

## CHAPTER VI : ECONOMIC SERVICES

### 6.1 Roads and Bridges

Good infrastructure is essential to unlock growth potential, promote economic development, bring about equity, inclusive growth and bridge the gap between urban and rural areas. Infrastructure includes the existence of a good all-weather roads and availability of reliable and adequate power supply. The District has no airport or railway connectivity. The nearest airport and railway station is at Guwahati around 180 km and 205 km away from Tura, the District Headquarters. The connectivity of the District with other districts of the State and the neighbouring State of Assam is by road only.

The schemes under which construction/ development of roads in the District was taken up were the Pradhan Mantri Gram Sadak Yojana (PMGSY), Non Lapsable Central Pool of Resources (NLCPR), Central Roads Funds (CRF), Rural Infrastructure Development Fund (RIDF), North Eastern Council (NEC), Assistance to States for Developing Export Infrastructure and Allied Activities (ASIDE), Housing and Urban Development Corporation (HUDCO), Construction of Rural Roads Programme (CRRP), Special Rural Works Programme (SRWP) and road construction/development works undertaken through the State budget.

In the District there are five<sup>1</sup> divisional offices of the Public Works Department (PWD) responsible for execution/maintenance of national highways, state highways, other district roads and village roads. Besides these, there is another Division (District Project Implementation Unit) functioning under the State Rural Roads Development Agency (SRRDA) in the District which exclusively executes road construction works under the Pradhan Mantri Gram Sadak Yojana (PMGSY).

#### 6.1.1 *Status of road connectivity in the District*

As per information furnished (May 2011) by the SRRDA, 749 villages in the District were connected by a road as of March 2011. As per Census 2001 there were 1,537 villages in the District, this meant that 788 villages (51 *per cent*) were yet to be provided with road connectivity.

The road length of various categories of roads in the District as at the beginning and end of the period under review was as under:

---

<sup>1</sup> Tura North Division; Barengapara Division; Ampati Division; NEC Division; and, National Highway-cum-Central Division

Table 6.1

Category of Road	Road available as of		(in km)
	March 2006	March 2011	Increase/decrease during 2006-11 (+/-)
National Highway	126.41	126.41	0
State Highway	215.27	308.47	(+) 93.20
Medium District Road	320.33	320.33	0
Other District Road	594.09	594.09	0
Village Road	285.93	445.89	(+) 159.96
<b>Total</b>	<b>1542.03</b>	<b>1795.19</b>	<b>(+) 253.16</b>

Source: Information furnished by the five PWD divisions, WGHD

As can be seen from the above table, there was improvement in the road length of village roads and State Highway. The length of village roads increased by 56 per cent from 285.93 km in March 2006 to 445.89 km in March 2011 and the State Highways increased by 43 per cent from 215.27 km in March 2006 to 308.47 km in March 2011.

### 6.1.2 Implementation of schemes

#### 6.1.2.1 Pradhan Mantri Gram Sadak Yojana

The Pradhan Mantri Gram Sadak Yojana (PMGSY), fully funded by the GOI, was launched in December 2000 with the objective of connecting every habitation that had a population of 1,000 or more through good all-weather roads by December 2003 and habitations with 500 people or more, by the end of Tenth Plan (2007). Public Works (Roads and Bridges) Department is responsible for implementation of PMGSY.

As per the District Road Plan prepared under the PMGSY for the District, 753 km of rural roads were to be constructed to cover 03 habitations having population of more than 1,000, 38 habitations with population more than 500, 188 habitations with population more than 250 and 16 habitations with population less than 250 by March 2007. Out of these, 38 road construction projects covering only 124.29 km of road length had been taken up. Of this, 31 projects covering 113.35 km were completed by March 2011 at a cost of ₹ 32.91 crore after delays ranging from seven months to 82 months (**Appendix 6.1**). It was, however, observed from records that all the 31 completed roads were of sub-grade stage (*kutchha*/fair weather) road and not 'all weather' road as prescribed under the PMGSY. Work on the remaining seven roads (estimated cost: ₹17.02 crore) was taken up only in February 2009 and are still ongoing and expenditure incurred on them was ₹ 8.90 crore till March 2011.

Inspection of 37 of the above 38 projects carried out by the National Quality Monitoring (NQM) agency during 2006-11 reported 11 projects as 'satisfactory', 16 as 'unsatisfactory' and 10 road projects 'required improvement'.

Thus, even after 10 years of implementation of the PMGSY in the District, only 15 per cent of the target was achieved and that too up to 'fair weather' grade roads only and not 'all weather' roads indicating extremely tardy implementation of the

PMGSY, besides denying the benefits of improved road connectivity to the populace which would have spurred economic growth of the District.

Joint verification along with departmental officers of seven completed roads (out of 31) conducted in July 2011 revealed the following:

- Three roads, viz., (i) Betasing Bazar to Banduraja (2 km), (ii) New Bhaitbari to Peradanga (2 km) and (iii) Agia Medhipathar Phulbari Tura road (109<sup>th</sup> km) to Dopatchigre (2 km) completed in September 2007, December 2007 and July 2008 respectively at an expenditure of ₹ 2.04 crore were found in dilapidated condition due to non-maintenance.
- Two roads, viz. (i) Garobadha Mankachar (GM) Road to Balapara (2.15 km) and (ii) GM road to Tangabari (1.61 km) completed in November 2009 and March 2010 were in good condition and were being maintained by the contractors as they were still under the warranty period i.e., defect liability period.
- Two roads, viz., (i) NH 51 to Aguragre (4 km) and (ii) NH 51 to Ringgigre (4.88 km) completed in March 2010 at a cost of ₹ 2.89 crore were found damaged with the granular sub-base layer almost worn out as can be seen from the photos below:



The CE, PWD (Roads) stated (January 2012) that the delays in completion of roads were due to limited working season, non-receipt of payments by the contractors in time, inaccessible terrains in some projects, insurgency activities, shortage of field staff, lack of capacity of the local contractor, lack of basic road construction machinery. The reply is not acceptable because all these aspects should have been considered while planning for construction of the roads.

