

Chapter 10: Monitoring Mechanism and Impact Evaluation

10.1 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 given in Table -35.

Table-35: 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 six meetings yearly during 2006-11. 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 against the officers 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. DC, however, stated (September 2011) that supervision of schemes at different level were done as per guidelines but documentary evidence in support of the statement was not produced. In the absence of documentation, audit could not ascertain the percentage of inspections at different levels actually carried out against the norms.

10.2 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. Though complaints were received by DC and PD, DRDA, documentation of receipt and disposal of their complaints/grievance were not done. In the absence of proper documentation of receipt and disposal of complaints/grievances, audit could not verify the timely disposal of complaints/grievances received from people of the district. DC stated (September 2011) that documentation of receipt and disposal of grievances would be done henceforth.

10.3 Lack of Documentation

Though DRDA maintained funds receipt registers under different schemes indicating funds received from GOI/GOA and funds utilised/released to the implementing agencies, 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 DC was unaware of total assets created during the last five years.

10.4 Sensitivity to Error Signals

Irregularities in implementation of different schemes were found published in local dailies. The Deputy Director of Information and Public Relations, GOA is responsible for forwarding the news paper clippings to DC and other departmental heads for necessary action. The Deputy Director forwarded 5,500 paper clippings to DC and others during 2006-11. Action taken by DC on newspaper clippings were asked for but were not made available to Audit.

Further, irregularities like underutilisation of scheme funds, irregular utilisation of scheme funds etc., were mentioned repeatedly in earlier Inspection Reports issued from the Principal Accountant General (Audit) to the PD, DRDA, DC, Nagaon and other departmental heads of the District. Audit scrutiny revealed that 94 IRs containing 575 paras (detailed in *Appendix-IV*) in respect of 18 DDOs of the District remained outstanding as of March 2011. Repetition of similar irregularities, thus, indicates that DC was not sensitive to error signals.

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 a 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 in all the tiers of local administration to ensure that the programmes are executed in time and timely corrective action is taken in cases of slippages.