

Evaluation Report No. 16  
1997-98

**EVALUATION STUDY**  
**ON**  
**MP LOCAL AREA DEVELOPMENT**  
**SCHEME**

**EVALUATION UNIT**  
**PROGRAMME IMPLEMENTATION DEPARTMENT**  
**GOVERNMENT OF MEGHALAYA, SHILLONG.**

# Contents

1. Introduction	-	1 - 3
2. Execution of <b>MPLAD</b> Works	-	4 - 5
3. Process of Implementation of <b>MPLAD</b> Scheme	-	6 - 14
4. Extent of Achievement	-	15 - 23
5. Bottlenecks	-	24 - 28
6. Remedial Measures and conclusion.	-	28 - 31
7. Summary of Finding	-	31 - 40

## PREFACE

The Study of MP Local Area Development Scheme was taken up as per directives of the Government of India to identify the bottlenecks resulting in the administrative delays both in sanction and execution of work involved under this scheme in the two districts of East Khasi Hills and West Garo Hills.

The Study was assigned to Shri F. Syndai, Deputy Director, who started the work in great earnest right from the initial stage of designing the schedules and questionnaires upto the report drafting stage under my overall supervision and the administrative control of the Ex-Officio Director of Evaluation. In the field works as well as in the preparation of master tables and tabulation of data, he was assisted by Kumari M. Kharshiing, Research Officer, Shri M.B. Lyngdoh and Shri S. Lyngdoh, Research Assistants. However, due to poor transport facilities and delay in receipt of filled-in schedules from different quarters, the study could not be completed in the stipulated time as desired by Government of India.

The Evaluation Unit, Programme Implementation Department expresses its sincere thanks and appreciation to the Deputy Commissioners, East Khasi Hills and West Garo Hills Districts for providing the basic information relating to the scheme and to all the concerned Block Development Officers and the beneficiaries for extending their cooperation so as to enable this Unit to complete this study.

I hope that this Report with all its limitations will serve as a useful feed-back to the Government of India and will also prove valuable towards improvement in the working of the scheme and to ensure enhance efficiency and impact.

*N. Roy*  
(N. Roy)

Joint Director,  
Evaluation Unit,  
Programme Implementation Department

## INTRODUCTION

### Outline of the scheme

1.1 The Members of Parliament Local Area Development Scheme was launched on the 23rd of December 1993 when the then PM made a formal announcement to this effect. A pilot implementation of the scheme in the state then took place, during 1993-1994 itself with limited number of projects. It was only in 1994-1995 onwards that all the 4(four) MPs of the state, 2 from Lok Sabha and another 2 from Rajya Sabha, came forward to recommend a number of development works within their respective constituencies.

### 1.2 Salient Features of the scheme:

The Guidelines emphasise that works to be taken up under the Scheme should be developmental in nature based on the locally felt-need of the identified population. The guidelines envisage that such works will create durable assets for the public in general. No purchases of inventory, equipment, etc or revenue expenditure should be allowed. Each individual work suggested should not exceed Rs 10 lakhs. The works that maybe suggested and taken up should fall in any of the categories under the District Plan, especially the Minimum Needs Programme. The guidelines also indicate that execution of the projects may extend for more than a financial year, depending of course on the quantum of the work involved. The guidelines further specify types of projects admissible for inclusion under the scheme and also the items of works not admissible. These types of work maybe seen in detail in the guidelines itself.

### 1.3 Sanction and execution of works:

The guidelines specify that administrative approval/ sanction to the List (s) of works recommended by any MP should be issued within 45 days from the date of receiving the Lists from the concerned MPs.

### 1.4 Need of the study:

As desired by the State Government its Evaluation Unit was to conduct a case study on the MPLAD Scheme vide their letter dated 16.1.97 which was however received on 5.2.97 only.

### 1.5. Objectives of the study:

As mentioned in the G. O. I. 's D/O. Letter No.C/2/94-MPLAD & Vol.-V, dt.15.11.96, the study was conducted with a view to :-

- (i) highlighting an extent of delay in the execution of the schemes in the State of Meghalaya,
- (ii) identifying bottle-necks responsible for such delay and
- (iii) suggesting remedial measures.

### 1.6. Districts Selected:

The State Government itself had selected the two Districts, namely East Khasi Hills and West Garo Hills, for the purpose of this case study.

#### 1.7. Period of Study:

The study confined itself to those MPLAD works sanctioned during 1994-1995 and 1995-1996 only when actual implementation of the scheme in the State began

#### 1.8. Tools used for the study:

Different schedules-cum-questionnaires were designed for collection of data at different levels which included-District Collector and the District Rural Development Block at District level; selected Community Rural Development Blocks, and the beneficiaries. Besides, discussions with implementing Agencies and on-the-spot observations provided important sources of information.

#### 1.9. Size and number of Samples:

In spite of attempts to make the study more intensive in scope sufficient number of samples could not be studied, due to staff constraints, time limit factor and various other factors. We therefore had to limit our choice of samples from 7 C.R.D. Blocks. Five numbers were taken from East Khasi Hills where the number of MPLAD Schemes were found relatively higher in number than those in West Garo Hills and the other two from Garo Hills.

These C.R.D.Blocks were: (i)Mawphlang (ii)Mawsynram (iii)Mylliern (iv)Pynursla and (v) Mawryngkneng in East Khasi Hills while (vi)Rongram and (vii) Zikzak from West Garo Hills. Besides, Tura Municipal Board involved in the implementation of the Scheme in Tura Urban Area was also selected.

1.10.Keeping in mind the objectives of the study, the selection of samples at beneficiaries level was based on the lists of sanctioned MPLAD works for 1994-1995 and 1995-1996. Samples were selected from among these incomplete works in order to identify bottlenecks hindering the timely completion of the scheme. Further in our attempt to take up the study as expeditiously as possible, samples were taken from among these MPLAD works which were being implemented in accessible areas. Hence, the study chose 32 samples from East Khasi Hills and 11 nos. from West Garo Hills taking into consideration of the respective total number of sanctioned MPLAD projects in the two Districts during the years 1994-1995 and 1995-1996. Similarly, from Mylliern Development Block which comprises as many as 9 Constituencies plus some villages under Nongkrem and Sohryngkham constituencies too, was found to have a maximum of number of sanctioned Schemes. Accordingly 16 samples were selected from this Community Rural Development Block, followed with 2 nos. from Mawphlang, 5 nos from Mawsynram , 4 nos from Pynursla and 5 nos from Mawryngkneng Development blocks in East Khasi Hills. Of the above 16 numbers of samples under Mylliern Development Block, 1 number out of them did not respond to our questionnaire. From West Garo Hills District, our samples included 3 nos. under Tura Municipal Board (T.M.B.), 4 nos. under Rongram and 4 numbers from Zikzak Development Blocks. Two samples ; one under Rongram and another one under T.M.B. were found to have been out of Station and hence questionnaire-cum-schedules were given to respective relatives with a request that they would send it back, duly filled in, to our office. But the same was not received from both of the beneficiaries. In

all, therefore, we had eventually 40 nos. (+2 for which important information gathered from concerned D. R.D.A. Block and +T.M.B.) samples from among the beneficiaries scattering in the 8 Projects with 31 nos. from East Khasi Hills and 9 nos. from West Garo Hills.