#### **6.1.2.2 Construction of Rural Roads Programme**

Construction of Rural Roads Programme in the District is being administered by the Community and Rural Development Department (C&RDD). The programme envisages improvement of rural road network by active involvement of village communities for construction of link roads in the villages to boost the rural economy.

The works under the programme are selected by the MLAs and implemented through local committees/beneficiary organisations. Funds under the programme are released by the C&RDD to the DRDA which in turn releases funds to the Blocks. The Blocks release the moneys in installments to the local committees/beneficiary organisations.

During 2006-11, the DRDA received ₹ 2.85 crore under the programme against which 753 works (estimated cost ₹ 2.61 crore) were sanctioned out of which ₹ 2.02 crore for 721 works was released to local committees/beneficiary organisations for execution. As of March 2011, out of the 721 works only 512 works were completed at a cost of ₹ 1.49 crore and 209 works were in progress against which expenditure of ₹ 53.71 lakh was incurred up to March 2011. The remaining 32 works were not taken up though funds were released by Government during 2008-09.

### 6.1.2.3 Status of works implemented under various schemes

During the period of review 2006-11, 257 works funded under the CRF, NLCPR, RIDF, NEC, ASIDE, HUDCO and through the State budget were under execution in the District. Out of 257 works, 226 works (roads: 198; bridges: 28) were taken up for execution prior to April 2006 at an estimated cost of ₹ 162.28 crore of which 111 works had been completed by March 2011. The remaining 31 works (roads:25; bridges:6) with estimated cost of ₹ 62.46 crore were taken up during 2006-11 out of which only one work was completed by March 2011. The status of these 257 works as of March 2011 is shown below:

Table 6.2

Name of the division executing the works	Total number of works taken up	Number of works completed	Period of delay in completion from target date	Number of works pre-closed/ de-sanctioned	Number of works incomplete	Period of delay in completion
Ampati	83	52	02 to 09 years	07	24	01 to 04 years
Barengapara	67	09	03 to 04 years	20	38	03 to 13 years
Tura North	97	47	02 to 10 years	25	25	01 to 12 years
NEC	04	01	03 years		03	02 years
NH-cum-Central	06	03	02 to 03 years		03	03 years
	<b>257</b>	<b>112</b>		<b>52</b>	<b>93</b>	

Source: Compilation of Information furnished by EEs of Ampati, Barengapara, Tura North, NEC and NH-cum-Central Roads Divisions

It will be seen from the above table that

- out of the 112 works completed by March 2011, not a single work was completed in time – the delays in these works ranged from two years to ten years;
- out of the 257 works, 14 works were subsequently de-sanctioned before any work was taken up and 38 works (roads: 34; bridges:04) were pre-closed during 2008-09 after incurring an expenditure of ₹ 7.03 crore (details in **Appendix 6.2**) on the ground of insufficiency of funds to meet the liability of the works; and,
- out of the 93 incomplete works, 73 works which were to have been completed were still incomplete after delays ranging from one year to 13 years.



The CE, PWD (Roads) stated (January 2012) that due to large bank of sanctions and inadequate plan funds, the works were de-sanctioned/pre-closed as per the criteria set up by the Empowered Committee and that the delay in completion of works was due to less working season and paucity of funds. The reply is not convincing because taking up of any project for execution without first ensuring the availability of financial resources was not a prudent exercise.

#### 6.1.2.4 Joint Verification of incomplete works



A joint verification was conducted with departmental officers in November 2010 (position updated in July 2011) of ten incomplete works selected on random basis under execution by Barengapara and Tura North Divisions, the findings of which were as below:

<p><b>Name of the Division:</b> Tura North</p> <p><b>Name of the work:</b> Improvement of Old Bhaitbari Bhaitbari to Nayagaon Nalbari (0-2.5 km)</p> <p><b>Month/year of sanction:</b> March 2006; <b>Sanctioned cost:</b> ₹ 1.24 crore</p> <p><b>Scheduled month/year of completion:</b> March 2009</p>	
	<p><b>Expenditure up to March 2011:</b> ₹ 1.04 crore</p> <p><b>Physical progress up to March 2011:</b> 90 per cent</p> <p><b>Findings of joint verification and Division's reply:</b> During joint inspection, no construction activities were noticed at the site. A portion of the road was found totally damaged and most stretches of the road was in bad condition. The EE stated (July 2011) that since it was a flood prone area, restoration of road connectivity was required to be done from time to time.</p>
<p><b>Name of the Division:</b> Tura North</p> <p><b>Name of the work:</b> M&amp;BT of extension of Bhaitbari of Paham village to Bholarbhita Bangalkata NEC road via Moulakandi (2-4.5 km)</p> <p><b>Month/year of sanction:</b> March 2006 <b>Sanctioned cost:</b> ₹ 1.60 crore</p> <p><b>Scheduled month/year of completion:</b> March 2009</p>	
	<p><b>Expenditure up to March 2011:</b> ₹ 1.22 crore</p> <p><b>Physical progress up to March 2011:</b> 60 per cent</p> <p><b>Findings of joint verification and Division's reply:</b> Only one kilometer out of the estimated 2.5 km of the road was found metalled and blacktopped. Work on the remaining road length was not started. The EE stated (July 2011) that work on the balance portion have been taken up and expected to be completed by March 2012.</p>

