

Overview

This volume of Audit Report consists of performance audit of three Centrally Sponsored/Funded Programmes of (i) National Family Welfare Programme (ii) District Primary Education Programme and (iii) Urban Employment Generation Programme and Prime Minister Rojgar Yojana.

Ministry of Health and Family Welfare (Department of Family Welfare)

National Family Welfare Programme

National Family Welfare Programme is not a single programme but the confluence of several continuously evolving policy initiatives covering a series of complimentary objectives aiming eventually at a demographic goal. It has moved away from a controlled regime to a target free voluntary mode, while its delivery vehicle has remained unchanged. The Review has brought out under achievement of demographic targets under various programmes, failure of full application of resources allocated and flows in project planning and execution. Greater sophistication and wider networking needs were emphasized but the quality of manpower and infrastructure remained entrenched in the conventional healthcare mould. Programmatic interventions tended to get defocused due to poor linkages and a series of mismatches. The cost of administration of the services was on increase, while the allocation for services was decreasing. The services failed to rally around the focal concept of reproductive and child health. Maternal health and maternal health care parameters have been approached unconvincingly due to poor outreach services and lack of monitoring and referral facilities. In the area of reproductive health and care the facilities for monitoring, treatment and follow-up continue to be skeletal and unresponsive. Child health and care are addressed by other schemes too and dovetailing arrangements were not worked out. The programme is heavily dependent on women, as the terminal methods of contraception have not attracted men. The infrastructure and the programme support services remained unsatisfactory, the system supports failed due to unreliable data and supplies continued to be poorly organised. The demographic goal is still far away.

- Around 34 *per cent* of total budget provision under the programme was financed from external source. However the assistance remained under-utilised as unutilised external funds accumulated to Rs 438 crore out of Rs 3510.10 crore by March 2000. The programme has practically no non-plan budgetary contents, which manifested in scanty budget provisioning for maintenance of infrastructure even lower than the actual level of expenditure. Further as a result of non-revision of the norms for contingencies etc fixed in the early seventies, and the State incurring expenditure at prevailing levels, Rs 656.50 crore of arrears piled up against the Central Government. Interestingly, some of the populous States failed

to utilize resources either way; higher allocations and lower allocation both resulted in savings exhibiting gross mismatch between the readiness of the infrastructure and the resources flow.

- The main objective of the National Family Welfare Programme was reduction in fertility rate thereby stabilising population by ensuring Reproductive health and care for the mother and the child and greater acceptance of family planning measures. The programme achievements, fell short of intended objectives despite several schematic interventions.
- The important services for ensuring maternal health and care include antinatal care, delivery care, post-natal care and referral services. Due to lack of systematic maintenance of records of check-ups and services provided, non-availability of registration of pregnant women and not establishing of method of house to house survey and voluntary reporting the statistical information could not be verified.
- The availability of essential obstetric care drugs, neonatal resuscitation, new born equipment kits in primary health centres and community health centres was low, and the scheme of supplying disposable delivery kits for home based deliveries was a failure in rural as well as urban areas.
- Implementation of referral services scheme failed due to poor performance of outreach services involving monitoring and collection of feedback.
- Poor availability of MTP facilities and around 25 *per cent* trained doctors were available in around 25 *per cent* of centre, for conducting MTP and only 36 *per cent* of women were aware of places from where MTP facility could be sought.
- Actual utilization of cold chain facility, an instrument to support immunisation programme was unsatisfactory and far below the level of capacity created.
- An analysis of IEC activities conducted during 1998-2000 revealed that only 16 *per cent* households reported awareness about any IEC activity ever undertaken in their area. In 13 States that either IEC activities were not undertaken or failed to provide sufficient coverage.
- Shortage of health supervisor and health workers at higher service delivery level ranged from 11 to 22 *per cent* whereas shortfall of supporting staff at different levels ranged between 9 to 18 *per cent* and of Medical Officers/Specialist from 8 to 15 *per cent* at PPC and CHC level.
- The NIHFV released funds to States/UTs for much larger number in excess of the proposed number and the achievements of training reported were dismal.

(Chapter-I)

District Primary Education Programme

The audit review brought out programme inadequacies on different fronts. While the programme contained all the required elements of a social sector spearhead, it could not entirely address the prevailing ground level realities. As an instrument of action it failed to ensure greater participation of the local community and create awareness or a sense of community ownership. While DPEP funds were not utilised, a significant trend was the enhanced enrolment of children in private schools. In effect, the schematic interventions did not make the desired impact on the principal objectives.