1.11. Field Study:

The actual field works could be started in the 2nd Week of April, 1997, due to difficulty narrated at para 1.2 and completed in the third week of May. Field visits included Block Development Offices and sites of the location of the selected MPLAD works.

1.12. Manpower:

Study design and field works relating to schedule canvassing etc. were effected by Shri F. Syndai, Deputy Director under the administrative control of the Joint Director and the Ex-Officio Director of Evaluation. In preparation of Master Tables, he was assisted by one Research Officer, Smt. K. Kharshiing and the two Research Assistants, Shri S. Lyngdoh and Shri M. B. Lyngdoh.

1.13. Constraints:

Poor transport logistics delayed considerable the start of the field study. The study could not pinpoint extent of delays at different levels, as opined by the GOI in their aforesaid letter due to non-availability of required data. Further, delaying in receipt of filled in schedules from different quarters led to the late completion and submission of the interim report. Over and above, the shortage of manpower compelled those Unit to limit the size of samples to the minimum possible. All these handicaps created unavoidable limitations in the present study.

## CHAPTER II

### **EXECUTION OF MPLAD WORKS**

#### **2.1. Executing Agencies:**

As per the guidelines, for executing the MPLAD works, the District Collector concerned may choose or entrust any of those executing agencies like P.W.D., Rural Development, Irrigation, Public Health Engineering etc. Works located in Urban areas may be assigned to the Municipalities or Corporations, where ever these local Institutions are established. In Meghalaya, in so far as the two selected Districts of East Khasi and West Garo Hills were concerned, the implementation of the Scheme was entrusted in most cases, to the existing Rural Development machinery through the Block Development Offices. In West Garo Hills District it was however found that besides the Rural Development Department, other Departments were also involved, like the Municipal Board, PHE, Meghalaya State Electricity Board and in some cases, the District Collector's office directly. In East Khasi Hills, however, the Rural Development Department was the sole Govt. Agency entrusted for the implementation of the Schemes. The actual process adopted by the two Districts in this connection is explained in the following paragraph.

In East Khasi Hills :

2.2. The Block Development Officer, after having obtained the lists of sanctioned/approved projects from the Deputy Commissioner, gave instructions to the concerned beneficiaries to appoint a Local committee from amongst themselves and were advised to contact the concerned Block Development Officer's office. The actual execution of the sanctioned project lay entirely upon the beneficiaries themselves. On his (B.D.O's) part, he simply exercised administrative, financial and technical control in the execution of the Scheme. They could not start the work without the prior work order from him or could not draw any subsequent instalments of the sanctioned amount unless he (B.D.O.) or his staff I/c was satisfied of the quantum of the work executed in relation to the amount drawn. Site inspection was accordingly necessary. This system was more or less like the one employed in the execution of other rural development schemes like JRY etc.

In West Garo Hills:

2.3. Of the two C.R.D. Blocks selected in West Garo Hills, one of them i.e. Zikzak executed the approved projects in the same manner as done in the 5(five) C.R.D. Blocks in East Khasi Hills. Likewise, the Tura Municipal Board followed the same procedure. The remaining C.R. D. Block (i.e. Rongram) in West Garo Hills undertook however, an over all charge of the execution work of the MPLAD works right from the preparation of Plan and estimate up to actual construction work. Payment to workers and to suppliers of the construction materials were all effected by the B.D.O.'s Office. The local

beneficiaries were, however, made to participate in the implementation of the Projects through joint physical supervision of the work and by their being engaged as workers according to their skill. In other words, the Projects were implemented Departmentally. An exception to this general practice was however, come across, when the implementation of one of the selected sample projects was entrusted to the beneficiaries themselves. So flexibility seemed therefore to be (applied) there in West Garo Hills depending upon the local situation.



## CHAPTER III

### PROCESS OF IMPLEMENTATION THE MPLAD SCHEMES

#### Administration:

#### 3.1. District Level Staff:

As stipulated in paragraph 3.3. of the MPLAD Revised Guidelines(1997),the administrative sanctions rest with the District authorities (District collectors). Accordingly, in the two selected Districts viz. East Khasi and West Garo Hills it was found that the DC's Development Branch were involved closely in implementing the Scheme within their respective jurisdictions.

Regarding the selection of projects, they were based invariably on the concerned MP's prerogative. The District Collectors' task was simply to ensure that the works so approved and sanctioned conformed to the guidelines. For these and other related functions, certain Officers and supporting staff were entrusted for carrying-out the same, in addition to their respective normal duties. In the case of East Khasi Hills District, the Deputy Commissioner himself took an over-all administrative control over the implementation of the scheme. His direct supporting staff included 1(one) typist who was at the same time, looking after the Development Branch of the District collector's office. It was seen that other subordinate staff played an indirect role in implementation of the scheme.

In West Garo Hills, the Additional District Magistrate was assigned the task of monitoring and supervising of the MPLAD Scheme. He however, stated that no staff was directly posted for the scheme but his Development Branch did help on a part time basis.

3.2. In addition to the above machinery, the respective Project Directors, of the District Rural Development Agencies (DRDA) and their staff played a critical role in the financial management aspects of the Scheme within their respective Jurisdiction. This was necessary due to the fact that the funds released by the Govt of India for the Scheme being non-lapsable were transferred to the concerned DRDAs account and booked there. It was utilised as and when administrative sanction for different MPLAD works were eventually made, possibly in the next financial year.

The Table below indicates the position of officers and staff involved in implementation of the scheme at the District level

TABLE NO 3:1

TABLE NO.3:1

**OFFICERS AND STAFF ADMINISTERING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE MPLAD SCHEME AT THE DISTRICT LEVEL**

Sl. No.	Designation of Officers & Staff	Strength	Remarks
1	2	3	4
<b>East Khasi Hills</b>			
1	Deputy Commissioner	1	In addition to their normal duties
2	Clerk	1	
3	Typist	1	
<b>West Garo Hills</b>			
1	Addtl Dist Magistrate	1	
2	Supporting staff		not available

Source: The District Collector's Offices

**Block Level Staff:**

3.3. Apart from the Block Development Officer who was responsible for an over-all control and supervision of the execution of different sanctioned projects, there were subordinate Engineers, Sectional Assistants and Gramsevak overseeing the on-the-spot implementation of the same (Projects), besides sundry ministerial staff in the respective offices. The subordinate Engineers, besides taking the measurement of each work, were also required to examine the plans and estimates submitted by the beneficiaries in respect of their sanctioned Scheme. From the discussions with the B.D.O s' in the two Blocks in West Garo Hills, the task of preparation for Plan and estimates was also performed by the Subordinate Engineers, besides taking measurement of the works and also preparing the Measurement Book. For the proper implementation of any Scheme, they were also to conduct site inspections from time to time. In performing these functions they were assisted by a Sectional Assistant. As to the progress of the execution of the work, the Gramsevak were to submit a report in respect of each Project. In some Blocks, the preparation of Muster Roll was done either by a concerned gramsevak or by a sectional Assistant.