<p><b>Name of the Division:</b> Tura North  <b>Name of the work:</b> M&amp;BT of West Bholarbhita to Haribanga via Charbatapara (2-3.5 km)  <b>Sanctioned Cost:</b> ₹ 1.05 crore  <b>Month/year of sanction:</b> March 2006  <b>Scheduled month/year of completion:</b> March 2009</p>	
	<p><b>Expenditure up to March 2011:</b> ₹ 77.71 lakh  <b>Physical progress up to March 2011:</b> 60 per cent  <b>Findings of the joint verification and Division's reply:</b> Work on some portion of the road was not yet taken up. The portion of the road constructed was also not blacktopped. The EE stated (July 2011) that work for the balance road length had been taken up and carpeting work will be taken up after the rainy season and expected to be completed by March 2012.</p>
<p><b>Name of the Division:</b> Barengapara  <b>Name of the work:</b> Replacement of existing bridges (Br. Nos 27/3,29/4,32/3,37/3) with RCC bridges on Adugre Purakhasia Road  <b>Month/year of sanction:</b> March 2006 <b>Sanctioned cost:</b> ₹ 1.39 crore  <b>Scheduled month/year of completion:</b> March 2009</p>	
 <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Br. No. 37/3</b></p>	<p><b>Expenditure up to March 2011:</b> ₹ 78.16 lakh  <b>Physical progress up to March 2011:</b> 38 per cent  <b>Findings of joint inspection and Division's reply:</b> Out of four bridges, only one bridge (32/3) was found complete, works on two bridges (Br Nos 29/4 and 37/3) was in progress and the work for Br No 27/3 not yet started. The EE stated (July 2011), that the work for Br No 27/3 was cancelled and the re-allotment of work was under progress.</p>
<p><b>Name of the Division:</b> Barengapara  <b>Name of the work:</b> Construction of a road from Machangpani to Doriapara (0-2.00 km)  <b>Month/year of sanction:</b> March 2006  <b>Sanctioned cost:</b> ₹ 67.90 lakh  <b>Target month/year of completion:</b> March 2009</p>	
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Construction of a road from Machangpani to Doriapara (0-2.00 km)</b></p>  <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Machangpani to Doriapara (2<sup>nd</sup> km)</b></p>	<p><b>Expenditure up to March 2011:</b> ₹ 63.69 lakh  <b>Physical progress up to March 2011:</b> 80 per cent  <b>Findings of joint inspection and Division's reply:</b> It was noticed that though the work on the road was targeted to be completed by March 2009, around one kilometer only was found completed even though expenditure of ₹ 63.60 lakh was incurred up to March 2011. The EE stated (July 2011) that the work is expected to be complete by December 2011.</p>

<p><b>Name of the Division:</b> Barengapara</p> <p><b>Name of the work:</b> Construction of bridge no 16/1 over river Lokai</p> <p><b>Month/year of sanction:</b> December 1995</p> <p><b>Sanctioned cost:</b> ₹ 1.17 crore</p> <p><b>Target month/ year of completion:</b> December 1998</p>	
	<p><b>Expenditure up to March 2011:</b> ₹ 1 crore</p> <p><b>Physical progress up to March 2011:</b> 66 per cent</p> <p><b>Findings of joint inspection and Division's reply:</b> No construction activity was noticed at the site. The EE stated (July 2011) that due to the demise of the contractor the work was stopped. Revised estimate for the balance work had been prepared and submitted for approval of higher authority.</p>
<p><b>Name of the Division:</b> Tura North</p> <p><b>Name of the work:</b> Construction of a road from Tikrikilla to Jangrapara via Bollongitok</p> <p><b>Month/year of sanction:</b> March 1997</p> <p><b>Sanctioned cost:</b> ₹ 92.07 lakh</p> <p><b>Target month/ year of completion:</b> March 2000</p>	
	<p><b>Expenditure up to March 2011:</b> ₹ 1.14 crore</p> <p><b>Physical progress up to March 2011:</b> not furnished</p> <p><b>Findings of joint inspection and Division's reply:</b> The work on the road was yet to resume since its discontinuance in May 2008. Revised estimate has been submitted for an amount of ₹ 1.77 crore which had not yet been approved (July 2011)</p>
<p><b>Name of the Division:</b> Barengapara</p> <p><b>Name of the work:</b> Construction of bridge No.1/8 over river Bhogai</p> <p><b>Month/year of sanction:</b> March 1997</p> <p><b>Sanctioned cost:</b> ₹ 3.05 crore</p> <p><b>Target month/ year of completion:</b> March 2000</p>	
 <p><b>ABUTMENT OF RCC BRIDGE ON APPROACH</b></p>	<p><b>Expenditure up to March 2011:</b> ₹ 1.33 crore</p> <p><b>Physical progress up to March 2011:</b> 28 per cent</p> <p><b>Findings of joint inspection and Division's reply:</b> No construction activity was noticed at the site of work during the joint inspection. The EE stated (July 2011) that the work had been stopped / abandoned since December 2003 due to delay in clearance of contractor's bills and further, the contractor had expressed his willingness in May 2011 to resume the work.</p>



<p><b>Name of the Division:</b> Barengapara  <b>Name of the work:</b> Construction of double lane RCC bridge No 28/3 over river Darong on Dalu Purakhasia road  <b>Month/year of sanction:</b> March 2000  <b>Sanctioned cost:</b> ₹ 2.01 crore  <b>Target month/ year of completion:</b> March 2003</p>	
	<p><b>Expenditure up to March 2011:</b> ₹ 2 crore  <b>Physical progress up to March 2011:</b> 28 per cent  <b>Findings of joint inspection and Division's reply:</b> During the joint inspection no construction activity was noticed at the site of work. The EE stated (July 2011) that due to delay in completion of the work by the original contractor, the work was re-allotted in May 2007 to another contractor.</p>
<p><b>Name of the Division:</b> Barengapara  <b>Name of the work:</b> Construction of double lane RCC bridge No 13/2 over river Bandra on Dalu Purakhasia road  <b>Month/year of sanction:</b> March 1996  <b>Sanctioned cost:</b> ₹ 1.49 crore  <b>Target month/ year of completion:</b> March 1999</p>	
	<p><b>Expenditure up to March 2011:</b> ₹ 1.68 crore  <b>Physical progress up to March 2011:</b> 40 per cent  <b>Findings of joint inspection and Division's reply:</b> No construction activity was noticed at the site of work. The EE stated that the scheme had been proposed for pre-closure. He further stated (July 2011) that after the demise of the contractor, the work was re-allotted in October 2003. As the work was progressing slowly due to delay in clearance of contractor's bills, the work was subsequently withdrawn. Re-allotment of the work was being initiated, which can be started after the monsoon is over.</p>

The CE, PWD (Roads) stated (January 2012) that the incomplete works under Tura and Barengapara Divisions were in good progress and the EEs of the divisions concerned were being instructed to complete the works without further delay.

