

**A
FINAL REPORT**

**EVALUATION STUDY ON BORDER
AREA DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME
MEGHALAYA
2003-2009**

**MARTIN LUTHER CHRISTIAN UNIVERSITY
SHILLONG
[4TH February 2010]**

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We are highly grateful to the Government of Meghalaya, Directorate of Programme Implementation and Evaluation, Shillong for assigning us this project and providing the financial assistance without which this study could not have been possible. We express our sincere thanks to Shri.A.Tewari, IAS, Director and Shri.S. Lyngdoh, Joint Director of Programme Implementation and Evaluation Department, Shillong for providing this unique opportunity to our University to do the evaluation study on Border Areas Development Programme in Meghalaya. We are thankful to Shri S.Nongsiej the former Director of Border Areas Development Programme, Shillong for providing all the information on the progress of BADP in Meghalaya.

We are equally thankful to all the concerned Border Areas Development Officers (BADOs), for their cooperative discussions and providing valuable insights about the BADP. Their suggestions and encouragement throughout the work have been the major source of inspiration to complete the task. We are also thankful to all the staff of Border Areas Development Programme, Shillong for helping us in contacting and communicating with other staff from all the five districts included in this study and providing us with all the necessary information related to the study.

We are especially thankful to all the Headmen and Sirdars in the nine blocks of the study for their valuable discussions on various aspects of the BADP and its impact on the socio- economic development. We extend our appreciation to all the beneficiaries and all the respondents for their valuable time, interest and information given to us for the study. We are thankful to the Inspector-General of the BSF, Meghalaya Frontier, Mr Prithvi Raj for his cooperation in providing information pertaining to the study.

We express our gratitude to the team which undertook this study, Mrs Iadalin S Rapthap, MSW, Lecturer in Social Work, Martin Luther Christian University, Shillong led the team and she was ably assisted by Ms Shabalyne L Mawlong, MSW, social worker. Together they spent several months visiting accessible and remote villages in the border areas interviewing officials and the people and visiting many project sites. The many hours of their painstaking work are encapsulated in this report.

Rev E H Kharkongor
Registrar
Martin Luther Christian University, Shillong, Meghalaya
Dated: March 23, 2011

Schemes/Projects Permissible/Not Permissible under BADP and Border Guarding Forces

A. Illustrative List of Schemes /Projects Permissible under the BADP

The BADP funds shall ordinarily be used for meeting the critical gaps after utilizing funds under the various Central/State schemes and to meet the immediate needs of border population. A baseline survey shall be carried out in border villages in order to assess the gap in basic, physical and social infrastructure and convergence of various Central/State schemes with the BADP should be ensured.

1. Education

- a. Primary/Middle/Secondary/Higher secondary school rooms)
- b. Development of playfields
- c. Construction of hostels/dormitories
- d. Public libraries and reading rooms

2. Health

- a. Building infrastructure (PHC/CHC/SHC)
- b. Provision of medical equipments of basic/elementary Type, X-Ray, ECG machines, equipment for dental clinic, pathology labs etc. can also be purchased
- c. Setting up of mobile dispensaries/ambulances in rural areas by Govt./Panchayati Raj Institutions including telemedicine

3. Agriculture and allied sectors

- a. Animal Husbandry & Dairying
- b. Pisciculture
- c. Sericulture
- d. Poultry farming/Fishery/Pig/Goat/Sheep farming
- e. Farm forestry, horticulture/floriculture,
- f. Public drainage facilities.
- g. Construction of irrigation embankments. or lift irrigation or water table recharging facilities (including minor irrigation works).
- h. Water conservation programme
- i. Soil conservation- protection of erosion-flood protection.
- j. Social Forestry, JFM, parks, gardens in government and community lands or other surrendered lands including pasturing yards.
- k. Use of improved seeds, fertilizers and improved technology
- l. Veterinary aid Centres, artificial insemination Centres and breeding Centres.
- m. Area specific approach keeping in view the economy of scale and integration.

4. Infrastructure

- a. Construction and strengthening of approach roads, link roads (including culverts & bridges)
- b. Industries - Small Scale with local inputs viz handloom, handicraft, furniture, making, tiny units, black smith works, etc and food processing industry
- c. Provisions of civic amenities like electricity, water, pathways, ropeways, foot bridges, hanging bridges, public toilets in slum areas and in SC/ST habitations and at tourist centers, bus stands etc.
- d. Development of infrastructure for weekly haats/bazaars and also for cultural activities etc. in border areas.
- e. Construction of buildings for recognized District or State Sports Associations and for Cultural and Sport Activities or for hospitals (provision of multi-gym facilities in gymnastic centers, sports association, physical education training institutions, etc.)
- f. Construction of houses for officials engaged in education sector and health sector in remote border areas.
- g. Tourism/Sports/Adventure Sports Scheme - creation of world class infrastructure for tourism and sports in border block where ever feasible- like rock climbing, mountaineering, river rafting, forest trekking, skiing and safaris (car/bike race, camel safaris, yak riding, boating in Rann of Kutchh.
- h. Creation of new tourist centers.
- i. Construction of mini open stadium/ indoor stadium./auditoriums.
- j. New & Renewable electricity- Biogas/Biomass gasification, Solar & Wind energy and mini Hydel Projects – systems/devices for community use and related activities.

5. Social Sector

- a. Construction of community centers
- b. Construction of Anganwadis.
- c. Rural Sanitation blocks.
- d. Cultural Centres /Community Halls
- e. Construction of common shelters for the old or Handicapped
- f. Capacity building programme by way of vocational studies & training for youth for self-employment and skill up gradation of artisans and weavers.

6. Miscellaneous:

- a. Development of Model villages in border areas.
- b. E-chaupals / agrishops mobile media vans / market yards.
- c. Cluster approach wherever feasible.

B. List of the works which are not permissible under the BADP

Creation of tangible assets should be given priority under the BADP. The smaller schemes, which are of direct benefit in nature to specific villages / individuals, need to be addressed by the State Governments under their own development initiatives.

The following schemes / project / works are not permissible under the BADP.

Education

- a. Buying of school dresses/ books.
- b. Adult Education.
- c. Books/Journals
- d. TV/Dish antennas

Health

- a. Health Awareness Programme.
- b. Eye Camps.
- c. RCH Programme
- d. Blood banks
- e. Control of Malaria, Filariasis, Leprosy, AIDS etc.
- f. First aid kit for midwives.

Agriculture and allied sectors

- a. Desilting of ponds in villages, towns and cities.

Infrastructure:

- a. Any schemes of individual benefit (such as roads to dera's and dhanies etc.)
- b. Boundary walls and construction of cremation sheds in graveyards/samsan ghats.
- c. Cleaning of cools/nalas/khalas.
- d. Boundary/retaining walls of ponds.
- e. Construction of building for Offices of local bodies, patwarkhana, panchayat ghar, BDOs, DCs, and residences for officials (except the official engaged in education and health sector) etc.
- f. Drain/Gutters.