3.4. The strength of the involved staff, in field works, is indicated at the Table No.3.2. It may be observed that of the 7 Selected Blocks were shown to have in position 2 subordinate Engineers each, while the rest only 1(one) each. Three Blocks were reported to have 1(one) Sectional Assistant each, while another three of them seemed to have no such staff in their establishment. Data furnished by the two C.R.D. Blocks, Mawsynram in East Khasi Hills and Zikzak, in West Garo Hills, showed that they were having only 1(one) Gramsevak each in position. In the case of Tura Municipal Board there was only one Assistant Engineer. The Chairman was also shown to participate in the implementation of the Scheme.

3.5. It is to be remembered that almost all rural and poverty alleviation Schemes are usually entrusted to the Block Development Officers. These Schemes include SRWP, CRRP (MLA Scheme), JRY, EAS, IAY, MWS etc, and for the implementation of these various schemes the same staff employed here were also engaged in the MPLAD Schemes. That is why, out of 8 sample projects (including Tura Municipal Board) a majority of them stated the inadequacy of the existing staff to cope with the job efficiently and expeditiously.

TABLE NO.3.2

STRENGTH OF STAFF ENGAGED IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF  
THE MPLAD SCHEMES IN SELECTED C.R.D. BLOCKS.

Sl No	Name of Block/Board	Design of Staff	Strength	Other schemes in which staff at Col 3 are attending to
1	2	3	4	5
1	Mawphlang	Subordinate Engg.	1	EAS, JRY, IAY, SR WP, CRRP, DWCRA, Normal CD schemes...
		Gram Sevaks	10	-DO-
2	Mawsynram	Junior Engg.	1	
		Sectional Assts.	1	
		Gram Sevaks	1	
3	Myitrem	Jr Engg.	2	JRY, IAY, MWS, C RRP, SRWP, EAS CD SCHEMES, IRDP
		Gram Sevaks	10	-DO-
		Sub Engg.	1	
		Sect. Assts.	1	
		Gram Sevaks	15	
4	Pyawsh	Sub-Engineer	1	
		Sectional Assts.	1	
		Gram Sevaks	15	
5	Mawryngkeng	Not Available		
6	Rengam	Junior Engineer	2	-DO-
		Gram Sevaks	15	
7	Zikzak	Sub Engineer	1	-DO-
		Sectional Asst.	1	
		Gram Sevaks	1	
8	Tura Municipal Board	Chairman	1	All Municipal Matters
		Asst Engineer	1	General Plan Schemes

### **Role of Govt of India**

3.6. Funds for the Scheme at rupees one crore per MP per year were released by the Govt. of India direct to the District Collectors after the vote on Account/Budget is passed. To be able to have some idea regarding an extent of time-lag taken for processing the connected matter at different levels, the study considers it appropriate to indicate the date(s) of receipt the Govt. of India sanctioning authorities by the concerned District collector. For this particular information, it appears that the dates of receipt the Govt. of India authorities by the two selected District were more or less the same in respect of the Schemes for 1994-95 and 1995-96. That is, both the District collectors of East Khasi and West Garo Hills received the Govt. of India sanctioning orders on 7.11.94 and 18.10.94 for 1994-95 Schemes. With reference to 1995-96 MPLAD Schemes the District authorities in East Khasi Hills received the Govt. of India's clearance on four different dates viz 1.8.95, 4.7.95, 15.12.95 and 20.12.95 while West Garo Hills District, received the orders at two different times on 4.7.95 and 20.12.95 (Note: The Deputy Commissioner, East Khasi Hills furnished data on the prescribed proforma while that of West Garo Hills gave them verbally giving rise thus to a risk of inaccuracy). According to the guide-line, the release of Funds by the Department of Programme Implementation (GOI) is to be done twice a year depending upon the financial and physical progress achieved. It is not therefore, quite certain whether the two different dates (7.11.94 and 18.10.94) of receipt the authorities for 1994-95 related to the two sanctioning orders for the two instalments where the gap of time between the two hardly a month. In case of 1995-96 Schemes, the interval between the authorities of the first instalment and 15.12.95 and 20.12.95 of the 2nd instalment seemed to correspond to the statement saying that the release of Funds was done twice a year.

### **Lists of MPLAD works proposed by the various MPs.**

3.7. From Table 3.3, it is evident that each MP used to submit two separate Lists of works recommended by him for any particular year. Some of them used to forward for more than two lists, separately for any year. It was on these approved Lists that the District authorities were to accord administrative approval. The fact emerging out of these data showed that there was a gap of time between the first and the subsequent List of approved works ranging between 1 month to 1 year 2 months in so far as the 1994-95 Schemes were concerned.

The reason for this time-gap might be due to delayed flow of applications perhaps from the beneficiaries. This procedure of submitting the lists of approved works batches was made because of the 2-instalment basis of release funds by the Govt. of India or depending upon the receipt of applications from their people. In this way, works received earlier got included in the first List of sanction order by the District Authority.

3.8. On further analysis, it shows that in so far as the 1994-95 MPLAD Schemes were concerned the first list of approved works as received from Shri P.G. Marbaniang (LS) by the Deputy Commissioner, East Khasi Hills was on 8.2.95 followed by another List on 8.12.95, that is, 10 months gap, where as from G.G. Swell (RS), the gap of time between the first and the last

List was just a matter of one month only (i.e. 6.12.94 to 5.1.95) but in case of Shri B.D.Dutta (RS) the time-lag extended for 11 months when the date of receipt of the first list was 6.12.94 and that of the second list on 24.11.95. In West Garo Hills, the difference of time between first and Second Lists submitted by Shri B.B.Dutta recorded for 9 months, (i.e. between 18.2.95 and 14.11.95) while in case of Shri P.A.Sangma, (LS) it was for 1 year-2 months as the first List was received on 18.7.94 and the last List on 16.9.95, for 1994-95 MPLAD Scheme.

3.9. It was however worth noting that for the MPLAD Schemes of 1995-96, the time gap between the submission of the first and the last List of the recommended works by the MPs to the concerned District Collector was significantly narrowed down to few months only (3 to 4 months' time). It might be so because the people have become well aware of the facility and hence submitted their applications well in advance.

TABLE NO. 3.3.

STATEMENT SHOWING DATES OF RECEIPT OF LISTS OF APPROVED WORKS FROM MPs FOR THE YEAR 1994-95 & 1995-96 MPLAD SCHEME

MP name	District	Year	1 <sup>st</sup> List	2 <sup>nd</sup> List	Extent of Gap
G. G. Swell	E. K. Hills	1994-1995	6.12.1994	5.1.1995	1 month
		1995-1996	2.10.1995	15.2.1996	4 months
P. G. Marbng	E.K. Hills	1994-1995	8.2.1995	8.12.1995	10 months
		1995-1996	24.11.95	23.2.96	3 months
B. D. Dutta	W. G. Hills	1994-1995	18.2.1995	14.11. 95	9 months
	E. K. Hills	1995-1996	2.10.1995	15.2.1996	4 months
P.A. Sangma	W. G. Hills	1994-1995	18.7.1994	16.9.1995	13 months
		1995-1996	12.7.1995	13.10.95	3 months