#### ***6.1.2.5 Delay in completion of road widening of National Highway***

The National Highway - 51 (NH) starts in the District from 21.87 km and ends at 148.28 km . During the review period, four road widening projects covering a total road length of 45.13 km of the NH-51 were taken up viz., (i) 43 to 55 km - sanctioned in February 2006 at an estimated cost of ₹ 12.86 crore for completion by March 2008; expenditure up to March 2011 ₹ 12.52 crore ; (ii) 21.87 to 43 km - sanctioned in

January 2008 at an estimated cost of ₹ 34.21 crore for completion by January 2010; expenditure up to March 2011 ₹ 18.19 crore; (iii) 55 to 64 km - sanctioned in February 2009 at an estimated cost of ₹ 35.25 crore for completion by February 2011; expenditure up to March 2011 ₹ 17.88 crore; and, (iv) 76 to 79 km - sanctioned in August 2010 at an estimated cost of ₹ 9.26 crore for completion by April 2012; expenditure up to March 2011 ₹ 36.07 crore.



Road condition of NH-51 between 55.64 km and 55.605 km

Except for serial (i) above, which was completed in March 2009 at a cost of ₹ 12.52 crore, serial (ii) and (iii) above were yet to be completed after delays of 14 months and one month respectively and an expenditure of ₹ 36.07 crore incurred on execution of works till March 2011.

During a visit to the sites of the three incomplete projects where widening of the NH-51 was still going on, the condition of the road was found to be deplorable. It was further noticed that though repairs for the stretches 72 km to 76 km and 79 km to 82 km of the NH-51 were sanctioned for execution in 2009-10 at an estimated cost of ₹ 1.94 crore, the works were yet to be taken up.

The prescribed carriage way width of a NH is minimum 7 metre in mountainous and steep terrain. However, it was observed that out of the total road length of 126.41 km of NH-51 passing through the District, carriage way width of 113.41 km was a single-lane road (around 3.75 metres) except for a stretch of 13 km from 43 km to 55 km.

The CE, PWD (Roads) stated (January 2012) that the delays in completion of the roads were due to frequent disturbances caused by some miscreants and involvement of additional items. As regards deplorable condition of roads, the CE stated that periodical repair could not be completed during the last working season because of heavy rainfall. The replies indicated lack of seriousness in timely completion and maintenance of works. The reply was, however, silent about for construction of single-lane road contrary to the prescribed norm of 10 metres.

#### 6.1.2.6 Unauthorised expenditure

According to Rule 246 of the Meghalaya Financial Rules, 1981, when owing to modification or deviations from the original proposals or in course of execution, it becomes apparent that the cost of the work will exceed the amount administratively approved by more than 10 *per cent*, revised administrative approval to the increased expenditure must be obtained. Scrutiny of records of the three<sup>2</sup> selected PWD divisions revealed that out of 112 completed works during 2006-11, in 12 road and bridge works (**Appendix 6.3**) the expenditure exceeded the administratively approved

<sup>2</sup> Tura North, Barengapara and Ampati divisions



estimate by over 10 *per cent* to 56 *per cent*. The total expenditure of ₹ 12.48 crore on these 12 works exceeded the administratively approved estimates of ₹ 10.43 crore - since revised administrative approvals were not obtained in these cases as required under the codal provisions, the excess expenditure of ₹ 2.05 crore was unauthorised. The CE, PWD (Roads) stated (January 2012) that the EEs concerned were being instructed to restrict the expenditure within the permissible limit.

#### **6.1.3 Quality Controls**

There was no quality testing laboratory in the District. The PWD had only one laboratory for the entire State at Shillong to test samples for road and bridge works. During 2006-11, it was observed that 110 bridge works' samples pertaining to the three test checked PWD divisions were sent to the laboratory for tests - the test reports in all the 110 cases found the samples in conformity with the required specifications. During the period 2006-11, these three divisions had also added 83.385 km<sup>3</sup> of black topped roads to the road network of the District (not including road repairs/maintenance carried out by these divisions during the period). However, not even one sample of the road work was sent for tests to the laboratory during these years by any of the three divisions. As such, the quality of the roads constructed remained unverified. The CE, PWD (Roads) stated (January 2012) that the EEs had been asked to conduct necessary tests of the stone aggregates before utilising in the works.

#### **6.1.4 Summing up**

**Though roads are the only means of connectivity in the District, 51 *per cent* of the villages were not connected to a road. Progress in implementation/ completion of various works taken up in the District under various programmes/ schemes was extremely tardy as a result of which the populace was deprived of the intended benefits of the programmes/schemes. Quality tests of road works executed were not carried out.**

#### **6.1.5 Recommendations**

- **Effective steps needs to be taken to ensure timely completion of road works so as to provide road connectivity to the villagers.**
- **Regular quality tests of the roads under execution should be ensured.**

---

<sup>3</sup> Barengapara Division: 40.425 km; Ampati Division: 22.06 km; Tura North Division: 20.90 km.

## 6.2 Special Rural Works Programme

The primary objective of Special Rural Works Programme (SRWP) of the State Government is to generate wage employment in rural areas to improve socio-economic conditions by the creation of useful public assets with public participation at the grassroots level.

The schemes under the SRWP are selected by the Members of the State Legislative Assembly (MLA) and implemented through local committees/beneficiaries' organisations in their respective constituencies. Funds for the programme are released by the Community & Rural Development (C&RD) Department to the DRDA of the District. The DRDA then places the funds at the disposal of the Block Development Officers (BDO) who in turn, release the funds in instalments to the implementing agencies who are required to submit utilisation certificates (UC) for the moneys spent. The BDOs are required to verify the UCs, countersign them and submit the same to the DC of the district.