C. List of permissible and non-permissible items of works to be undertaken under BADP by the Border Guarding Forces

Following schemes of developmental nature can be recommended / implemented by the Border Guarding Forces (BGFs) under the Border Area Development Programme.

- a. Construction of Link roads to BOPs
- b. Any other, work raising the infrastructure regarding drinking water supply / electricity generation (New & Renewable Energy). etc.

However, approval of the State Level Screening Committee is a pre-requisite for implementing such schemes and it shall form part of the Annual Action Plan of the State. Such schemes recommended/implemented under the BADP by the BGFs and Armed Forces are open for inspection by the State/Central Government Officers concerned.

Following works/activities are **not permissible** for implementation by the **BGFs** under BADP:

- a. Any type of Civic Action Programme for which funds are released by the Ministry of Home Affairs MHA or the States Government – like purchase of medicines, eye camps etc.
- b. Purchase of vehicles / night vision devices / other equipments etc.

Photographs of PRAs (Participatory Rural Appraisal) and Home Visits

1. PRA at Tyrna village, Shella Bholaganj Block



2. PRA at Borsora, Ranikor Block



3. PRA at Wahiajer, Khliehriat Block



4. PRA in Dalu Block, West Garo Hills District



5. Home visit at Saikarap village, Shella Bholaganj Block



Indicative Projects

1. Suspension Footbridge, Shella Bholganj Block



2. Water Reservoir at Umwai Village, Shella Bholaganj Block



3. Construction of LPSchool, Pynnai, Pynursla Block



4. Construction of LP School at Chengkompara, Betasing Block



5. Community Hall, Laitkynsew Village, Shella Bhloganj Block



6. Community Hall, Nongriat Village, Shella Bhloganj Block



7. BSF Mobile Ambulance at Shella BOP



8. Tolegre Suspension Footbridge, Baghmara



9. Rongara Suspension Footbridge, Rongara



10. RangtangSORA Suspension Footbridge, South Garo Hills



**Evaluation of the
Border Area Development Programme (BADP)
in Meghalaya (2003-09)**

**By
Martin Luther Christian University
Department of Social Work
Shillong
2010**

Table of Contents

Section	Page No.
I. Introduction	3
A. Background and Scope of the BADP	
B. BADP in Meghalaya	
II. Scope and Methodology of the Evaluation	7
A. Why an evaluation of BADP?	
B. Objectives of the evaluation	
C. Coverage area of the study	
D. Study design and selection of respondents	
E. Demographic profile of respondent beneficiaries	
F. Participatory Rural Appraisals (PRA)	
III. Findings of the Evaluation Study	12
A. Status of programmes and schemes	
B. Actual expenditures	
C. Critical gaps in various sectors	
IV. Opinions of the People and Officials	19
A. People's participation	
B. Impact of BADP: People's assessment	
C. Felt needs of the people	
D. Official's suggestions	
V. Recommendations and Conclusions	25
A. Summary of findings	
B. Recommendations	
C. Conclusions	

Annexures

1. Schemes /Projects permissible/not permissible under the Border Area Development and Permissible/non-permissible items of works to be undertaken by the Border Guarding Forces
2. Photographs of the PRAs
3. Photographs of Indicative Projects

I. Introduction

A. Background and Scope of BADP

Development along the border regions has a unique place and significance in the process of national planning and development. The character and magnitude of developmental challenges differ from region to region depending upon the geographical context, socio-cultural set-up and attitude of the neighbouring country. These areas suffer from inaccessibility and insecurity. The Government of India introduced the Border Area Development Programme (BADP) in the western region during the Seventh Plan with the twin objectives of balanced development through adequate provision of infrastructure facilities and promotion of a sense of security amongst the local population. In the Eighth Plan it was extended to states which have an international border with Bangladesh and during the Ninth Plan, the programme was further extended to states which border Myanmar, China, Bhutan and Nepal. The programme at present covers all the seventeen states which have international borders.

The work of BADP was handled by the Planning Commission up to the year 2003-04. It is presently being handled in the Department of Border Management, Ministry of Home Affairs. BADP is a centrally funded programme and Special Central Assistance (SCA) is provided for the execution of schemes. The block is the basic unit for the programme. The schemes to be taken up under the programme are prepared by the concerned departments in the States and submitted to the nodal department for approval by the State-level Screening Committee. The Empowered Committee at the Centre deals with policy matters, prescription of the geographical limits and allocation of funds to the States.

The schemes being selected by the State governments are generally from sectors such as education, health, roads and bridges, water supply, etc. Particular emphasis is being given to improvement and strengthening of social and physical infrastructure. For this, the felt needs of the people are the prime criteria. Some of the State governments are undertaking construction of playgrounds and community halls, so that the people, particularly, youth can spend their leisure time in constructive and creative activities. A system of monitoring the schemes under BADP in physical and financial terms has been introduced since 1994-95 and the State governments submit reports indicating the scheme-wise achievements in financial and physical terms.

A long term perspective plan for each border block should be prepared by the State government keeping in view the objectives of overall balanced development of the region. The State Government may undertake a study of remote villages in the border blocks in order to assess the needs of the people and the critical gaps in physical and social infrastructure. Schemes should be drawn up based on this assessment. Grassroots institutions such as PRIs/District Councils/Traditional Councils should be involved in identification of the priority areas. Village level institutions such as Gram Sabhas should be involved in the decision making process. Appropriate modalities may be worked out by the State government to ensure greater participation of the people of the border areas in the selection of schemes.

Emphasis must be laid on schemes for employment generation, production oriented activities and schemes, which provide for critical inputs in the social sector.

The BADP has been in operation in the Western Sector since the Seventh Plan and in the Eastern Sector since 1993-94. However, there has not been any systematic evaluation of the scheme to assess its impact on the well-being of the people and the effectiveness of the implementation methods adopted by the implementing agencies. Nor do the monitoring mechanisms adopted by the implementing agencies and the Planning Commission throw up information that could provide even a rough assessment of the performance of the scheme. Thus, the need for an evaluation study was felt in order to strengthen the implementation of various schemes and to ensure active participation of the people in its implementation.

B. BADP in Meghalaya

The Border Areas Development Department was created in 1973 to look after the implementation of various integrated schemes and developmental activities under the BADP. The Directorate of Border Areas Development was established in 1975 to gear up the organizational set-up with a Director and staff and District level officers, namely, the Border Areas Development Officers.

The Border Areas Development Department is implementing developmental schemes along the areas bordering Bangladesh for the notified border villages in the State. The schemes being implemented are regularly supervised by the Border Areas Development Officers posted in the different locations in the border areas. During 1997-98, a technical wing was created in the Border Areas Development Department.