Source: District Collectors' Office

## Administrative Approval:

3.9. Before administrative approval was accorded, they needed to be satisfied themselves that the recommended works, forwarded to them by any MP, did conform to norms laid down in the Guide-lines of the scheme. Relevant documents, like Plans & Estimates, enclosed if anywhere also to be scrutinised as to whether the sanctioned amount tallied with the estimated amount. These and other allied and routine matters had to be attended to by the respective District Administration. As such, it necessitated for a certain period of time. The Guide-line suggests a targeted period of time as 45 days. As stated earlier and shown in Table NO.3.3., there had been a significant gap of time between the first and the last List of approved MPLAD works submitted by different MPs, so also, in some cases, there was a difference of time between the first and the last series of the sanctioning orders issued by the Deputy Commissioner, East Khasi Hills. Thus, in case of 1994-95 Projects submitted by G.G.Swell MP(RS) a series of administrative sanctions were accorded and issued between 4.1.95 and 31.5.95 giving rise to 5 months time-lag. The projects forwarded by P.G.Marbaniang MP(LS) for the same year (1994-95) could, however, be cleared administrative just for a matter less than 3(three) month's time only i.e. between 3.1.95 & 20.3.95. But in case of the MPLAD Schemes approved by D.B. Dutta MP(RS), the time interval was exceptionally very long extending from 12.1.95 to 27.2.96 i.e. more than a year. This exceptionally seeming delay may be diluted when we consider the fact that the date of receipt the last series of recommended works by the MP fell on 24.11.95 as indicated in the Table No.3.3. Comparing then between the dates of receipt the last list of recommended works furnished by the concerned MP and the dates of last sanctioning order, the gap of time worked out to be more or less between 2 and 3 months, which may be reasonable considering the constraints faced by staff who have got to attend to their normal duties, as well. This time-span applied to 1995-96 MPLAD Schemes also, in which the first sanctioning order was issued on 12.3.96, both in respect Schemes submitted by P.G.Marbaniang MP(LS) and G.G.Swell MP(RS) as can be seen from Table No.3.4.

3.10. These data were not available from the D.C's Office West Garo Hills District. We may, however, form some idea pertaining to particular information by making use of the data received from the three Selected Projects viz. the C.R.D.Blocks, Rongram and Zikzak and the Tura Municipal Board. As per the Lists of the MPLAD Schemes furnished by the three said Projects, there were altogether 15 and 13 MPLAD works sanctioned during 1994-95 and 1995-96 respectively, of the 15 MPLAD works of 1994-95, 10 nos. of them were sanctioned during March '95, 2 nos. after March which extended upto December, '95 and 3 nos. during 1996. With regard to 1995-96 Schemes, it was found that out of 13 nos. 7 of them got sanctioned between February and March '96, 2 nos. after March '96 and the remaining 4 nos. in February, '97. Thus, of the 28 total numbers of Schemes for 1994-95 and 1995-96, 17 numbers of them (60.71 P.c.) obtained the sanction within the month of March of the particular year. Accordingly, it took 5 to 6 months to get the first series of sanctioning orders after having received the last series of

approved works proposed/recommended by the MP(LS) P.A.Sangma.(The situation may be glanced in Table No.3.4.)It was therefore, obvious that in both the Districts, under the study, a targeted 45 days period of according sanctions after the date of receipt of the approved works from the concerned MP could not be materialised perhaps due to practical difficulties faced by the dealing staff.

TABLE NO: 3.4

STATEMENT SHOWING DATES OF SANCTIONING ORDERS ISSUED FOR MPLAD SCHEMES OF 1994-95 & 1995-96.

Sl no.	MP NAME	MPLAD WORKS FOR 1994-95 and 1995-96			
		1994-1995	1995-1996		
		Date of receipt of the last work list	Sanctioned Orders Issued between	Date of receipt of the last work list	Sanctioned Orders Issued between
1	P.G. Maib (LS)	8.12.1995	3.1.95 & 30.3.95	23.2.96	6.12.95 & 12.3.96
2	G. G. Swell (LS)	5.1.1995	4.1.95 & 31.5.95	15.2.96	6.12.95 & 12.3.96
3	B. D. Dutta (RS)	24.11.1995	12.1.95 & 27.2.96	Nil	Nil
4	P.A. Sangma (LS)*	16.9.1995	March'95 & Dec '95	31.10.95	2.3.96 & 13.2.97

Sources: D.C.'s Office, Shillong

\* As obtained from the Sample C.R.D. Block & TMB Tura.

### 3.10. Scrutiny at Block Level:

On receipt of the sanctioning order, the task of the Block Office was to examine carefully the Plan and Estimate enclosed if any, with the applications by the concerned beneficiaries. The foremost point of scrutiny was on the Plan and Estimate whether the estimated amount tallied or not with the sanctioned amount, whether the Plan and Estimate was approved by the competent authority, whether the Estimate was given in detail, for every item of works or materials involved. If everything was found in order, the petitioners were intimated of the D.C.'s sanctioning order with specific communications like (a) clearance for executing the work (b) furnishing authority to whom the money to be paid. In case, however, the Estimated amount for exceeded the sanctioned amount, the concerned beneficiaries were directed either to recast the Plan and Estimate as to bring the same equal to the sanctioned amount or to give an undertaking that the excess amount be supplemented out of their own resources. The second alternative was possible only when the excess amount was small enough or when the organisations were of financial soundness. If these two options were not there, there was no alternative but to go by the first one; (i.e. recast the P & E). Hence, in many cases, the problem arose when a considerable length of time was taken for obtaining the revised Plan and Estimates. Specific



instances will be later shown in Chapter-5. Thereafter, it took between 1 week to 1 month's time for the Block Offices to complete this job of scrutiny as per information given by the sample Blocks. No work order was issued to those projects where approved Plan & Estimates were not existing.

Preparation of Plan and Estimate in West Garo Hills:

3.11. In contrast to what was practised in East Khasi Hills, the selected C.R.D.Blocks in West Garo Hills District, informed that except in few cases, where the Plan and Estimates were available, the latter (P&E) was prepared by the Technical Staff of the Block who would then get the same approved by competent authorities. The question of revising the Plan and Estimate or contribution of own resource for the excess amount did not arise, as also, the question of delaying in procuring the modified Plan and Estimate was solved. In case of Tura Municipal Board, it was not quite clear whether Revised Plan and Estimate was required because even when the sanctioned amount was short of the Estimated Amount, the work allotment order was still issued. Hence execution was carried out, and it appears the payment be made basing on the actual quantum of work done. According to the T.M.B. officers, time required for processing the matter was not more than a week. It would appear that there was a blatant violation of the standing guidelines regarding preparation of plans and estimates.

