

Chapter 15 Conclusion and Recommendations

15.1 Conclusion

The scheme guaranteed generation of employment *vis-à-vis* creation of rural infrastructure through proper planning, adequate financial management, transparency in issue of Job Cards and proper monitoring and execution of works.

However, major policy decisions like planning and monitoring was left unaddressed as the State apex level body viz., State Employment Guarantee Council (SEGC) failed to meet at regular intervals as envisaged in the SEGC Rules framed by the State.

The District Perspective Plans (DPPs) prepared in the 10 test-checked districts at a cost of ₹73.64 lakh proved to be wasteful as these were not approved by SEGC as required, and therefore, had no scope left for the preparation of Annual Action Plans emanating from DPPs.

The programmes in the State were implemented during 2007-08 and 2008-09 without any approved labour budget. The labour budget for the years 2009-12 though approved had no co-relation with the release of funds. The instances of belated transfer of funds, unadjusted loans and advances and diversion of funds indicated inadequate financial management system.

Only 9.03 *per cent* of the registered households in the State were provided with 100 days employment during 2007-12 rendering failure of ensuring primary objective of the scheme. Transparent process of registration of households was absent with deficiencies in accounting and issue of Job Cards. The systematic records in regard to providing employment to the job seekers were not maintained depriving the job seekers from getting their due unemployment allowances, if any. Compensations for delayed payments as required to be paid to the beneficiaries out of State fund was also not paid.

Non-maintenance of wage material ratio as per scheme guidelines in seven out of 10 test-checked districts resulted in non-generation of 42.64 lakh mandays of employment. The number of incomplete works in 10 test checked districts due for completion during 2007-12 ranged between 9.85 and 82.91 *per cent* of the total works sanctioned, due to non-receipt of funds by the implementing agencies and lack of

initiatives. The Assets created were not fully documented and maintained by the department. These assets were also not handed over to the user groups for maintenance rendering the assets created susceptible to deterioration.

There were also deficiencies in targeted inspections coupled with lack of proper vigilance, inadequate checking of MRs and lack of transparency in the maintenance of records which led to suspected misappropriation/doubtful expenditure/fraudulent payment aggregating ₹3.40 crore.

In sum, the scheme suffered to a great extent due to ineffective planning and inefficient implementation on account of the factors discussed in the Report.

15.2 Recommendations

The Government may consider to:

- ensure regular meetings of State Employment Guarantee Council to address issues of planning, monitoring, grievance redressal and Social Audit of the scheme;
- prepare the District Perspective Plan (DPP) after taking inputs from Stakeholders viz., Gram Sabha/Gram Panchayat etc., and Annual Action Plan and Labour Budget should emanate from shelf of schemes in DPPs to ensure generation of expected mandays to provide 100 days employment;
- ensure engagement of full-time POs at Block level, with adequate supporting staff like GRS, Accountant and Computer Assistant at GP level;
- ensure creation of durable assets for future livelihood of rural people;
- make rural people more aware about the provisions and benefits of the scheme through wider publicity;
- encourage the GPs to make provisions in their subsequent AAPs for maintenance of assets created earlier; and

- strengthen the monitoring mechanism, Social Audit and redressal of public complaints.

Guwahati
The

(C. H. Kharshiing)
Accountant General (Audit), Assam

Countersigned

New Delhi
The

(Vinod Rai)
Comptroller and Auditor General of India