1. Border Villages by District

A master list of border villages was prepared by the State Government for implementation of schemes under the BADP, last revised in 1992. As of now, there are 1523 villages falling in the border areas which cover 4430 sq km.

<i>No.</i>	<i>District</i>	<i>No. of border</i>	<i>Total No.</i>	<i>No. of border</i>	<i>Length of</i>
1.	Jaintia Hills	2	499	139	107 km
2.	East Khasi Hills	4	962	424	101 km
3.	West Khasi Hills	1	943	218	43 km
4.	West Garo Hills	2	1537	364	114 km
5.	South Garo Hills	3	627	315	78 km
	Total	12	4568	1523	443 km

2. Border Blocks Covered Under BADP in Meghalaya

Out of the 33 blocks in the State, 12 blocks have been declared as border blocks. In these blocks, there are 1523 border villages.

<i>No</i>	<i>Block</i>	<i>District</i>	<i>No.of border villages</i>	<i>Popula- tion</i>	<i>Area sq km</i>	<i>Length of the border</i>
1	Khliehriat	Jaintia Hills	59	20881	540	54 kms
2	Amlarem	Jaintia Hills	80	32130	310	31 kms
3	Mawkynrew	East Khasi Hills	37	14186	210	The villages are within 10 kms, of the border
4	Pynursla	East Khasi Hills	120	46793	290	29 kms
5	Shella-Bholaganj	East Khasi Hills	129	28366	450	45 kms
6	Mawsynram	East Khasi Hills	141	37187	370	37 kms
7	Ranikor	West Khasi Hills	218	50088	590	59 kms
8	Baghmara	South Garo Hills	205	44367	760	76 kms
9	Gasuapara	South Garo Hills	159	29137	340	34 kms
10	Dalu	West Garo Hills	167	47242	400	40 kms
11	Betasing	West Garo Hills	86	29610	250	The villages are within 10 kms, of the border
12	Zikzak	West Garo Hills	122	48363	380	38 kms
	Total		1523	4,28,350	4890	443 kms

3. Border Area Development Officers (BADO)

The 1523 villages in the border blocks are divided into 12 areas under the charge of one Border Area Development Officer (BADO) each for the administration and implementation of schemes.

<i>Location of the BADO</i>	<i>No. of villages)</i>	<i>Population</i>	<i>District</i>
Khliehriat	76	20927	Jaintia Hills
Amlarem	76	36025	Jaintia Hills
Shillong	26	15276	East Khasi Hills
Shella Bholaganj	104	30516	East Khasi Hills
Pynursla	117	61756	East Khasi Hills
Mawsynram	136	45003	East Khasi Hills
Ranikor	208	62781	West Khasi Hills
Betasing	86	29332	West Garo Hills
Dalu	166	49331	West Garo Hills
Zikzak	115	48447	West Garo Hills
Baghmara	211	44524	South Garo Hills
Gasuapara	245	38798	South Garo Hills
Total	1523		

II. Scope and Methodology of the Evaluation

A. Why an evaluation of BADP?

The BADP has been in operation in the western sector since the Seventh Five Year Plan and in Eastern Sector bordering Bangladesh since 1993-94. The Central Government has conducted or commissioned several evaluation studies for eg a study of BADP in six states in 1999 and a detailed study in West Bengal in 2002. In the revised guidelines for BADP issued in 2009, the State governments were directed to develop an institutional system for the inspection of BADP schemes/projects and submit reports to the Department of Border Management, Ministry of Home Affairs. A provision for third party inspection was also laid down.

The impact analysis of different programs and schemes is necessary to decide the future course of action and direction of development. This study is an attempt to analyze the impact of different activities implemented under the BADP, by evaluating nine border blocks in Meghalaya selected for the evaluation.

B. Objectives of the evaluation

1. To determine if the utilization of funds is in accordance with the guidelines
2. To assess the physical and financial performance of the programme
3. To evaluate the impact of the programme on the well-being of people living in border areas
4. To determine if the scheme has generated a sense of security among the people
5. To evaluate the extent of people's participation in the implementation of the scheme.

C. Coverage area of the study

<i>District</i>	<i>Block</i>	<i>No. of villages</i>	<i>No. of beneficiaries</i>
East Khasi Hills	Pynursla	26	43
East Khasi Hills	Shella-Bholaganj	30	76
West Khasi Hills	Ranikor	35	58
Jaintia Hills	Amlarem	15	23
Jaintia Hills	Khliehriat	12	35
West Garo Hills	Betasing	18	27
West Garo Hills	Dalu	32	62
South Garo Hills	Baghmara	12	15
South Garo Hills	Gasuapara	15	13
<i>Five districts</i>	<i>9 blocks</i>	<i>195 villages</i>	<i>352 beneficiaries</i>

D. Study design and selection of respondents

1. Questionnaire-based interviews with the District and Block officials in relation to the following aspects:
 - a. General and demographic information about the blocks and villages covered by BADP
 - b. Infrastructure facilities available to the people before and after the implementation of the programme
 - c. Flow of funds under the programme
 - d. Scheme-wise allocation and expenditure, the physical achievements under BADP
 - e. Manner of coordination of the activities and the monitoring agencies in the block
 - f. Involvement of the local governance institutions
 - g. Security problems encountered the people's participation in the implementation of the programme
 - h. Reasons for incomplete utilisation of funds and delays in meeting the physical targets
 - i. Problems faced by them in the implementation of the programme
 - j. Suggestions for the improvement of the programme.
2. Questionnaire-based interviews with the village leaders in relation to the following aspects:
 - a. Assessment of the impact of the scheme has to be made on the basis of infrastructure facilities available in the villages before and after the implementation of the programme
 - b. Involvement of the local governance institutions and the people in the planning and implementation of the various schemes taken up under the programme.
 - c. Improvement in the security perception of the people
 - d. Suggestions for its improvement.
3. Questionnaire-based interviews with the beneficiaries (households and individuals) in relation to the following aspects:
 - a. Assets and liabilities of the beneficiaries and the investment pattern of the families
 - b. Impact of the programme in the villages through creation of infrastructure
 - c. Mitigation of the security threat to the villagers
 - d. Improvement in the social and economic conditions
 - e. Problems faced by them and their 'felt needs' regarding improvements in the programme.
4. Interviews with State, District and Area employment council
5. Group discussions using Participatory Rural Appraisal. PRA is a survey method where the surveyors work with the community using a range of participatory approaches and methods that emphasize local knowledge and enable local people to facilitate information sharing, analysis, and action among stakeholders.