Under the SRWP the DRDA, West Garo Hills District received ₹ 60.70 crore during 2006-07 to 2010-11 for construction of school buildings, community halls, fishery tanks, purchase and distribution of CGI sheets, supply of books to students/libraries, *etc.* Of this amount, ₹ 47.98 crore was released to the Blocks for 2,878 projects and the balance of ₹ 12.72 crore remained unutilised. The details are given below:

**Table 6.3**

Year	Projects sanctioned	Fund released by State Government	Amount released by DRDA to Blocks	Projects taken up	Projects completed	Ongoing projects	Projects for which utilisation certificates wanting
	(number)	(₹ in crore)		(in number)			
2006-07	1,605	14.50	14.14	1,564	56	4	1,504
2007-08	494	7.50	6.73	488	23	-	465
2008-09	498	15.00	13.95	495	11	155	329
2009-10	240	15.00	7.33	222	1	211	10
2010-11	109	8.70	5.83	109		109	
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,946</b>	<b>60.70</b>	<b>47.98</b>	<b>2,878</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>479</b>	<b>2,308</b>

Source: DRDA, West Garo Hills District

As can be seen from the above table 2,946 projects were sanctioned under SRWP during 2006-11 of which 2,878 were taken up and only 91 completed as of March 2011 at a cost of ₹ 3.47 crore. 479 projects were in progress on which an expenditure of ₹ 11.99 crore was incurred till March 2011. The status of the remaining 2,308 projects could not be ascertained due to non-submission of UCs by the implementing agencies though ₹ 32.49 crore was released for these projects.

During exit conference, the Commissioner and Secretary, C&RD Department stated that pending UCs were due to the non-reelection of most of the MLAs to whom funds were released for SRWP and initiative would be taken to obtain the wanting UCs. The contention of the Commissioner and Secretary, C&RD Department is not acceptable

as the funds are released to DRDA, which in turn releases them to BDO and as such UCs were to be furnished by the concerned authorities to whom funds have been released and not by MLAs as stated.

**In sum, though funds were not a constraint, 97 per cent of the works out of 2,878 works taken up for execution during 2006-11 remained incomplete even after one to four years.**

#### ***Recommendation***

**Timely completion of works taken up under the SRWP should be ensured. A monitoring mechanism should be instituted to watch submission of utilisation certificates for funds released to the implementing agencies.**

### 6.3 Employment Generation

The three most important rural employment schemes of the GOI are the Swarnjayanti Gram Swarozgar Yojana (SGSY), National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (NREGA), 2005 (renamed as Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act from October 2009) and the Indira Awas Yojana (IAY). The objective of the SGSY was to promote self-employment while that of the NREGA was to generate wage employment. The IAY was geared towards providing dwelling houses to BPL families in rural areas. However, there was also a wage component as the dwelling houses had to be constructed by the beneficiaries themselves.

#### 6.3.1 Swarnjayanti Gram Swarozgar Yojana

##### 6.3.1.1 Financial management

The SGSY, funded by the Centre and State in the ratio of 75:25, was launched in April 1999 with the objective of bringing assisted poor BPL families above the poverty line by organising them into Self Help Groups (SHG) for taking up economic activities. The SGSY envisaged evolution of the SHGs through three stages of evolution viz., Stage-I: SHG formation; Stage-II: capital formation through a revolving fund; and, Stage-III: SHG is given project financing.

The SGSY is implemented in the District by the DRDA through the Blocks. The funds received by the DRDA, WGHD under the SGSY during 2006-11 were as under:

**Table 6.4**

(₹ in crore)

Year	Opening balance	Fund received		Other receipts	Funds utilised	Closing balance
		Centre	State			
2006-07	0.14	1.60	-	0.14	0.89	0.99
2007-08	0.99	1.43	1.19	0.02	2.32	1.31
2008-09	1.31	1.59	-	-	0.44	2.46
2009-10	2.46	-	0.65	0.23	1.52	1.82
2010-11	1.82	-	-	0.20	1.26	0.76
<b>Total</b>		<b>4.62</b>	<b>1.84</b>	<b>0.59</b>	<b>6.43</b>	

Source: DRDA, WGHD

It would be seen that out of ₹ 7.19 crore received during the period, ₹ 6.43 crore was utilised leaving a balance of ₹ 0.76 crore as on 31 March 2011.

##### 6.3.1.2 Self Help Groups

The position of formation/development of SHGs in the District since inception of the SGSY in April 1999 till March 2011 is as under:

**Table 6.5**

No. of SHGs formed from April 1999 to March 2011	No. of SHGs given revolving fund	No. of SHGs given project financing	No. of SHGs out of Col.2 who have taken up economic activities	No. of SHGs out of Col. 3 who have taken up economic activities
4,480	2,904	294	1,053	156

Source: DRDA, West Garo Hills District

Six months after their formation, SHGs are entitled to a revolving fund of ₹ 25,000 from the bank of which ₹ 10,000 is the subsidy component given by the DRDA and the balance ₹ 15,000 is the loan component. Out of the 2,904 SHGs who had each received the revolving fund of ₹ 25,000, 294 SHGs had been provided project financing; 1,053 SHGs had taken up economic activities even though project financing was not provided and remaining 1,557 SHGs had not taken up any economic activities. Further, out of the 294 SHGs given project financing, 138 SHGs had not also taken up any economic activities. The Project Director (PD), DRDA stated (July 2011) that the key activities selected by 1,557 SHGs were not viable for marketing and selection of alternative key activities was under process. In respect of the 138 SHGs who were given project financing but who had not taken up any economic activities, the PD stated that project reports were not received. Thus, the objective of generating sustainable income in respect of the 1,557 SHGs to whom ₹ 1.56 crore<sup>4</sup> was released as subsidy, appeared uncertain.

