

Chapter 9: Monitoring Mechanism and Impact Evaluation

9.1 Inspection and Supervision

DC is responsible for monitoring the overall progress of implementation of various developmental programmes in the District and ensuring that these are executed within the specified timeframe and approved budget. While most of the Central and State plan schemes specify the monitoring requirements, in general, most schemes require that DC closely monitors the progress on a monthly/quarterly basis. The District Planning and Development Committee is also required to review the progress of schemes every quarter. In addition, the State Government has also specified the extent of supervision to be carried out at various levels with regard to the developmental works/projects, as follows:

Table-33: Extent of supervision to be carried out at various levels

Designated Officer	Percentage of Inspection to be carried out
Block Development Officer / Junior Engineer	100
District Planning Officer	15
Addl. DC / Addl. DM	5
Sub-Divisional Officer	10
Deputy Commissioner	4
Official from State Planning Department	1

Source: Departmental figures.

Apart from the stipulated personal inspection and supervision, review of the execution of schemes was also to be done through periodical review reports and statements of expenditure (SOE) to be sent from various levels – GPs to the Blocks, Blocks to DRDA/DC, DC to the State Government and onwards to the

Central Government, for the Central schemes.

Audit scrutiny, however, revealed that monitoring and supervision of the progress of implementation of various schemes in the District was perfunctory. The District Planning and Development Committee convened only four meetings during 2006-10. DC held monthly meetings with BDOs and the district departmental heads to review the progress of execution of works/schemes. Records, however, revealed that no action was initiated by DC, who remained absent in the said meetings. Besides, the minutes of the meetings did not indicate the position of different schemes being implemented in the District.

The sampled Blocks did not send the Statements of Expenditure on a monthly basis to DC.

9.2 Grievance Redressal

There was no mechanism in the District to address the grievances of the public relating to the services/utilities provided by various departments and agencies of the State. DC does not have any Grievance Cell. The DRDA stated (June 2010) that the Grievance Cell existed in DRDA and grievances were disposed off regularly but no documentary evidence to that effect was produced to Audit.

9.3 Social Audit

The PD, DRDA could not furnish any information regarding social audit at GP level. Although social audit in the sampled GPs was completed during 2008-09, the exercise was not structured in meaningful manner to come out with findings which could help in effecting corrective measures. To ascertain the impact of implementation of development schemes during 2005-10, views of 35 GPs were obtained and their responses are mentioned in Chapter-8.

9.4 Lack of Documentation

Although DRDA maintained funds receipt registers under different schemes indicating funds received from GOI/GOA and funds utilised/released to the lower level, the test-checked Blocks did not maintain any such register. Further, inventory of assets created under different schemes were not maintained at any level, in the absence of which the district administration was unaware of total assets created during the last five years.

In sum, monitoring and supervision of the progress of implementation of various schemes at all tiers of local administration in the District was perfunctory which impacted the progress of developmental works/projects undertaken by various departments/implementing agencies. Consequently, there were number of works in the social and economic sectors, which were plagued by cost and time overruns, thereby depriving the public of the benefits of these developmental schemes.

Recommendation

- Monitoring, inspection and supervision needs to be strengthened at all the tiers of local administration to ensure that the programmes are executed on time and within cost and timely corrective action is taken in cases of slippage.

9.5 Sensitivity to Error Signals

Irregularities in implementation of different schemes were found published in local dailies. The Deputy Director of Information and Public Relation is responsible for forwarding the news paper clippings to DC and other departmental heads for necessary action. The Deputy Director forwarded 295 paper clippings to DC and others during 2005-10. Action taken by the District Administration on newspaper clippings were not produced to Audit.

Further, irregularities like underutilisation of scheme funds, irregular utilisation of scheme funds etc., are found mentioned repeatedly in earlier Inspection Reports issued from the Principal Accountant General (Audit) to the PD, DRDA, DC, Cachar and other departmental heads of the District. Repetition of similar irregularities indicates that the District Administration was not sensitive to the error signals.