6. Key informants

- a. Village Headmen
- b. Sirdars
- c. School teachers
- d. Youth leaders
- e. Womens' and mens' groups

E. Demographic profile of respondent beneficiaries (household/individual interviews)

1. Gender of the respondent beneficiaries

<i>Gender</i>	<i>No. of Beneficiaries</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
Male	242	68.75
Female	110	31.25
<i>Total</i>	<i>352</i>	

2. Age profile of respondent beneficiaries

<i>Age Group</i>	<i>No. of Beneficiaries</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
0-30	62	17.61
31-40	84	23.86
41-50	106	30.11
51-60	73	20.73
Above 60	27	7.6
<i>Total</i>	<i>352</i>	

3. Education profiles of respondent beneficiaries

<i>Education</i>	<i>No. of Beneficiaries</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
Illiterate	23	6.53
Primary School	189	53.69
High School	64	18.18
Secondary School	48	13.63
Graduates	25	7.10
Postgraduates	3	0.85
<i>Total</i>	<i>352</i>	

4. Occupation of respondent beneficiaries

<i>Occupation</i>	<i>Male</i>	<i>Female</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
Agriculture	114	62	176	50.00
Business	27	8	35	9.94
Blacksmith	6	-	6	1.70
Contractor	8	-	8	2.27
Teacher	19	7	26	7.38
Daily labourer	36	13	49	13.92
Govt servant	10	5	15	4.26
Petty trade	18	11	29	8.23
Coal mining	8	-	8	2.27
<i>Total</i>	<i>246</i>	<i>106</i>	<i>352</i>	

5. Income of respondent beneficiaries

The income level of households is the most important criteria to judge the level of socio economic development in any region.

<i>Monthly Income</i>	<i>No. of Beneficiaries</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
Rs 1000-2000	69	19.60
Rs 2000-3000	176	50.00
Rs 3000-4000	34	9.65
Rs 4000-5000	54	15.34
Above Rs 5000	19	5.39
<i>Total</i>	<i>352</i>	

The above table indicates the income level of beneficiaries in order to understand the level of socio-economic development. A majority of the beneficiaries earned their daily living with a monthly income of Rs 2000-3000 having 50%. Some of the beneficiaries earned with the income of around Rs 1000-2000 per month that constitutes of 19.60%. Whereas 15.34% of the beneficiaries earned their monthly income of Rs 4000-5000 and 9.65% earned their income of Rs 3000-4000 per month. Only few of the beneficiaries which constitutes of 5.39% earned their monthly income of Rs 5000 and above.

F. Participatory Rural Appraisals Conducted

District	Block	No. of PRAs	No. of Participants and Classification					
			Male Female		Age		Education	
					0-30	30-60	Below	Class 9
					Class 8		& above	
			%		%		%	
East Khasi Hills	Pynursla	6	54	36	10	90	60	30
East Khasi Hills	Shella Bholaganj	5	67	23	15	80	65	25
West Khasi Hills	Ranikor	4	65	35	8	92	76	14
Jaintia Hills	Amlarem	4	61	29	50	40	20	80
Jaintia Hills	Khliehriat	3	64	31	10	90	15	85
West Garo Hills	Betasing	5	56	44	50	40	22	78
West Garo Hills	Dalu	6	71	29	60	30	10	85
Total		33	438	227	203	462	268	397

III. Findings of the Evaluation Study

A. Status of programmes and schemes being implemented

1. Construction of Rural Roads under State Plan

Road communication is one of the main contributing factors for all-round development activities in the border areas. The Department is constructing short-distance link roads from one village to another and other road works. Up to the year 2006-07, this programme was implemented by the Public Work Department. From the year 2007-08 onwards the scheme is being implemented by the Border Areas Development Department.

Year	Amount (Rs lakhs)	Expenditure (Rs lakhs)
2003-04	30.00	30.00
2004-05	30.00	29.66
2005-06	30.00	30.00
2006-07	42.00	Not available
2007-08	100.00	Not available
2008-09	300.00	Not available

2. Award of Border Scholarships under State Plan: - This Department is providing scholarships to the students hailing from the notified border villages of the State through the Education Department where fund is channelized by the Department to the Education Department. The scholarships is provided to the L.P. & M.E School students securing 1st division, SSLC, HSSLC students securing 1st to 3rd division, and the students of Degree examination securing Honours/ Distinction/ MA/MSC/MCOM, Students in professional courses such as Engineering/ Medical. Etc.

Year	Amount (Rs lakhs)	Expenditure (Rs lakhs)
2003-04	35.00	21.42
2004-05	38.00	30.00
2005-06	38.00	30.00
2006-07	42.00	Not available
2007-08	42.00	Not available
2008-09	32.93	Not available

3. Miscellaneous projects (Under the Ministry of Tribal Affairs)

The Government of India, Ministry of Tribal Affairs has funded a number of projects in the Border Area Development Department. The following are the list of schemes taken up during the year 2003-2008

<i>Sl. No</i>	<i>Year</i>	<i>Name of Scheme</i>	<i>Amount (Rs in lakhs)</i>
1.	2003-04	Tea Plantation at Malyngngot	Rs 58.050
2.	2004-05	Fruit Processing unit at Wahkdait	Rs 22.500
3.	2007-08	Two nos. of ropeways godowns at Lyting Larbri and Lamin Villages	Rs. 4.112
5.	2007-08	Construction of two nos. of ropeways from Mawrap to Mawblang and Mawblang to Mawkyrwang	Rs. 16.998
6.	2007-08	Construction of one no. of ropeway at Nongpriang village	Rs. 8.499
7.	2007-08	Construction of RCC Footbridge over Wagesik stream, Baghmara	Rs. 5.220
<i>Total funds received</i>			Rs 115.379

4. Projects completed by scheme

<i>Name of Scheme</i>	<i>2003-04</i>	<i>2004-05</i>	<i>2005-06</i>	<i>2006-07</i>	<i>2007-08</i>	<i>2008-09</i>
Construction or extension of school buildings	76	88	75	68	54	-
Community hall	22	22	26	28	20	16
Footbridges	56	26	136	152	78	36
Footpath	63	65	26	82	88	59
Link road	14	30	-	22	18	-
Playground	34	31	26	33	36	15
Community farm	10	-	-	-	-	-
Market stall	10	13	8	12	10	-
Fisheries	116	21	-	96	54	-
Betel nut soaking pond	62	-	-	78	-	-
Sewing machine	11	-	-	-	5	-
Piggery schemes	63	-	-	73	52	-
Goatery scheme	19	-	-	-	-	-
Drinking well	43	-	-	-	23	-
Water supply	4	42	-	38	26	-
Handicraft	10	-	-	-	-	-
Bee keeping	20	-	-	12	8	-
Handloom	1	1	-	-	-	-
Minor Irrigation	2	6	-	2	-	-
Sanitation units	12	-	-	10	5	-
Industries schemes	7	4	-	-	-	-
Ropeways	6	-	-	8	5	-
Improvement of sports facilities and playgrounds	9	-	-	7	5	-
Health & sanitation	46	60	-	33	21	-
AH & veterinary	2	7	-	-	-	-
Agriculture, horticulture and allied sectors	2	-	-	-	-	-
Assistance to community-based organisations	28	-	-	-	-	-
Approach road	3	-	-	5	4	-
Sericulture units	2	-	-	-	-	-
Purchase of solar light/alternative energy source	11	-	-	-	-	-
Teaching materials for schools	10	-	-	-	-	-
Sanitary latrines	10	7	-	9	10	-
Sports & cultural activities	9	-	-	-	-	-
Ring well R.C.C.	10	-	-	2	-	-
Water tank	8	-	-	3	-	-
Soil conservation, cash crop	1	-	-	-	-	-
Embankment	3	-	-	-	-	-
Retaining Wall	5	-	-	8	11	-
Godown	1	-	-	5	2	-
Restaurant	4	-	-	3	-	-

