

CHAPTER 7 MONITORING AND EVALUATION

Inspection, Monitoring and Evaluations are tools for better implementation of the programme/schemes and also enable the executives to take follow up action on error signals. We reviewed this aspect and noticed that besides non-convening of meetings as per guidelines, orders etc., under different sectors as described at Chapter 3, regular monitoring and supervision of implementation of these programmes by the Collector, district level officers, higher authorities like Directors, Secretaries were not adequate and result oriented as discussed in succeeding paragraphs.

Health sector

7.1 Absence of Health Monitoring Committee

The *Rogi Kalyan Samiti* (RKS) functioning at the District Headquarters Hospital (DHH) level under the Chairmanship of the Collector and at the CHC / PHC level under the Chairmanship of the Chairman, Panchayat Samiti were to constitute Health Monitoring Committees (HMC) who were to visit hospital wards and collect patients' feedback and send monthly monitoring reports to the Collector and the President ZP. Audit noticed that no such committee was constituted in any hospital except in CHC, Adenigarh (March 2012) which also did not furnish any report to the Collector, though required. Despite it being an important tool to get the patient's feedback through reports of these committees, the Collector, being the Chairperson of DHH never insisted for formation of such Committees.

The CDMO stated (May 2012) that though monitoring committees were formed, but they had not furnished any report to the district authority. In absence of any reporting, the purpose of meetings remained unserved.

7.2 Inspection by the CDMO and other higher authorities not conducted

Since regular inspection and monitoring was crucial to exercise effective implementation of the programme, the CDMO was required to prepare annual schedule of inspections for visit to health institutions in a year. Audit noticed that the CDMO neither prepared any schedule nor inspected any health institution during 2007-12. Besides, no other higher authorities like the Collector, Revenue Divisional Commissioner, Director of Health, Secretary of Family & Welfare Department (H&FW) etc., made any scheduled inspections to the health institutions.

When asked about the reasons for not conducting such inspections, the CDMO stated that the inspections were conducted. No evidence was however on record.

7.3 Absence of monitoring and supervision of construction of works by the District Level Construction Committee

In view of poor progress of construction activities in health sector undertaken under NRHM and other implementing agencies, the H&FW Department instructed (October 2009) to form District level Construction Committee (DLCC) under the chairmanship of the Collector with members like CDMO, DPM etc., which should meet once in a month to review the progress of the works. Audit noticed that though the first meeting was held in December 2010, the next meeting was held after 14 months (March 2012). Casual approach for holding the meetings did not serve any purpose for timely completion of works that led to 44 works remaining incomplete (March 2012)/not commenced (2007-08) for years together.

The Collector stated (September 2012) that district construction review meetings were conducted at regular intervals. No proceedings were however available in support of the meetings convened.

Education sector

7.4 Ineffective monitoring and supervision by DPC

Though the DPC, SSA, Boudh conducted field visit for 376 days (November 2007 to March 2010) on an average of 13 days in a month and inspected 1013 schools to review the SSA activities and progress of civil works, the inspections were confined to issue of some verbal instructions only as a result of which deficiencies noticed were not on record and no follow up action was initiated. There was no institutional memory of the outcomes of such inspection. The DPC did not submit inspection report from April 2010 to May 2011. Thereafter, no regular DPC was posted. The Sub-Collector and the District Inspector of Schools (DI), who remained in charge up to March 2012, did not conduct any inspection. Due to such casual and ineffective inspections, nearly 37 *per cent* (147) of works that still remaining incomplete for years together, could neither be expedited nor the educational development of the students be achieved and dropouts minimised as mentioned at *Paragraph 6.2.3*.

Food and Nutrition

7.5 Inadequate monitoring by the BLCC

One Block Level Coordination Committee (BLCC) with the Child Development Project Officer as its Chairman was required to monitor and supervise ICDS activities. Audit noticed that out of total three ICDS projects, BLCC was not constituted in two (Harabhanga and Kantamal) projects. Even the BLCC formed in Boudh project held only three meetings against the schedule of 20 meetings during 2007-12. The Collector noted the observations of audit.

7.6 Lack of periodic reviews by the Chairman of ICDS

The Sub Collector being the Chairman of ICDS project was to conduct monthly review of ICDS activities and visit at least 5-10 *per cent* of the AWCs and 25 *per cent* of CDPO offices as directed (May 2011) by the W&CD Department. Scrutiny of records for 2011-12 revealed that the Sub-Collector reviewed only the activities of ICDS project, Boudh twice in place of 11 times and never visited any AWC. Review of other two projects of the district was also not conducted. Due to absence of visit and non-monitoring of the programme on a regular basis, the projects were functioning in unhygienic environment and without availability of basic facilities as discussed at Paragraphs 6.3.3 and 6.3.4.

Employment guarantee / Rural employment

7.7 Deficiencies in conducting social audit under MGNREGS

To maintain transparency in execution of works and payment of wages under MGNREGS, the operational guidelines stipulated social audit in Gram Sabha presided over by a person other than the Sarpanch / GP functionaries since they were the part of execution. It was found on test check of proceedings of 110 social audit meetings that 61 social audit meetings were presided over by the Sarpanch. Besides, following deficiencies were also noticed.