The programme achievements fell short of the intended objectives as brought out below:

- During 1994-2000, Rs 2271.95 crore was released against the approved Annual Work Plan Budget of Rs 3951.26 crore. Even this low budget allocation was not fully utilised by the States and therefore, the funds pledged by various international funding agencies as soft loans and grants, could not be drawn as per their disbursement schedules. Many instances of diversion of funds were noticed, besides instances of avoidable, idle and wasteful expenditure in the utilization of resources.
- Distribution of free text books and supplementary material to target groups was not proper: 81 *per cent* of the schools confirmed receiving the text books and 44 *per cent* of the schools confirmed receiving other material for free distribution to students. Against this, only 64 and 24 *per cent* of the parents confirmed having received textbooks and supplementary material respectively.
- Access to primary schools was adversely affected due to non-provisioning of basic infrastructural facilities in the schools: 84 *per cent* of the schools did not have separate toilets for girls, while 33 *per cent* schools did not have drinking water facility. In Uttar Pradesh and West Bengal, the Pupil Teacher Ratio was quite high at 72 and 96 respectively. The average student classroom ratio was more than the normative levels in seven States. It was the highest in West Bengal (84) followed by Assam (66) and Uttar Pradesh (64).
- A comparatively higher growth in enrolment was witnessed during the initial period of DPEP implementation, but it could not be sustained in the subsequent years, across all the DPEP states. Enrolment of girls as a percentage share declined as they moved up from one class to another. The inequities in enrolment levels between boys and girls and SC/ST and others also persisted despite DPEP interventions.

- The dropout rate continued to be well over 10 *per cent* in all DPEP. In 17 districts of seven States the difference in drop out rates among gender and socially disadvantaged groups remained more than five *per cent*. Differences in competence attainment levels between boys and girls and between SCs/STs and others could not be narrowed to desired level of five *per cent*.
- Unstructured deployment of teachers was noticed in six States. Training schedules were also not adhered to by the States and large number of teachers and other programme functionaries could not be trained.
- The Block Resource Centres and the Cluster Resource Centres responsible for providing onsite academic support and training to teachers, could provide training/academic support to only 58 *per cent* of the teachers.
- Targets fixed for civil works were not achieved. Involvement of the community in the civil works was marginal.
- Monitoring of the scheme at the Central and State level was not effective as the various committees set up to review the implementation of the scheme, did not meet regularly.

(Chapter-II)

**Ministry of Urban Development and Poverty Alleviation and
Ministry of Industry**

Urban Employment Generation Programme and Prime Minister Rozgar Yojana

The Swarna Jayanti Shahari Rozgar Yojana was launched from 1 December 1997 to provide gainful employment to the urban unemployed/under-employed by setting up of self-employment ventures or through wage employment. The Ministry has not been able to address satisfactorily the issue of targeting the urban families below poverty line for providing employment under Swarna Jayanti Shahari Rozgar Yojna and registration of employment seekers. Beneficiaries have been neither registered nor issued family cards. Employment has, therefore, been provided to unregistered workers and in most cases they either did not have family cards or where these were available, the employment details were not noted in them. Thus, there was no certainty whether the intended population which was to be provided employment under the schemes was actually targeted in a comprehensive manner nor whether the persons provided employment had actually fulfilled the criteria for grant of wage employment. The figures of employment generated as also expenditure incurred were not genuine. The Ministry's role was confined only to framing and circulating the guidelines to the state governments, without ensuring compliance of the instructions so that benefits could flow to the targeted group, and funds properly utilised.

- Of the total Central and State share of fund of Rs 2039.89 crore released under UEGP during 1989-2000, Rs 645.98 crore remained unspent as on March 2000

because unspent balances under earlier schemes were not taken into account while releasing funds under this scheme.

- Due to gross underperformance by HUDCO, out of Rs 117.17 crore released to them under SHASU component of NRY during 1989-96, Rs 57.46 crore remained unutilised as of March 2000. While HUDCO earned Rs 29.32 crore as interest on it, the objective of providing assistance for housing and centre upgradation to economically weaker section of the urban population suffered. Rs 37.97 crore remain with them.
- Against Rs 385.53 crore reported as expenditure by States/UTs, utilisation certificates of Rs 148.55 crore were not received.
- The accounts of erstwhile schemes (NRY, UBSP and PMI UPEP) subsumed into SJSRY with effect from 1 December 1997 in most of the States/UTs was not closed. The unspent balances of Rs 561.89 crore of erstwhile schemes treated as opening balance under SJSRY were unauthentic.
- Central share of Rs 75.59 crore was released to the State Governments with delay ranging from one month to seven years. Similarly state share of Rs 133.65 crore was released to implementing agencies with delays up to 36 months. In addition both central/state share of Rs 57.51 crore was released with delay up to two years. In PMRY in some states, funds were released with delays ranging between two months to six years.
- Implementing agencies abandoned 910 schemes midway after incurring Rs 6 crore.
- Theoretical reporting of the employment figures, absence of evidence of employment generation casts a doubt on the actual employment generation under these programmes. Evaluation of the impact of implementation of the programme was not conducted by most of the states.
- In PMRY the evaluation for 1993-95 was conducted by IAMR and the recommendations relating to organising task force meetings at the Municipal/Block level, raising of limit of investment in Industry in service sector and business sector, introduction of collateral security and raising age limit were implemented. No further evaluation was conducted.
- In PMRY, the projects created out of Government/Banks assistance either ceased to exist or were not set up leading to misutilisation of funds. The recovery of loan was about 52 *per cent* of the cases.

(Chapter-III)