5. Projects completed by district and block

Dis- trict	Block	Title of the scheme	BADP Sector	Year Completed
East Khasi Hills	Pynursla	Construction of footpaths Construction of footbridges	Infrastructure	2006-07 2007-08
		Construction of water storage Construction of drainage	Agriculture & Allied sector	2007-08 2006-07
		Construction of school buildings Construction of playgrounds	Education sector	2005-06 2006-07 2007-08
East Khasi Hills	Shella Bholaganj	Construction of footpaths Construction of footbridges Construction of ropeways Construction of cement blocks Extension of Express Tyres Work Construction of public toilets	Infrastructure	2004-05 2007-08 2003-04 2006-07
		Construction of betelnut units Bee colonies Poultry Farms Fishery Ponds	Agriculture & Allied sector	2005-06 2007-08 2004-05
		Construction of community halls	Social sector	2005-06
West Khasi Hills	Ranikor	Construction of waiting shed Construction of washing ponds Construction of footpaths Construction of septic tank, Latrine for public	Infrastructure	2006-07 2007-08 2003-04 2005-06
		Construction of school buildings Extension and repair of LP school and Secondary school Construction of playgrounds	Education	2005-06 2007-08 2006-07
		Construction of community centre Construction of community halls	Social sector	2006-07 2007-08
Jaintia Hills	Amlarem	Construction of betel nut processing units Improve community fishery pond Construction of fishery ponds	Agriculture & Allied sector	2006-07 2007-08
		Construction of footpaths Construction of ropeway	Infrastructure	2005-06 2007-08

		Construction of drainage Construction of community halls	Agriculture & Allied sector Social sector	2007-08 2006-07
Jaintia Hills	Khliehriat	Construction of playgrounds Construction of basketball court Construction drinking water tanks Construction of piggery & poultry	Education Agriculture & Allied sector	2006-07 2007-08 2007-08 2006-07
West Garo Hills	Betasing	Construction of footpaths Construction of timber bridge Construction of culverts Construction of footbridges Construction of approach and link roads Construction of L.P. school Construction of bakery units	Infrastructure Education Agriculture & Allied sector	2006-07 2006-07 2006-07 2007-08 2007-08 2006-07 2007-08
West Garo Hills	Dalu	Construction of link roads Construction of RCC footbridges Construction of footpaths Construction of upper primary & Lower primary schools Construction of playground Construction of fishery ponds Construction of community halls	Infrastructure Education Agriculture & Allied sector Social sector	2003-04 2004-05 2003-04 2005-06 2003-04 2005-06 2006-07 2003-04
South Garo Hills	Baghmara	Construction of footpaths Construction of waiting shed Construction of footbridges Construction of meat selling stall Construction of school building Construction of water tank Construction of piggery farm	Infrastructure Education Agriculture & Allied sector	2003-04 2006-07 2003-04 2005-06 2005-06
South Garo Hills	Gasuapara	Construction of footpath Construction of footbridges Construction of waiting shed Construction of market stall Construction of godown Construction of LP school Construction of hostel	Infrastructure Education	2006-07 2006-07 2006-07 2006-07 2006-07 2007-08 2007-08

The initial work of BADP was been done in infrastructure sector. The first step of the work was the construction of footpaths, footbridges and link roads. The development of link roads provides the connections necessary for agricultural marketing and industrial development. The constructions of roads and bridges, which are the life lines of the socio-economic development of any area, have brought a significant improvement on the mobility of the general public. The people in the border areas could easily cross the river from one village to another through the suspension footbridge especially during heavy monsoon season.

B. Actual expenditures

An outlay of **Rs.559.00** lakhs was proposed during 2006-07.

The schematic expenditure/ anticipated expenditure/ and proposed outlay for 2006-07 is in the Table below:-

Name of the Scheme	Actual Expenditure 2003-04	Actual Expenditure 2004-2005	Anticipated Expenditure 2005-2006	Proposed Outlay 2006-2007
Scholarship/ Stipends to Border Areas students	21.42	30.00	30.00	42.00
Construction of Roads in the Border Areas	30.00	29.66	30.00	42.00
Border Areas Development (DIRECTORATE) : Direction & Administration	27.50	24.54	35.00	43.00
Agro. Custom Hiring in the Border areas	1.68	1.79	2.00	4.00
Land Acquisition & Construction of office building for the office of BADOs.	3.86	20.38	31.00	82.00
Special Central Assistance Under Border Areas Dev. Programme (BADP).	470.00	548.00	494.00	559.00
C.A. under Article 275(1)	50.55	20.00	28.00	28.00
Total	605.01	654.37	642.00	800.00

C. Critical gaps in various sectors

1. Education

There were few primary schools in the initial year of the BADP implementation in the nine blocks. The number of primary schools rose, registering a growth of students. The BADP has played a significant role in the development of educational infrastructure in the nine study blocks. The construction of additional rooms, verandahs, latrines and urinals was the priority area. This scheme has benefited a total of more than a hundred schools in nine blocks.

A wide gap is observed in the existing educational infrastructure and requirement of the blocks. There are 195 villages in all the nine blocks of the five border districts of Meghalaya which require schools. In addition to school buildings, playgrounds, hostels, libraries, uniforms and books also need to be provided. A significant gap is also observed in the area human resource development. Providing vocational and technical education can bridge this gap.

2. Agriculture

Agriculture continues to remain the main occupation of the people in the border areas as it is direct source of income and employment for them. The farming sector provides livelihoods both as owner-cultivator and daily labourer. Very little work has been done to improve irrigation and water supply.

There is urgent need for minor irrigation facilities, quality seeds, adequate supply of fertilizers in time, pesticides, and agricultural training in new techniques and technologies. There is significant gap in the field of animal husbandry in all the blocks. The quality of livestock is poor. There is a need of veterinary aid centers, artificial insemination and breeding centres. There are gaps in pisciculture, sericulture, horticulture and social forestry.