- Social Audit was conducted in perfunctory manner as minimum quorum (10 *per cent* of voters of the GP) was not maintained in any such 110 meetings. The participation of villagers was between 20 to 147 only as against the voters ranging from 6266 to 6861 in these GPs. The Collector admitted (September 2012) the position.
- Officials of line departments executing MGNREGS works were not present in the 92 social audit meetings (83 *per cent*) which led the forum itself expressing its unhappiness over such non-attendance in 30 such meets. The Collector stated (September 2012) that the implementing agencies were being requested to attend the social audit meetings regularly.
- Wide publicity for larger participation (even by traditional means like drum beating) was required for effective social audit meetings. During interview of 88 villagers, it was found that 77 villagers were not even aware of any such meetings.
- Guidelines required setting up of Internal Audit Cells at the DPC level to review the social audit reports of Gram Sabhas and conduct special audit / investigation, whenever required. But no such cell was set up and the social audit reports of Gram Sabha remained unreviewed for possible corrective action.

The Collector while admitting (September 2012) the above fact stated that steps were being taken for setting up an internal audit cell.

7.8 Lack of effective grievance redressal mechanism

The Operational Guidelines of MGNREGS gave emphasis on putting in place an effective grievance redressal mechanism for ensuring a responsive

implementation process. For this purpose, complaint register in prescribed format was to be maintained at the GP / PS / DRDA / DPC level and complaints received were to be duly entered and disposed within the statutory time limit (seven to 15 days) of its receipt.

We observed that the complaint register was maintained by the POs at the block level since 2011 only. Out of 40 complaints received (March 2012), 11 cases (28 *per cent*) were pending for disposal. Further, there was delay in disposal of complaints between five months and 13 months (March 2012).

During 2006-11, the PD, DRDA received 246 complaints which were forwarded to different BDOs with the instruction to comply within seven days but the BDO Kantamal did not dispose of 79 cases forwarded to him even after lapse of 18 to 68 months. The BDO, Harabhanga submitted compliance to 76, out of 82 pending complaint cases in one day (31 December 2010) after lapse of three months to 54 months. Similarly, the BDO, Boudh submitted only seven compliance reports out of the 73 cases forwarded to him after a period of five months to 16 months.

7.9 Inadequate quality checks due to absence of technical personnel

We observed that even random check measurement / quality check of works executed under MGNREGS was not undertaken by the State quality monitors and resources persons engaged. Further, the works executed at GP level were not check measured by any higher level officer except the JE of the block. This was due to non appointment of Works Manager and Technical Assistants at district level. It was simply mentioned in the MPR that physical inspection of two, ten and 100 *per cent* works by the State/District/block level officers respectively were carried out as per statutory obligations. Four⁶³ State level Officers (Secretary) conducted physical inspection of nine works executed under MGNREGS during 2010-12 and issued general instructions for early completion of the work.

Rural Housing

7.10 Inadequate grievance redressal under IAY

There was no separate grievance redressal mechanism for IAY. It was observed that during 2007-12, 69⁶⁴ grievances were received by the PD, DRDA, which were forwarded to respective blocks for compliance out of which 44 cases pertaining to above years were not disposed of. (March 2012).

⁶³ Special Secretary, Steel and Mines from 8.6.10 to 10.6.10 (five works), Commissioner cum Secretary, PR Department from 28.7.10 and 29.7.10 (six works) , Sri Panchanana Das, IAS: from 17.11.2011 to 19.11.2011 (three works) Principal Secretary, Energy Department (no detail work list)

⁶⁴ Boudh-23, Harabhanga- 20, Kantamal- 26

7.11 Non-involvement of NGOs in monitoring

As required under the IAY guidelines, local NGOs with good track records were to be involved in the supervision, guidance and the monitoring of construction of IAY houses for ensuring better transparency and access in rural area. However, no such NGOs were involved in the monitoring and supervision of the scheme in this district. Non involvement of NGOs in supervision and monitoring led to weak community monitoring and certain degree of lack of transparency.

The Collector stated (September 2012) that all the BDOs were instructed to involve the leading NGOs in supervision and monitoring of IAY works.

Agriculture

7.12 Non-constitution of Management Committee of ATMA

The Management Committee (MC) of ATMA to be constituted under the Chairmanship of DDA was responsible for implementation of programmes and had to meet every month. However, this was not ensured. It was intimated to audit that the GB meeting served the purpose of MC meeting for which no separate meetings were conducted. The contention was not correct as the GB meeting was held only four times during last five years. Besides, the functions of MC were quite different from that of the GB meetings

Role of Collector

7.13 Lack of follow-ups on tour notes of Collector

Audit noticed that the Collector had undertaken tour for 154 days during 2011 of which 105 days (68 *per cent*) were within the district. It was seen from the inspection notes that although extensive tours were made by the Collector, instructions passed to the subordinate officers on the deficiencies noticed were mainly advisory and routine in nature. Follow up action thereon was not done. Though the Collector was holding regular review meetings with the officers of line department, they were basically appraisal meetings with no action plan for improving performance and ensure achievement of targets.

Evaluation

7.14 Non-evaluation of programmes by the District Authority

The District Planning Committee (DPC) had to arrange for evaluation implementation of various programmes in the district. However, evaluation / impact assessment of none of the programmes implemented in the district was conducted by the DPC during 2007-12.

Monitoring on all sectors by the District Authorities including the Collector was routine and not outcome-driven. None of the sectoral heads evaluated the impact of implementation of programmes to ascertain whether goals set were achieved and benefits effectively received by the rural populace of the district.

Recommendations:

The Government may take the following steps for effective monitoring mechanism in the district.

- District sectoral heads should strengthen monitoring and supervision through regular visit of sites;
- Instructions may be given to the officers on tour to highlight the deficiencies noticed and the solutions suggested in their tour notes.
- Accountability should be in place to check wilful underperformance;
- Periodical evaluation and Impact assessment may be made.