etc., through regular reporting from the Block level to the State level through the district level officials. It was, however, noticed that the monitoring was inadequate. Reports of progress of work, deviations and decisions for corrective action etc. were not available on record.

Besides, a sum of Rs 6.15 lakh<sup>7</sup> was paid to the Orissa Remote Sensing Application Centre (ORSAC) for concurrent and independent evaluation of project performance, which too did not materialise due to non-supply of required maps by the Forest Divisions to the ORSAC.

#### **4.7 Abstract of Audit findings**

The SGRY scheme implemented in the KBK districts failed to generate targeted number of employment days under RLTA. The afforestation programme aimed at conservation and extension of forests coupled with employment also showed a dismal performance.

#### **4.8 Impact assessment**

Poverty alleviation through rural employment programmes was given high priority under RLTA to address unemployment and check migration of labour in the region. However, the data maintained by the Labour and Employment Department indicated that migration of labourers to other States was on the increasing trend ranging from 8,845 in 2001-02 to 14,787 in 2005-06. These numbers however did not include migration through unregistered contractors. From the available information it was reasonable to conclude that efforts for generation of employment did not achieve satisfactory results. Graduation of SHGs into potential micro enterprises did not show impressive result as only a few of them entered into economic activities and very few were earning the desired monthly income. The beneficiaries did not have a sense of community ownership on the community assets created. Improvement in rainfall and increase in forest cover in the KBK districts were among major performance indicators for determination of success of afforestation programme. As per the rainfall reports maintained by the Special Relief Commissioner (SRC), the average annual rainfall in the region was 1323 mm during 1993-97 whereas the same averaged

---

<sup>7</sup>

2002-03 : Rs. 6.00 lakh and 2004-05 :Rs .0.15 lakh.

1319 mm during 1998-2006 indicating there was marginal reduction instead of increase in precipitation. The survey by the XIMB revealed that while 25 per cent of the beneficiaries felt that the RLTAAP had little impact on alleviation of their poverty, another 25 per cent felt the impact to be of a fair level. The remaining 50 per cent rated the impact as satisfactory. Some benefit, however, accrued to them in the form of employment generated by the schemes.

#### **4.9 Recommendations**

- Transparency in execution of works under SGRY schemes should be ensured to avoid engaging contractors in the guise of village labour leaders.
- Continuous and effective guidance and direction for micro entrepreneurial activities should be developed by the SHGs.
- Requirement of fire wood and fodder should be assessed and plantation carried out under Non Timber Forest Produce (NTFP) schemes to provide sustained employment and to check illicit felling of trees.