## CHAPTER - IV

EXTENT OF ACHIEVEMENT:

Progress:

4.1. East Khasi Hills:

Although Funds for MPLAD Schemes do not lapse, yet the study would like it to highlight progress made on a year-wise basis in the execution the MPLAD works for 1994-95 and 1995-96 Schemes. It however, appears that information in this manner was not readily available. In case of East Khasi Hills District we got, first of all the position of progress made as on 31.7.96 and subsequently as on 30.6.97. Accordingly, it is fitting to compare the progress achieved in a year's gap of time. The District East Khasi Hills supplied data separately for 1994-95 and 1995-96 Scheme separately. Thus, as per Table No4.1., it was observable that out of 162 numbers of schemes sanctioned for 1994-95, 101 (62.34 P.c.) were completed as on 31.7.96 and the nos. rose to 108 (66.67 P.c.) as on 30.6.97 giving rise an increase of 7 numbers of 4.32 P.c. for 11 month's space of time. This showed that as on 30.6.97, there was a back-log of 54 nos or 33.33 P.c. 1994-95 MP Schemes. The Table further shows that of the 73 MPLAD works approved by Shri G.G.Swell for 1994-95, 54 nos (74.0 P.c.) were completed as on 30.6.97, of 62 nos recommended by P.G.Marbaniang, 42 (67.74 P.c.) got completed as on 30.6.97 followed by those of B. B. Dutta MP(RS)'s 27 nos. schemes out of which 12 nos. (or 44.44 P.c.) could be completed as on 30.6.97.

4.2. In regard to the year 1995-96, there were 101 numbers of schemes in all, recommended by the two MPs namely G.G.Swell (RS) 48 nos. and P.G.Marbaniang (LS) 53 nos. The progress was that by 31.7.96, only 18 nos. (17.82 P.c.) were completed and 29 nos. (28.71 P.c.) by 30.6.97 giving thus an additional member of 11 nos completed during a year. The back log of MPLAD Works for 1995-96 thus stood at 72 (71.28 P.c.) as on 30.6.97.

TABLE NO. 4.1.

STATEMENT SHOWING THE NUMBERS OF MPLAD WORKS COMPLETED AS ON 31.7.96 AND 30.6.97 FOR E.K. HILLS ONLY  
SOURCE: D.C.'S OFFICE, SHILLONG

MP NAME	Schemes for 1994-95			Schemes for 1995-96		
	Tot. Nos	Completed as on		Tot. Nos	Completed as on	
		31.7.96	31.6.97		31.7.96	31.6.97
G.G. Swell (RS)	73	50	54	48	9	15
P.G. Marbaniang (LS)	62	40	42	53	9	14
B.B. Dutta (RS)	27	11	12			
TOTAL	162	101	108	101	18	29

#### West Garo Hills District:

4.3. As per List furnished by the District, it appears that all the MPLAD Schemes for 1994-95 and 1995-96 were under the recommendation of one MP(LS) Shri P.A. Sangma. The List tagged together both the 1994-95 and the 1995-96 Schemes being in the same Lok Sabha the 10th in series. They were altogether 73 in number. Accordingly, it might even include those of 1993-94 Schemes of which the study did not cover. Therefore one cannot view separately the respective progress made in the execution of the works for the year of 1994-95 and that of 1995-96. Thus, as per combined List received on 7.5.97 at D.C.'s Office, Tura, the completed MPLAD works were shown to be 57 in number. In the subsequent revised List submitted to the P.I.D. (State), 2(two) of these 57 completed Schemes were noted as being uncompleted, reducing a such, the previously given figure dt. 4th June'97 of 57 to 55. In the said latest List, the number of completed Schemes stood at 63 adding thus 8 nos more of works completed. So by June'97 there remained 10 nos or 13.7 P.c. Schemes yet to be completed.

#### At Block Level : 1994-95:

4.4. The year-wise numbers of completion the MPLAD Schemes sanctioned during 1994-95 & 1995-96 by each of the sample C.R.D. Blocks and by the Tura Municipal Board (TMB) were incorporated in Table No. 4.2. It was heartening to find that both Pynursla in East Khasi and Zikzak Development Block in West Garo Hills, had been able to complete the execution of all their respective MPLAD works sanctioned during 1994-95 as in 1996-97. That is all the 9 sanctioned Schemes, for 1994-95, in respect of Pynursla Development Block were stated to have been completed with 8 nos. during 1995-96 and 1(one) number during 1996-97, that is, within two working seasons as suggested at para 2.2 of the original guideline. Within this same span of time, Zikzak Development Block too completed 5 nos of MPLAD

works in 1995-96 and subsequently 2 nos in the following year leaving thus no back-log for 1994-95 Schemes. A note of caution may, however, be raised here when according to the Statement containing this particular information, one MPLAD Scheme viz. A.R. college was also included. Such completion might refer to its first phase or on its financial aspect, but till the time of field visit, the project had not been, as then, able to become serviceable to the students. The work was on progress. Rongram Development Block too was not far behind when out of 7 nos of 1994-95 Schemes, 5 nos were shown to have been completed during 1995-96 and 1 no in May '97 (1997-98). So only 1 no was left unfinished. Being assigned with 1 (one) Scheme only during 1995-96, the TMB could also complete it during 1995-96, that is, one year more or less after sanctioning order. In case of Mawphlang Development Block, it is shown that out of a total 10 nos of Schemes sanctioned for the year 1994-95, the year-wise nos of completion stood respectively, 1, 4 and 2 in 1994-95, 1995-96 and 1996-97, leaving thus 3 nos yet to be completed. Mawsynram with just 10 nos or (43.47 P.c.) only were complete out of a total of 23 Schemes, appears to be at the lowest in the rate of achievement. The B.D.O. of Mawryngkneng while himself gave no figures in the Return about this particular information, yet from the List of Schemes completed as submitted by the D.C. East Khasi Hills to the Govt. of India, it showed that 15 nos (83.33%) of the 18 nos of sanctioned Schemes were completed as on 30.6.97 (1997-98).

4.5. The Myllem Development Block the area of which is conterminous to that of Greater Shillong comprising 9 (nine) L.A. Constituencies and part of villages under Sohryngkham Nongkrem and Mawphlang Constituencies, had got the maximum number of MPLAD Works sanctioned during 1994-95 i.e. 70 nos which was equal to 53.85 % of the total 130 nos of all the 5 selected Blocks in East Khasi Hills or 48.28 % of the total number (145) of all the sample projects. Of the 70 nos of 5 schemes sanctioned, 5 nos were completed during 1994-95 itself while 10 nos during 1995-96 and the highest 33 nos during 1996-97. The Aggregate number touched the level of 48 nos accounting to 68.57% of the total nos of the sanctioned MPLAD Works for 1994-95.

4.6. Based therefore on the figures as furnished by the 5 (five) sample projects in East Khasi Hills and the one obtained from the D.C.'s document the study found that there had been altogether 89 nos or 68.46% of the total 130 nos sanctioned. As against this rate of achievement, West Garo Hills, in so far the 3 sample projects were concerned, was found to have surpassed its counterpart (East Khasi Hills) by having been able to complete as many as 14 nos (93.33%) of the total 15 nos of Schemes sanctioned for the year 1994-95.