3. Infrastructure

BADP has played a major role in the infrastructure sector where many footpaths, footbridges, suspension footbridges, community halls, water tanks, link roads, etc were constructed under this scheme which brings development in the border villages.

IV. Opinions of the People and Officials

A. People's participation with BADP, felt needs and potential for employment

People's participation in the process of development provides them opportunities to fulfill their felt needs and creates a sense of responsibility for the proper utilization and maintenance of the community assets created by them. Thus, their partnership in the development enhances their level of confidence in sustainable development. The BADP emphasizes the selection of the projects/schemes based on the felt needs of the people or special problems of the area, with ensured participation of the people from planning level to implementation level and even thereafter for utilization and maintenance of the assets created.

Involvement of the Traditional Local Institutions with BADP

There is a dorbar in each village which is a strong traditional institution. Each village selects its own schemes as per its needs and priority. Implementation of the schemes is entrusted to the Village Committee formed by the Village Dorbar and their work is satisfactory taking into the account the time factor, the quality of work and the amount spent. The State Government has therefore requested that the current system should therefore, be allowed to continue.

The results of the study summarized in table no 5.1 reveal that people's participation has been ensured in the implementation of different activities under BADP

1. People's participation in the infrastructure sector

<i>Districts</i>	<i>Blocks</i>	<i>Outcome Excellent</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Poor</i>	<i>Total</i>
East.Khasi.Hills.	Shella Bholaganj	24	11	6	41
East.Khasi.Hills	Pynursla	25	39	13	77
West.Khasi Hills	Ranikor	13	23	2	38
Jaintia Hills	Amlarem	20	27	13	60
Jaintia Hills	Khliehriat	2	8	2	12
South Garo Hills	Baghmara	8	26	8	42
South Garo Hills	Gasuapara	5	6	5	16
West Garo Hills	Betasing	85	100	20	205
West Garo Hills	Dalu	97	63	14	174
TOTAL		279 (41.95%)	303 (45.56%)	83 (12.48%)	665

From the above table it was indicated that 279 (41.95%) respondents feels that people's participation on Infrastructure sector under BADP was excellent during the last six years (2003-2009). Whereas, majority of the respondents i.e.303 with 45.56% found out that people's participation on Infrastructure sector was good. Only 12.48% (83 numbers) of the respondents feels that people did not participate well in the implementation of BADP on Infrastructure sector which was very poor indeed.

2. People's participation in the education sector

<i>Districts</i>	<i>Blocks</i>	<i>Outcome Excellent</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Poor</i>	<i>Total</i>
East.Khasi.Hills	Shella Bholaganj	34	5	2	41
East.Khasi.Hills	Pynursla	43	21	13	77
West.Khasi Hills	Ranikor	18	13	7	38
Jaintia Hills	Amlarem	12	39	9	60
Jaintia Hills	Khliehriat	6	3	3	12
South Garo Hills	Baghmara	10	24	8	42
South Garo Hills	Gasuapara	10	2	4	16
West Garo Hills	Betasing	110	80	15	205
West Garo Hills	Dalu	125	35	14	174
Total		368 (55.33%)	222 (33.38%)	75 (11.27%)	665

This table shows that majority of the total number of respondents i.e. 665, 368 number of the respondents with 55.33% said that people participate well in the implementation of BADP Schemes which was excellent on education sector. 222 number of respondents with 33.38% said that people's participation was good on this sector and only 75 respondents of the total number with 11.27% said that people's participation was poor on education sector.

3. People's participation in the social sector

<i>Districts</i>	<i>Blocks</i>	<i>Outcome Excellent</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Poor</i>	<i>Total</i>
East.Khasi.Hills.	Shella Bholaganj	29	8	4	41
East.Khasi.Hills	Pynursla	27	25	25	77
West.Khasi Hills	Ranikor	15	16	7	38
Jaintia Hills	Amlarem	13	32	15	60
Jaintia Hills	Khliehriat	4	5	3	12
South Garo Hills	Baghmara	5	31	6	42
South Garo Hills	Gasuapara	9	1	6	16
West Garo Hills	Betasing	78	109	18	205
West Garo Hills	Dalu	132	34	8	174
Total		312 (46.91%)	261 (39.24%)	92 (13.83%)	665

The table above indicated people's participation on social sector under BADP where large number of the respondents i.e. 312 with 46.91% found out that there was an excellent participation from the people in this sector. Whereas 261 respondents with 39.24% found the participation of the people on social sector was good and 92 number of the respondents with 13.83% only found out that there was less participation from the people in this sector.

B. Impact of BADP: People's assessment

The observations and perception of the people regarding the BADP and socio-economic change were recorded to assess the impact of the scheme.

Village leader of Umblai village, Shella-Bholaganj Block: "BADP is one of the governmental schemes which have been implemented in his village. The work done under BADP is satisfactory; it really helped the local people and brings changes in the village".

Member of an Association at Mawlong village, Shella-Bholaganj Block: "There is a very good impact of the programme on the socio-economic development of the people of block and especially to the association"

Executive Member of Kongwang village, Pynursla Block: "Good work has been done under BADP by the Dorbar Shnong in the block, which has made a good impact on the socio-economic change in the block".

Villager from Nongsken village, Pynursla Block: "BADP is a well-known government scheme in the block and enough money is being given. We are enjoying life very well and nothing, like; sense of insecurity prevails among the people here." "Since there is no proper school building more additional classrooms should definitely be constructed under BADP".

Elder from Keniong village, Ranikor Block: "there is a very good impact of educational development, which has made a significant impact on the area. It has given a boost to the educational and cultural development of the surrounding area".

Youth leader of Shnongpdeng village, Amlarem Block: "there is very poor health status of the people in the block because of certain factors, including poverty and poor health services. The major health problems of the block are communicable diseases, diarrhea and malaria. There is immediate requirement of PHC and sub-centres from health department".

Leader of women's group at Nongwar village, Shella-Bholaganj Block: "There is no proper monitoring of the work and there is no monitoring committee. All concerned departments should be the members of the monitoring committee and each member should have the right to monitor the work of all agencies.

Group discussion held at Baghmara Block, highlighted the problem of insurgency. People are of the opinion here that the militants have become dominant and they have entered in the local politics and taking advantage of the government schemes.