### **6.3.1.3 Impact of implementation of SGSY**

Under SGSY, a SHG may consist of 10 to 20 persons, one from each BPL family and a person should not be a member of more than one group. Considering a minimum 10 members from 10 families in each of the 2,904 SHGs of the District, at least 29,040 BPL families were assisted under SGSY. The PD, DRDA, Tura stated (January 2012) that 464 out of 51,400<sup>5</sup> BPL families in the District were brought above the poverty line from the inception of the SGSY till March 2011. This indicated that the programme had failed to make any notable impact even after 12 years of its implementation in the District.

### **6.3.2 Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act**

The primary objective of National Rural Employment Guarantee Act, renamed as Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (MNREGA), was to provide 100 days guaranteed wage employment in a financial year to every household whose adult members volunteer to do unskilled manual work. In the District, MNREGA is implemented through the DRDA through Area Employment Councils and Village Employment Councils of the respective Blocks.

The Central Government bears the entire cost of wages for unskilled manual workers and 75 *per cent* of cost of material and wages for skilled and semi-skilled workers. The State Government bears 25 *per cent* of the cost of material and wages for skilled and semi-skilled workers and will also bear unemployment allowances and administrative expenses of the State Employment Guarantee Council.

---

<sup>4</sup> subsidy @ ₹ 10,000 per SHG for 1557 SHGs.

<sup>5</sup> State Government's BPL census conducted in 2002



Funds received under MNREGA in the District during 2006-11 were as under:

Table 6.6

(₹ in crore)

Year	Opening balance	Fund received		Other receipt	Fund utilised	Closing balance
		Centre	State			
2006-07	5.19	20.53	0.56	1.74	22.98	5.04
2007-08	5.04	38.95	5.49	0.28	38.77	10.99
2008-09	10.99	29.68	3.70	0.48	26.69	18.16
2009-10	18.16	24.03	3.15	0.42	45.75	0.01
2010-11	0.01	84.82	7.42	0.58	92.46	0.37
<b>Total</b>		<b>198.01</b>	<b>20.32</b>	<b>3.50</b>	<b>226.65</b>	

Source: DRDA, WGHD

As per Schedule I of the MNREGA, the focus of the rural employment guarantee scheme shall be on the works like water conservation and water harvesting, tree plantation, irrigation canals, land development, rural connectivity to provide all-weather access and any other work that may be notified by the Central Government in consultation with the State Government. According to the monthly progress reports, 8,706 such works were completed during 2006-11 at an expenditure of ₹ 186.69 crore.

The year-wise position of households provided with employment in the District during 2006-11 is given below:

Table 6.7

Year	No of Households issued with job cards	No of Households who demanded employment	No. of Households provided with employment	No of Households who were provided with completed 100 days employment (per cent)
2006-07	94,765	91,935	91,935	220 (0.23)
2007-08	94,858	93,558	93,558	4,973 (5.31)
2008-09	95,872	78,173	73,678	0
2009-10	97,149	91,785	91,785	1,446 (1.57)
2010-11	96,918	95,791	95,159	3,647 (3.83)

Source: DRDA, West Garo Hills District.

The above table indicates that against 78,173 households (in 2008-09) and 95,791 households (in 2010-11) who demanded employment, 4,495 and 632 households respectively were not provided any employment. MNREGA stipulates that if a worker who has applied for work is not provided employment within 15 days from the date on which work is requested, an unemployment allowance shall be payable by the State Government at the prescribed rate (₹ 70 per day up to July 2009 and thereafter at ₹ 100 per day). It was observed that these households were not paid any unemployment allowance as provided.

During exit conference, the Commissioner and Secretary, C&RD Department stated that in absence of any demand, unemployment allowance was not paid.

### **6.3.2.1 Payment of wages**

As per Clause 6.6.1 of MNREGA guidelines, the wages of workers should be paid within a week or fifteen days at most. In the event of delay in wage payments the workers are entitled for compensation as per the provisions of the Payment of Wages Act, 1936.

It was noticed that in the three<sup>6</sup> out of the four test-checked Blocks, wages for 30,378 mandays involving ₹ 30.38 lakh were paid after delays ranging from six days to 93 days due to non-availability of funds as stated by the BDOs concerned. However, required compensation was not paid to the workers.

### **6.3.2.2 Social Audit**

Social Audit by the Village Employment Councils (VEC) is mandatory under Clause 11.1.1 of MNREGA guidelines, to ensure transparency and public accountability.

In the District, two rounds of social audit were conducted by all the 1,500 VECs of the District during March 2007-April 2007 and September 2009-February 2010, the major outcome of which was as under:

- recovery of ₹ 6.38 lakh effected from the Secretaries of five VECs for misuse/non-accounting of money;
- secretaries of four VECs diverted ₹ 12.41 lakh to other works not approved under MNREGA;
- secretary, VEC, Upper Chigijangre, Tikrikilla misused ₹ 4.20 lakh by forging signature of job card holders; and,
- four persons were put in jail custody for destroying books of accounts and remand orders were issued against five persons for impersonification against job card holders.

990 VECs also conducted a third round of social audit during November-December 2010, the major outcome of which was as under:

- misuse of money of ₹ 4.77 lakh detected out of which recovery of ₹ 0.50 lakh effected:
- poor quality of work done due to payment of wages of ₹ 38,000 instead of ₹ 62,720 by the VEC secretary; and,
- diversion of fund of ₹ 0.73 lakh to other works.

Follow up action, if any, taken on the findings of social audit had not been furnished.

---

<sup>6</sup> BDO, Selsella, Dalu and Rongram

### 6.3.2.3 Asset Register

MNREGA guidelines prescribe that asset registers for the works executed by the beneficiaries are to be maintained by the implementing agencies. In the four Blocks selected for test check, it was observed that Betasing and Selsella Blocks were not maintaining the said register and Dalu and Rongram Blocks started maintaining the document only from 2010-11.

### 6.3.3 Indira Awas Yojana

The IAY aims at providing low cost houses to SC/ST and BPL bonded labourers free of cost. 80 *per cent* of the total allocation under IAY was to be utilised for the construction of new houses and the remaining 20 *per cent* for conversion of unserviceable *kutch* houses into *pucca* houses. Construction of smokeless *chullahs* and sanitary latrines was an integral part of IAY houses. Under the IAY, the dwelling houses had to be constructed by the beneficiaries themselves.