1995-96:

4.7. Figures pertaining to 1995-96, at Table No. 4.2. showed that in the 5 (five) sample C.R.D. Blocks in East Khasi Hills, the total number of sanctioned schemes stood at 91 of which 49 nos (53.85 P.c.) were

reported to have been completed as in June '97. Here also Myllem Block had a lion share with 62 nos in all and of which 35 nos (56.45 P.c.) of them had been completed as in 1996-97. The year-wise break-up were 6 nos during 1995-96 and 29 nos during 1996-97. Next to Myllem in the number of Schemes, we have Mawphlang with 11 nos of Schemes, sanctioned for 1995-96. Indicating the dates of sanctioning orders for the MPLAD Works of 1995-96, the Myllem Development Block spelled out them (dates) to be ranging between 6.12.95 to 31.3.96. Since 35 nos of the works were completed upto 1996-97, it signified that the execution period extended just for one year or so at least for the said 35 nos of complete works. The same Table No.4.2. demonstrates that 8 nos (47.06 P.c.) of the total 17 nos of the 1995-96 MPLAD Schemes under the three sample Projects in West Garo Hills were completed as on 1996-97. Thus, with regard to achievement in respect of 1995-96 Schemes, East Khasi Hills out did its counterpart by being able to secure 53.85 P.c. as against 47.06 P.c. by West Garo Hills.

Reported to have been completed as in June'97. Here also Myllem Block had a lion share with 62 nos in all and of which 35 nos(56.45 P.c) them had been completed as in 1996-97. The year-wise break-up were 6 nos during 1995-96 and 29 nos during 1996-97. Next to Myllem in the number of Schemes, we have Mawphlang with 11nos of Schemes, sanctioned for 1995-96. Indicating the dates of sanctioning orders for the MPLAD Works of 1995-96, the Myllem Development Block spelled out them (dates) to be ranging between 6.12.95 to 31.3.96. Since 35 nos of the works were completed upto 1996-97, it signified that the execution period extended just for one year or so at least for the said 35 nos of completed works. The same Table No.4.2 demonstrates that 8 nos (47.06.P.c.)of the total 17 nos of the 1995-96MPLAD Schemes under the three sample Projects in West Garo Hills were completed as on 1996-97. Thus, with regard to achievement in respect of 1995-96 Schemes, East Khasi Hills out did its counterpart by being able to secure 53.85 P.c. as against 47.06 P.c. by West Garo Hills.

**TABLE NO. 4.2.**

NOS OF 1994-95 AND 1995-96 MPLAD WORKS SANCTIONED AND COMPLETED IN RESPECT OF THE SAMPLE C.R.D. BLOCKS 7 TURA MUNICIPAL BOARD.

S l o	Name of CRD Block	1994-95 Schemes						1994-95 Schemes				Remarks	
		Nos san ctio ned	Nos completed during					No s san cti on ed	Nos completed during				
			94- 95	95- 96	96- 97	June 97	To tal		95-96	95-96	95- 96		T o t al
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		14
<u>East Khasi Hills</u>													*Figures obtained from DC documen t
1.Mawphlang		10	1	4	2	-	7	11	3	4	-	7	
2.Mawsynram		23	3	7	-	-	10	4	nil	nil	-	-	
3.Myllem		70	5	10	33	-	48	62	6	29	-	35	
4. Pynurshi		9	-	8	1	-	9	7	-	3	-	3	
5 Mawryngkheng		19	-	-	-	15*	15	7	-	-	4*	4*	
Total		130	9	29	36	15	89	91	9	36	4	8	
<u>West Garo Hills</u>													
1. Rongram		7	-	5	-	1	6	7	-	3	-	3	
2. Zikzak		7	-	5	2	-	7	6	-	3	-	3	
3. Tura Municipal Board		1	-	1	-	-	1	4	-	2	-	2	
Total		15	-	11	2	1	14	17	-	8	-	8	

### Samples Selected:

4.8. As hinted earlier, samples were selected only from among the incomplete MPLAD works as found from the Sampling frame supplied by the PID. From Table No.4.3, it is found that from a total 42 nos of samples (i.e. inclusive of the 2 samples, information for which were gathered from beneficiaries' relatives as well as from the concerned departmental implementing Agencies) 19 nos of them related to 1994-95 year of sanction while 23 belonged to 1995-96. Of these 42 samples, shown earlier as being incomplete, it was found during on-the-spot inspection, 15 of them (i.e. 33.71 P.c.) of them had been either fully or almost completed. This, of course, included one sample, for which site verification could not be materialised due to time constraint and its location which is away from our Tura Camp. Now, of these 15 completed MPLAD Works 10 (52.63 P.c.) belonged to 19 samples of 1994-95 year of sanction, what the study would like to stress was that some nos of Schemes were still treated as being incomplete due to communication gap of the periodical position existed at the grass-root level. The Block-wise position of the complete and incomplete nos of selected MPLAD works can be seen at Table No.4.3, while the actual position of each work as could be observed from layman's point of view during field study has been detailed at the Annexure II.

TABLE NO. 4.3

		Schemes of 1994-95 & 95-96						Remarks
Sl no	Name of block E.K. HILLS	Nos selected	Nos actually selected & completed during					
			94-95s	94-95c	95-96s	95-96c	C/total	
1	Mawplang	2	1	1	1	-	1	
2	Mawsynram	5	4	1	1	-	1	
3	Mylliem	16	6	5	10	3	8	
4	Pynursla	4	-	-	4	-		
5	Mawrykneng	5	4	1	1	1	2	
	TOTAL	32	15	8	17	4	12	
W.G. HILLS								
1	Rongram	4	2	1	2		1	
2	Zikzak	4	2	1	2		1	
3	Tura Mun Board	2			2	1	1	
	TOTAL:	10	4	2	6		3	

Financial:

4.9. The total amount sanctioned for 1994-95 Schemes accumulated to Rs.223.82 lakhs in East Khasi Hills, of which Rs.177.72 lakhs or 79.40 P.c. was spent up to 31.7.96. Sanctioned amount for 1995-96, accounted to Rs.98.46 lakhs in the same District and the amount utilised as on 31.7.96 totalled to Rs.52.81 lakhs 53.64 P.c. The utilised amount covered those Schemes which were not yet completed but the execution works are going on. So the amount presented in the Table 4.4. did not tally with the figures shown in the D.C.(EKH)'s letter dt.8.8.97 representing only the List of Schemes which had been virtually completed, and on which basis, the study is making use of in giving the latest figures of completion under the MPLAD Schemes for 1994-95 & 1995-96. As regards the position in West Garo Hills, information received related to the entire period of the 10th Lok Sabha and the figures indicated the expenditure reached the level of Rs.86.69 lakhs as against the sanctioned amount of Rs.100.00 lakhs (or 86.69 P.c.)

TABLE NO. 4.4.

STATEMENT SHOWING THE AMOUNT SANCTIONED AND UTILIZED IN  
RESPECT OF THE MPLAD SCHEMES, EAST KHASI HILLS.