C. Felt needs of the people

One hundred and ninety-five villages located in five districts of Meghalaya under nine blocks of Border Areas Development Programme were studied. Overall, the following needs were emphasized:

1. *Education*: More than a thousand households felt that they needed more schools in their villages as there are few government schools. The villages have been contributing in whatever way possible for opening and sustaining the needs of the schools.
2. *Health*: There are Community Health Centres, Primary Health Centres, and Sub-centres in the villages but they do not function on a regular basis because of lack of doctors or nurses and the supply of medicines is very limited. In case of sickness the patients have to fend for themselves. To reach these centres from their villages some have to travel for many kilometers. Nurses feel frustrated because there are no medicines. Over the years the buildings are deteriorating and are being used more as sheds for local animals. The health workers cannot function effectively without medicines.
3. *Livestock*: Keeping of livestock is common, especially pigs, goats, cows and chickens. It has not picked up as a business and trade and is more of a part-time activity. The method of livestock management is traditional and they have not picked up modern skills or knowledge about veterinary health.
4. *Markets, transportation and storage*: the local market is 5 km to 50 km from the villages. Due to this problem villages are not motivated to produce surplus. It will be a waste because most items are perishable. Even after reaching the market the villagers cannot dictate the price. Middlemen control the price. The villagers have to sell their produce at low rates because they cannot return to the villages with produce.
5. *Cost of labour*: Hiring of daily-wage labourers is common. The daily wage rate is Rs 70-80 for males and Rs 40-50 for female labourers. People in the border areas could not afford to hire labourers for infrastructure work under BADP schemes.
6. *Fuel*: wood is the main source for domestic energy. It takes two hours per day to collect wood from the forest. Only in a few villages small-scale afforestation has been conducted by the forest department jointly with the village. In many villages people fear that government will take control of their land if they give permission to forest department for afforestation. Regular supply of kerosene is needed.
7. *Drinking water*: is available only in some of the villages. In the rest it takes about one to two hours on an average to collect water from the nearest source. Only a few villages have a community sanitation system.
8. *Women's empowerment*: traditional political beliefs and practices restrict women's participation in political affairs, their involvement in the village council is discouraged. Selection of beneficiaries is done by men alone. Women's main problem is lack of health services. Drunkenness of men or their laziness adds to their woes.

Summary of Felt Needs

Education sector

- a. Additional rooms in all primary schools
- b. Up-gradation of primary schools, additional rooms in all middle schools
- c. Water and toilet facilities in schools
- d. Playgrounds in schools

Agricultural and allied sector

- a. Supply of water with distribution channels.
- b. Pisci-culture development.
- c. Poultry farming.
- d. Subsidized agriculture implements
- e. Piggery development.
- f. Pipes for irrigation on land beyond and deep bore wells for irrigation.
- g. Sericulture plantation
- h. Bamboo plantation (bamboo handicraft)
- i. Rubber plantation
- j. Bee keeping development

Infrastructure sector

- a. Footbridges
- b. Footpaths
- c. Bus stop sheds
- d. Maintenance/construction culvert/small bridges.
- e. Hand pump for drinking water
- f. Transport facility
- g. Ropeways
- h. Link roads

Social sector

- a. Construction of community hall
- b. Fruit processing unit.
- c. Vocational training centres

Other sectors

- a. Proper supply of kerosene.
- b. Compensation for the land acquired for BSF/Army.
- c. Compensation of the land acquired for BOPs.
- d. Solution of the land problem between fencing and zero line.
- e. Bank facilities in the border area.
- f. Supply of rations
- g. Tourism development.

D. Official's suggestions

Former Director of Border Areas Development, Shillong: “that regular inspection, supervision and monitoring of the schemes by the Officers at various levels is necessary and the Department should have sufficient technical manpower for doing the inspection and supervision of BADP schemes. Therefore to ensure proper implementation and quality control of the schemes, the Technical Engineering Wing of the Department is required to be strengthened by appointing at least one Junior Engineer in each Border Block”.

Assistant Director of Border Areas Development, Tura: “timely release of funds to the district is necessary for a better implementation of BADP schemes/programmes”.

Officer on Special Duty, Directorate of Border Areas Development, East Khasi Hills District, Shillong: “the Department need to be strengthened by appointing sufficient manpower in administration as well as in field work”.

BADO's from Shella-Bholaganj Block and Pynursla Block of East Khasi Hills District: “manpower should be increased like technical persons and office assistant in the border blocks for better monitoring and supervision”.

BADO from Amlarem Block: “the provisions in the guidelines should be strictly adhered to in the selection of schemes. Moreover, in the selection of State Level Schemes under SCA (BADP) the applications of the projects by the village committees etc should be strictly routed through the respective Border Block Officers whereby he will forward the proposals based on the inspection of the site, priority and feasibility of the projects so as to fill in the critical gaps and streamline the developmental activities of the respective border blocks. Accountability and transparency is necessary for all the border blocks.

BADO from Khliehriat Block: “for better implementation of BADP schemes/programmes proper training should be given to the staff and manpower should be increased”.

BADO from Ranikor Block of West Khasi Hills District: “technical persons need to be appointed in all the border blocks for better supervision in order to ensure quality of work. Better coordination should be enhanced with other line departments in order to understand the gaps in overall development and to find the critical gaps of BADP schemes/programmes.

BADO from Gasuapara Block of South Garo Hills District: “empowerment is needed for the officers in the department in order to supervise the projects freely without any political interference. Encouragement should be given to all the registered bodies like SHGs, NGOs and other agencies for implementation of schemes and programmes and more people's participation is needed in all the Border Blocks”.

Need for awareness programmes for the people

All the BADP officials are of the opinion that awareness programme is needed for the people. Therefore, before implementing of BADP schemes the Department should conduct awareness programmes on various BADP schemes in order to get more participation from the people.

V. Conclusions and Recommendations

A. Summary of findings

1. Delay in the release and flow of funds
 - i. From the Centre to the State Governments primarily owing to the delay in finalisation of schemes by the Screening Committees and secondly due to non-fulfillment of the guidelines such as submission of progress reports, utilisation certificates etc.
 - ii. After the funds are released to the State Governments, the implementing departments may get them only after a time lag of six months to a year or even more. Hence, Special Central Assistance may be released to a specialized agency such as the District Rural Development Agency.
2. Profile of beneficiaries
 - i. Gender: two-thirds of beneficiaries are male (69%)
 - ii. Age group: the largest group of is 41-50 years (30%). Almost three-fourths of beneficiaries are under 50 years of age.
 - iii. Literacy: More than half of beneficiaries have completed primary education (54%). 7% are illiterate.
 - iv. Occupation: 50% are farmers. 14% are daily wage labourers and 10% have their own business.
 - v. Level of income: 50% earn Rs 2000-3000 per month. 20% earn more than Rs 5000 per month, the highest bracket.
3. Peoples participation, perceptions and felt needs
 - i. Awareness about schemes is poor
 - ii. The study indicated people's participation is higher in three sectors of BADP schemes/ programmes in Meghalaya. These three sectors were the infrastructure, education and social
 - iii. The felt needs of the people include some of the schemes and projects already under BADP and other needs which have not yet been taken up by BADP.
 - iv. BADP also removes the feeling of alienation from the minds of the people living in remote border areas of Meghalaya.
4. Opinions of officials
 - i. People in the border area region need awareness on BADP schemes/ programmes before its implementation in order to get full support and participation from the people.
 - ii. Regular inspection, supervision and monitoring of the schemes by the officers at various levels is necessary The Department should have sufficient technical manpower for this.
 - iii. Timely release of fund
 - iv. In the selection of State Level Schemes the applications of the projects by the village committees should be routed through the Border Block Officers
 - v. Proper training for all personnel