The IAY is implemented by the DRDA at district level through the Blocks. The IAY is funded in the ratio 75:25 between the Centre and State. Funds received by the DRDA under IAY during 2006-11 were as under:

Table 6.8

(₹ in crore)

Year	Opening balance	Fund received		Other receipt	Fund utilised	Closing balance
		Centre	State			
2006-07	-	2.91	1.07	-	3.97	0.01
2007-08	0.01	1.90	0.86	-	2.75	0.02
2008-09	0.02	4.93	2.28	-	6.53	0.70
2009-10	0.70	11.66	1.30	0.03	12.38	1.31
2010-11	1.31	15.00	1.66	0.05	17.32	0.70
<b>Total</b>		<b>36.40</b>	<b>7.17</b>	<b>0.08</b>	<b>42.95</b>	

Source: DRDA, West Garo Hills District

The year-wise position showing the target and achievement of new construction and upgradation of houses in the District is given below:

Table 6.9

(in unit)

Year	Annual target		Achievement		In progress	
	New construction	Upgradation	New construction	Upgradation	New construction	Upgradation
2006-07	3,003	1,716	1,154	638	0	0
2007-08	2,389	1,888	800	440	0	0
2008-09	3,417	NA	1,410	888	0	0
2009-10	5,487	NA	2,089	0	1,128	0
2010-11	3,899	-	2654 <sup>7</sup>	-	1,940	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>18,195</b>	<b>3,604</b>	<b>8,107</b>	<b>1,966</b>	<b>3,068</b>	<b>0</b>

Source: DRDA, WGHD

<sup>7</sup> Out of 2654 houses constructed during 2010-11, 1128 houses pertain to the year 2009-10 and 1526 houses pertain to the year 2010-11.

Audit scrutiny revealed the following irregularities:

#### **6.3.3.1 Houses lacking amenities prescribed under IAY**

In four test-checked Blocks viz., Rongram, Betasing, Selsella and Dalu, financial assistance of ₹ 19.41 crore was given under IAY to 4,694 beneficiaries during 2006-11 in these Blocks for construction of new houses. However, as per information furnished by the BDOs, the newly constructed houses did not have sanitary latrine and smokeless *chullahs* and thus, frustrated the objective of the scheme.

#### **6.3.3.2 Irregularities in payments to beneficiaries**

IAY guidelines stipulate that payments to beneficiaries for construction of houses were to be made on staggered basis depending on the progress of work. Ideally, the funds should have been distributed in two instalments, first instalment with the sanction order and the second instalment when the construction reaches the lintel level. It was however, noticed in Selsella Block that financial assistance of ₹ 27,500 per beneficiary under IAY was paid in one instalment to 60 beneficiaries (total ₹ 16.50 lakh) on 30 March 2007. All the beneficiaries submitted UCs for the amounts received by them on the same day they got the financial assistance. BDO, Selsella Block failed to furnish any documents in support of the fact that new houses were actually constructed by the beneficiaries by utilising the financial assistance. Thus, the fulfilment of intended objective of providing financial assistance remained doubtful. As such, it cannot be assured that new houses were constructed out of the financial assistance provided.

#### **6.3.3.3 Inventory of houses**

IAY guidelines provide that the implementing agencies should have a complete inventory of houses constructed, indicating date(s) of commencement and completion, name, address, occupation and category of beneficiaries and other relevant particulars. Of the four test-checked Blocks, Betasing, Rongram and Dalu Blocks where 3,311 houses were constructed under IAY during 2006-11 did not maintain the inventory of houses. Though the Selsella Block had been maintaining the inventory of houses, the correctness of the same remained questionable because of the position given in **paragraph 6.3.3.2** above.

While accepting the Audit observations, the Commissioner and Secretary, C&RD Department stated during exit conference that houses constructed without sanitary latrine and smokeless *chullahs* would be covered through Total Sanitation Campaign.

#### **6.3.4 Summing up**

**Progress of the SGSY whose objective was to bring assisted BPL families in the District above the poverty line was abysmal. A large number of SHGs given financial assistance under SGSY failed to undertake any economic activity. The District authorities failed to provide the guaranteed wage employment under**

**MNREGA thereby defeating the objective of security of livelihood to the needy people. A large number of houses constructed under the IAY were without smokeless *chullahs* and sanitary latrines which were mandatory facilities.**

#### **6.3.5 Recommendations**

- **The State/District administration should find out the reasons as to why the families assisted under SGSY has not risen above the poverty line, as envisaged under the programme, by carrying out the economic activity chosen by them. Any problems faced by these families should be properly addressed to achieve the objective of the programme.**
- **Provision for basic facilities like sanitary latrine and smokeless *chullahs* should be ensured in houses constructed by beneficiaries under the IAY.**
- **The District administration should make all possible efforts to provide minimum guaranteed wage employment of 100 days to all beneficiaries who demanded employment.**



## 6.4 Power

The Meghalaya State Electricity Board (MeSEB), corporatised as the Meghalaya Energy Corporation Limited (MeECL) in April 2010 is responsible for supply of electricity in the State. The MeECL's infrastructure in the District comprises of five<sup>8</sup> divisional level offices responsible for all aspects of transmission and distribution of electricity to the urban, sub-urban and rural households in the District.

During 2006-11, three schemes were taken up in the District namely, (i) Construction of 132 KV line from Agia (Assam) to Nongalbibra, (ii) Construction of 132/33 KV, 2X25MVA sub-station at Ampati (iii) Rajiv Gandhi Grameen Vidyutikaran Yojana (RGGVY)

### 6.4.1 Status of Electrification of Villages in the District

The position of electrification of villages in the District as at the beginning and end of the review period was as under

Table 6.10

Status	Position as on 01 April 2006	Position as on 31 March 2011
Electrified villages	789	824
Un-electrified villages	657	649
Villages electrified earlier but subsequently found uninhabited as on the given date	62	64

Source: Chief Engineer (Rural Electrification), MeECL

Thus, during the five-year period 2006-11, only an additional 35 villages were electrified. Out of a total of 1,537<sup>9</sup> villages in the District, 649 villages (42 per cent) were yet to be electrified as on 31 March 2011.