MP	MPLAD Schemes			
	1994-95 (Amount Rs. In Lakhs)		1995-96 (Amount Rs. In Lakhs)	
	Sanctioned	Utilized as on 31.7.96	Sanctioned	Utilized as on 31.7.96
P.G. Marbaniang	45.75	37.84	59.27	30.01
G.G. Swell	100.00	82.21	39.19	22.80
B.B. Dutta	78.07	57.67	-	-
TOTAL	223.82	177.72	98.46	52.81

## WEST GARO HILLS

MP	MPLAD Schemes			
	1994-95 (Amount Rs. In Lakhs)		1995-96 (Amount Rs. In Lakhs)	
	Sanctioned	Utilized as on 31.7.96	Sanctioned	Utilized as on 31.7.96
P.A. Sangma	100.00	86.69	(as per statement dt.25.4.97)	

At Block Level :



4.10. In the originally designed schedule, it was intended to show a year-wise amount of expenditure disbursed by each selected C.R.D. Block against a total amount of sanctioned. Many of the samples could not, however, convey the figures as desired. Wherever such information was available (i.e. a year-wise rate of progress), the same was embodied in the Table No.4.5. which exhibits that out of a total sanctioned amount of Rs.195.71 lakhs in the 5 C.R.D. Blocks (samples) in East Khasi Hills, the amount disbursed upto 1996-97 accounted to Rs.167.91 lakhs or 85.80 P.c. and of which Rs.41.68 lakhs (21.30 P.c.) was incurred in 1994-95 itself followed by Rs.64.67 lakhs (33.04 P.c.) in 1995-96 and by another Rs.61.56 lakhs (31.45 P.c.) in 1996-97. As already mentioned, Mylliem Development Block, in view of the area and population it contains, was found to have the largest share of sanctioned amount viz. Rs.143.16 lakhs constituting 73.15 P.c. of the total sanctioned amount mentioned above. The three selected projects-2 C.R.D. Blocks and a Tura Municipal Board in West Garo Hills had however a sanctioned amount for 1994-95 MPLAD Schemes totalled to Rs.13.20 lakhs and the percentage of achievement financially turned upto 92.45 P.c. when an amount disbursed as in 1996-97 reached the level of Rs.12.60 lakhs. Thus, added together the total sanctioned amount in all the 8 selected sample projects for the 1994-95 MPLAD Schemes totalled to Rs.208.91 lakhs of which expenditure incurred as in 1996-97 amounted to Rs.180.51 lakhs or 86.40 P.c.

4.11. With regard to achievement in respect of 1995-96 schemes, the Table No.4.5. indicated that a sum of Rs.76.04 lakhs or 85.24 P.c. was disbursed as in 1996-97 out of the accumulated sanctioning amount of Rs.89.20 lakhs for by the 5 sample C.R.D. Blocks in East Khasi Hills comparatively speaking there occurred a considerable decline in the sanctioned amount by 54.42 P.c. in 1995-96 i.e. from Rs.195.71 lakhs in 1995-96 to Rs.89.20 lakhs in 1994-95 in so far as these sample C.R.D. Blocks were concerned. This signified that the scheme had been spread in other Blocks as well. The Table further displays a year-wise amount of disbursement during 1995-96 to 1996-97, was Rs.30.02 lakhs and Rs.46.02 lakhs respectively. In respect of the 1995-96 MPLAD Schemes, in the 3 sample projects in West Garo Hills, there had been a significant rate of short-fall in Expenditure, as in 1996-97, when compared to rate of attainment made collectively by those (sample) of East Khasi Hills, as out of Rs.26.27 lakhs, the disbursed expenditure incurred as in 1996-97 stood just at Rs.11.95 lakhs which was equivalent to 45.49 P.c. as against 85.24 P.c. by those of East Khasi Hills. The reason was that the Rongram Development Block which represented the highest portion of the sanctioned amount (Rs.17.00 lakhs) could not execute the approved works timely due to certain hindrances. Taken together the amount sanctioned for the MPLAD Schemes during 1995-96 under the 8 sample Projects totalled to Rs.115.47 lakhs and of which Rs.87.99 lakhs or 76.20 P.c. had been spent as in 1996-97.

TABLE 4.5

THE SANCTIONED AMOUNT FOR 1994-95, 1995-96 MPLAD SCHEMES  
AND THE DISBURSED AMOUNT DURING 1994-95, 1996-97 UNDER THE  
SAMPLE C.R.D.BLOCKS AND TURA MUNICIPAL BOARD.

Sl. No.	Name of C.R.D Blocks	1994-95 Schemes					1995-96 Schemes			
		Sanctioned amount	Amount Disbursed as in (Rs. In lakhs)				Sanctioned amount	Amount Disbursed as in (Rs. In lakhs)		
			1994-95	1994-95	1994-95	Total		1995-96	1996-97	Total
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1	Mawphlang	9.44	-	3.37	0.50	3.87	2.11	1.00	0.10	1.10
2	Mawsynram	12.40	-	5.19	4.90	10.09	1.75	-	1.30	1.30
3	Myllem	143.16	41.68	42.29	24.24	126.21	73.49	28.77	35.83	64.60
4	Pynursia	15.61	-	13.82	1.18	15.00	8.35	0.25	5.84	6.09
5	Mawryngkneng	15.61	-	N.A	12.74	12.74*	3.50	-	2.95*	2.95*
	Total East Khasi	195.71	41.68	64.67	61.56	167.91	89.20	30.02	46.02	76.04
6	Rongram	5.20	-	-	-	4.60	17.00	-	5.12	5.12
7	Zikzak	6.00	-	-	-	6.00	3.90	-	3.15	3.15
8	Tura Municipal Board	2.00	-	-	-	2.00	5.37	-	3.68	3.68
	Total West Garo	13.20	-	-	-	12.60	26.27	-	11.95	11.95
	Grand Total :	208.91				180.51	115.47			87.99

Sources : Sample Projects

\*D.C. East Khasi Hills.

Note: In the next Report, it is contemplated to throw some light on the extent of time taken in the construction works of the sample MPLAD Works and the position of each as on the date of visit.

**BOTTLENECKS:**

5.1. With all the limitations that the study was facing (as indicated at para 1.12) this Report could not highlight all the impediments faced by different agencies in the execution of the different MPLAD Works sanctioned during 1994-95 and 1995-96. Some of them were, however cited in the succeeding paragraphs and the extent how each of these factors was responsible in lingering the implementation of the concerned projects.

**Instalments and Release of fund :**

5.2. Like any other development scheme, it is the duty of the implementing authorities to ensure, by adopting appropriate measures, that the fund released for any development project should be properly utilised and not misappropriated or misused. One of such measures has been to restrict the flow of fund to an immediate implementing agency by releasing the sanctioned amount on instalments basis. In the implementation of this scheme, from the District down to Block Level, this procedure was practised with a view to monitoring the proper flow of fund. From the District Level, it transpired that the release of fund for any project was done into two Instalments. At the Block Level, the variance was between 2 to 4 instalments. Four of the respondents categorically stated it to be in 2 instalments. In West Garo Hills, this frequency seemed to be in operation with no alteration and actually of these 4 respondents who gave this statement 3 of them were of W. Garo Hills District. The other Sample belonging to East Khasi Hills, though they stated it to be of 2 instalments yet in practice, as supported by one beneficiary sample, it was found that they released the sanctioned amount into 3(three). Hence it could be concluded that there was no set procedure for release of funds. Considering the comparative success of the execution of the scheme in West Garo Hills, where the funds were released without much delay it could be surmised that the frequency in the release of fund may have some influence in the timely completion of the scheme. However, with regard to the quality aspect, nothing could be concluded.