- vi. Better coordination with other line departments in order to understand the gaps in overall development
- vii. Empowerment for the Officers in the Department in order to supervise the projects freely without any political interference.
- viii. Encouragement should be given to all the registered bodies like SHGs, NGOs and other agencies for implementation of schemes and programmes in order to have more people's participation

B. Recommendations

1. Administrative

- a. The people should have a major role in the identification of needs. Their participation at the project formulation stage should be ensured. Some reputed voluntary organization and educational/technical institutions, may be involved to assist the people in the task of identifying the 'felt needs' and priorities.
- b. The effective and timely implementation of the scheme needs a proper mechanism for the monitoring of the expenditure and work performance. There is no Monitoring Committee and Monitoring Schedule in any of the blocks. A permanent Monitoring Committee should be formed at the district level, having all district level heads (including BSF) of the implementing agencies and its permanent members.
- c. The channel of fund flow from State level to district level needs to be changed. Funds from the State may be released directly to the District Planning Office. The District Planning Office should be equipped and empowered to release the funds to different implementing agencies.
- d. There is need of capacity building and delegation of power to District Planning Office for planning, implementation and coordination of schemes under BADP at the district level. This may be considered by the Screening and Empowered Committees.
- e. There should be review meetings for incomplete works under BADP.
- f. Steps for erection of signboards/ landmark/ milestone at the sites of BADP work.
- g. People need an awareness programme on BADP from the Department of Border Areas Development Programme in Meghalaya in order to increase the participation of the people in the border area region.
- h. Better coordination between the Department of Border Areas Development Programme and the Local Traditional Institutions would enable efficient implementation of the scheme at the village level.

2. New programmes for employment and sustainable development
 - a. STD/PCO booth
 - b. Electrician
 - c. Radio, TV repairing
 - d. Tyre repairing
 - e. Tailoring
 - f. Wax and candle making
 - g. Brick-making
 - h. Traditional arts and handicrafts
 - i. Fair price shops
 - j. Restaurants

C. Conclusions

To make a study of what has been achieved so far in various fields on the path of progress and development, it is only right to giving ourselves time to pause and look back to the past. The past achievement can act as a springboard for further intensifying our efforts, for effectively harnessing available resources and exploring new openings for future development. In spite of various constraints and shortcomings, there is no doubt that the Border Areas Development Programme is surging ahead.

The main conclusion of the study is that to a large extent BADP has contributed towards creating an enabling environment for undertaking normal economic activities in border areas and expanding development opportunities for the local population. Infrastructure development has a key role to play in both economic growth and poverty reduction. The pace and magnitude impact of infrastructure sector depends on the pro-active involvement of the Government and its various local organizations.

The work completed under different sectors and executed by different implementing agencies under BADP, has brought about a limited but significant impact on the socio-economic development of the study blocks.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Border Area Development Programme (BADP) was introduced in the Seventh Plan as a Centrally Sponsored Scheme with the objective of infusing a sense of security among the people and building the much-needed social and physical infrastructure to propel normal development activities. BADP is a Central Government strategy to bring about a balanced development of border areas, which have specific problems such as inaccessibility, remoteness, sense of insecurity and cross-border terrorism. The state governments are required to conduct 'need assessment' surveys of border areas to identify and formulate specific schemes in the broad areas of concern of BADP.

In Meghalaya, the Border Areas Development Department was created in 1973 to look after the implementation of various integrated schemes and developmental activities under the BADP. The Directorate of Border Areas Development was established in 1975 with a Director and staff and District level officers, namely, the Border Areas Development Officers.

Twelve blocks in the five border districts are declared as Border Blocks. These blocks have 1523 border villages with a total population of 4.28 lakhs. An evaluation study was commissioned in 2009-10 with the objectives of assessing the utilization of funds, to evaluate the impact of the programme on the well-being of people living in border areas, to determine if the scheme has generated a sense of security among the people, and to evaluate the extent of people's participation in the implementation of the scheme, during the period 2003-09..

For this evaluation study, a sample of nine blocks in the five border districts was selected. These blocks were Shella-Bholaganj, Pynursla, Amlarem, Khliehriat, Ranikor, Baghmara, Gasuapara, Dalu and Betasing. From each block 12-35 villages were selected for evaluation. The study methods used were Participatory Rural Appraisal (group discussions in 33 villages were held with appropriate representation of officials, elders, women, youth and others) and questionnaire-based interviews of district and block officials, village leaders, households, district, state and area employment councils and various key informants such as teachers, youth leaders and leaders of community organizations. For each category of respondents, a different questionnaire was used. A total of 352 respondents were interviewed. From the responses, a demographic profile and various socio-economic data were obtained, apart from the opinions and information on BADP projects.

The study group also compiled and tabulated data on fund allocation and utilization, projects completed and in progress, various bottlenecks encountered in implementation and success stories. The study team visited numerous project sites for a firsthand appraisal, recording pertinent data on site.

Each village is supposed to select its own schemes as per its needs and priorities. Implementation of the schemes is entrusted to the Village Committee formed by the village durbar and their work is satisfactory taking into the account the time factor, the quality of work and the amount spent. Almost ninety percent of the respondents felt that people's participation in the planning and implementation of infrastructure, education and social sector projects was excellent or good.

In general, it was found that the BADP projects had contributed usefully to local development, according to the respondents and beneficiaries. The quality of the work was felt to be satisfactory and the projects had also strengthened the educational and cultural scenario in the rural areas.

However, the responses revealed some areas of concern. Better awareness and information about BADP is needed among the beneficiary populations. Some felt that the planning and monitoring of the projects needed improvement. Another concern was that not all the felt needs of the local people had been addressed.

The 'felt needs' of the people needs better consideration. In this survey, the people highlighted the need for more education and health facilities, drinking water, livestock, access to markets and storage of produce and fuel supplies. The need for greater participation by women was also stressed.

Certain recommendations for the smooth flow of administrative and financial procedures were suggested by officials at various levels, especially better coordination between the different government agencies, timely release of funds, review and monitoring, capacity building, awareness building and signboards, better criteria for allocation of BADP funds, connectivity and communication and involving reputed voluntary organizations to help in identifying needs and priorities.

The Border Areas Development Programme has made some noteworthy achievements in spite of various constraints and shortcomings. BADP has created a positive and enabling environment for undertaking development activities in the border areas and in expanding social and economic opportunities for the local population. However, the BADP can be further strengthened by giving more importance to wider community participation so that grassroots projects undertaken in these sensitive and important areas of the state will be fully relevant to the needs and priorities of the people.