### 6.4.2 Delayed completion of projects

- A project 'Construction of 132 KV line from Agia (Assam) to Nongalbibra (Meghalaya)' at an estimated cost ₹ 43.32 crore to provide an alternate route for supply of power to WGHD was taken up under the NLCPR during May 2007. The project was to be completed by December 2009 which however, was yet to be completed. Up to March 2011, ₹ 42.91 crore had been incurred on the project. The EE, Transmission and Transformation Division, Tura stated (July 2011) that the reason for delay in completion was due to non-receipt of no objection certificates from land owners for erection of towers on their land.
- A project 'Construction of 132 KV single circuit line on double circuit tower from Rongkhon substation to Ampati & Construction of 132/33KV, 2x25MVA substation at Ampati' was approved by GOI, Department of North East Region (DoNER) in March 2010 at an estimated cost of ₹ 30.79 crore and to be

<sup>8</sup> West Garo Hills Distribution Division, Tura; Distribution Division, Tura; Revenue Division, Tura; Transmission and Transformation Division, Tura; and, Rural Electrification & Construction Division, Tura.

<sup>9</sup> Census 2001

completed within two years. ₹ 11.09 crore was released by DoNER to GOM in March 2010 and from GOM to MeECL in December 2010. As per information furnished by the Chief Engineer (Transmission) in August 2011, the up-to-date expenditure on the project was only of ₹ 3.13 lakh and the balance amount of ₹ 11.09 crore was lying in the MeECL's account. Audit observed that verification of the survey works for the 132 KV line was yet to be completed besides land for the substation was also yet to be acquired. Thus, even after 16 months (as of August 2011) of approval of the project, very little progress had been made.

#### 6.4.3 Transmission and Distribution Loss

- The Accelerated Power Development and Reform Programme (APDRP), totally funded by the GOI, aims at strengthening and upgrading sub-transmission and distribution networks to reduce the transmission and distribution (T&D) losses to 10 *per cent*. As per the information furnished by the two distribution divisions of the MeECL in WGHD, APDRP scheme was taken up in the District in October 2005 and completed in March 2008 at a cost of ₹ 7.03 crore.
- The construction/augmentation of 33/11 KV lines (estimated cost ₹ 12.03 crore) under the Tura Improvement Scheme (TIS) and funded under the National non-Lapsable Central Pool of Resources (NLCPR) was taken up in October 2000. The work though scheduled to be completed by March 2003, was completed only in November 2007 after incurring an expenditure of ₹ 11.83 crore. The main objective of the TIS was renovation and augmentation of the Tura electric supply system to meet immediate and future requirements of the town and to bring down T&D losses to 9.2 *per cent* by 2002.

However, even after implementation of the above two projects, the T&D losses in the District not only continued to be very high but continuously increased during the period 2006-11 as evident from the table below:

**Table 6.11**

(in per cent)

T&D Loss as on 31 March 2007	T&D Loss as on 31 March 2008	T&D Loss as on 31 March 2009	T&D Loss as on 31 March 2010	T&D Loss as on 31 March 2011
35.42	48.40	52.95	55.95	55.76

Source: Executive Engineer, West Garo Hills Distribution Division, MeECL, Tura

Thus, the expenditure of ₹ 18.86 crore on the two projects did not bring about the expected benefits.

The Chief Engineer (Distribution), MeECL admitted the facts and stated (January 2012) that efforts were on to bring down the losses.

#### 6.4.4 Tardy implementation of Rajiv Gandhi Grameen Vidyutikaran Yojana

GOI launched the RGGVY in April 2005 with the objective of providing access to electricity to all households and free electricity to all BPL households in the country by March 2009.

Under the RGGVY, a Detailed Project Report (DPR) for WGHD, estimated to cost ₹ 68.75 crore was prepared by the MeECL in November 2005 (revised to ₹ 79.34 crore in December 2006). The project was approved by GOI in March 2008 at a cost of ₹ 81.44 crore to cover 123 de-electrified, 534 un-electrified and 816 electrified villages with 40,543 BPL population. The works for 11 KV Village Electrification Infrastructure and 33 KV lines and sub-stations were awarded to contractors in January 2010. It was observed that on the basis of surveys conducted by the contractors, the MeECL revised the DPR to ₹ 128.32 crore in January 2011 which was approved by GOI in February 2011. In the revised DPR, 127 de-electrified, 516 un-electrified and 821 electrified villages were to be covered with BPL population of 37,726. GOI released ₹ 33.98 and ₹ 39.92 crore to MeECL in January 2010 and March 2011 respectively out of which ₹ 30.52 crore was spent up to June 2011.

Reasons for the contractors themselves carrying out surveys after the works were allotted to them, though called for from the CE, Rural Electrification, MeECL in August 2011, were not furnished. Moreover, re-revision of the DPR to ₹ 128.32 crore in January 2011 on the basis of contractors' surveys indicated that the first DPR prepared by the MeECL was not realistic and without a proper assessment. The fact that as many as 127 de-electrified villages of the District had again to be taken up for electrification indicated poor maintenance of the infrastructure created. Further, the project was way behind schedule since the work was allotted to contractors only in January 2010 whereas the objective of the RGGVY to provide access to electricity to all households and free electricity to all BPL households by March 2009.

#### **6.4.5 Summing up**

**As of March 2011, 649 villages (42 per cent) of the District were yet to be electrified. Taking up of 127 de-electrified villages under RGGVY indicated poor maintenance by the MeECL of the infrastructure created in these villages.**

#### **6.4.6 Recommendations**

- **Efforts need to be made to ensure coverage of un-electrified villages and completion of the projects within a specific timeframe.**