**Pre-conditions:**

5.3.(a) Plan and Estimate : For the release of First instalment the approved Plan and Estimate (detailed) in consonance to the sanctioned amount was of paramount importance and the absence of which entailed the non-execution of our two selected sample project viz. (i) Renovation of Ingsad Syiem Smit' and (ii) Renovation of Smit Market both sanctioned during 1994-95. The Syiem of Khyrim showed the Plan and Estimate prepared by one Architect under M/s. G. Diengdoh, Builders Civil Contractors-Engineers but the same were not acceptable to the concerned Block Office. On their part too, they refused to come to the help of the beneficiaries on the plea that it was the latter's sole concern nor send any official communication specifying the defects of the (P & S) and the suggested measures despite of the fact that the particular beneficiary they were dealing was no less than that the Institutional Head duly recognised by the Governments. As stated earlier,

even the re-casted Plan and Estimate(P&E) need to be re-approved by the competent authorities. In this way, the poor villagers had to run hither and thither for the proper P&E. Preparation/revising the P&E was one thing but getting the countersignature of the concerned authorities was another side of the coin. This particular condition was also insisted by the DRDA, East Khasi Hills district. In West Garo Hills District this problem did not arise, at all, because the Block Officials took the responsibility of preparation and getting the countersignature of the P&E. At the same time, they preferred to prepare the P&E only after getting the actual sanctioned amount.

(b) U.C 's, Voucher receipts, Muster Rolls.

5.4. For the subsequent instalments, the beneficiaries were to submit bundles of required documents like U.Cs. of the earlier instalment(s), Voucher receipts for the procurement of materials plus Muster Rolls for Labourers employed based on the all-India accepted minimum rate of wages. Submission of P A Rs. Is no doubt, very legitimate so as to prove the quantum of materials procured and utilised in the project in the right proportion. But as to the preparation of Muster Rolls at the all-India minimum rate of wages Rs.45/- for a skilled and Rs.35/- for an unskilled labour when the actual local rate was more than double of these minimum rates it certainly posed a big problem, time-consuming and lots of adjustments. This problem became more complicated and troublesome when the cost of projects was in lakhs of rupees. Here in our state, particularly Khasi and Jaintia, the cost of living is very high, so also the daily rate of wages, when compared to places in other states. It took one's energy and time. This problem was raised by one of our sample beneficiaries. So the delay in preparation and submission of such Muster-Rolls entailed a delay also in getting the subsequent instalments released. In instance, it was stated that even for the utilisation of the first instalment would have to be verified not only by the Subordinate Engineer but even by the B.D.O. and the Executive Engineer of the C.R. D. Department. In contrast to this practice, what was done in West Garo Hills, was to be satisfied that 50% of the work was done in order to get the release of the 2nd instalment. Notwithstanding of this fact some of the respondents in West Garo Hills, did however, opine of lack of promptness in releasing the second instalment by the District authorities.

(c) Beneficiaries' plight :

5.5. In course of schedule canvassing, some of the beneficiaries did relate their plight in that they had to report for many times to the Block Office in order to get the release of any particular instalment. They even specified the frequencies they visited the Block Office. They maintained that this procedure resulted not only in loss of working days and travelling expenses but also frustration and unnecessary delaying in the execution of the project. To clarify this point, we contacted the concerned B.D.O. whom we met in his office two times consecutively while conducting the field visits. He (B.D.O.) related also his own problem particularly the cashier and another staff too. Besides, the local State Bank of India had a limitation for cash holding. So he could not issue check on the same day beyond the authorised capacity of the Bank. As for another B.D.O. we could not get any clarification as he was out of station

(d)Supervision :

5.6. In some of our beneficiary samples, we did perceive the enthusiasm on the part of the local executing agency and the local people through observing and assessing the quantum of work executed, which according to their statement that besides procuring a land for football ground out of their own source of about 2 acres had also incurred expenditure through the voluntary labour by the entire villagers amounting to Rs.25,000/-or so. Their labour consisted in land levelling, masonry works etc. As against this they had been given since 21.4.95 with just Rs.26,000/-out a total sanctioned amount of Rs.65,000/-for 1994-95 scheme. When asked of the delay they said that the Office insisted on the feed-back from the concerned Gramsevak whom they reported that he never visited the project. On a nearby village a project "Ground for Dance Festival" of same sanctioned amount met with a same fate. Here also, the concerned B.D.O. expressed

his helplessness as most of his Gram Sevaks had been neither on transfer or on training. That is why, at Table No.3.2.,the strength of Gram Sevaks was shown just 1(one).But the particular Gramsevak in charge of the selected samples was, however, reported to be in position.

Lack of mutual understanding :

5.7. One of the common impediments, as narrated by three of our sample projects in East Khasi Hills related to misunderstanding among members of local committees, the implementing agencies at the grassroots level. In one C.R.D.Block, we had two samples, the execution of which was delayed due to such circumstances. One of these samples, thanks to the present B.D.O's wit and pragmatic approach which could pacify the tension prevailing between one locality, a beneficiary of MPLAD work "Improvement of Footpath" -on the one hand and the Local Village as a whole on the other hand. The work after being suspended was however, resumed sometimes in July'96 and by the time of inspection (13.5.97) the same was found nearing completion. Another sample in the same Block(Mawsynram)viz. Community Hall, which, as a matter, it was just an extension of the existing one. The construction work was unduly prolonged due to previous Headman's objectionable behaviour. Similarly, under Mawphlang Development Block, it was shown there were as many as 3 1994-95 schemes remaining pending due to local disputes. One MPLAD Work was also indicated for the delay of the work due to this very reason. At Mahendraganj, a sanctioned scheme (1995-96)for improvement of the local Market place through land reclamation by filling up the existing ponds located therein, but due to refusal of some shop owners to vacate from their respective grocery shops,(ordinary ones)the work could not be implemented.

5.8. Being a Case Study, we did desire it to be as detailed as by getting specific cause(s) from the sample C.R.D. Blocks against such pending MPLAD Work. But only few of them did come forward with this particular information. When insisted for this information from one B.D.O's office,

because a remark was simply made thus "Beneficiaries delay for spelling out the actual causes, it was regrettable to be informed that the beneficiaries did not reportedly divulge to them of the real causes.

Site Selection/Settlement for the Project :

5.9. Some of the sample MPLAD Works were found to be lying in suspense due to pending settlement of site for the installation of the Project. As stated earlier, the "100-Drum Wangala Dance R.C.C. Building in West Garo Hills", carrying a sanctioned amount of Rs.10.00 lakhs could not be executed in the right earnest as the decision for site selection was lingering among the concerned parties for almost one year's span of time. The work could be started only sometimes in the early part of this year. Situation similar to this did also happen in respect two samples in East Khasi Hills. The Durban-cum-Office for Mawphlang Lyngdohship (Rs.85,000/-),1994-95,could not be implemented till the time of visit,(May'97)as the implementing authority was awaiting the materialisation of Deed of Agreement with P.W.D. for an exchange of plots of land between the local Hima and the P.W.D. The same thing happened with one sample (1995-96).Under Pynursla Dev. Block. They were waiting a clearance from the P.W.D. for improvement of their Foot-ball playground.

Torrential Rain :

5.10. Being the rainiest place in the globe, dislocation of the construction work in the State particularly like Drains, R.C.C. Buildings etc., could not be ruled out. Many of our samples did attribute this factor as one of the hindrance for the speedy execution of the construction works since most of the work orders were received immediately prior to the on-set of monsoon.

Technical Problem :

5.11. It was purely an unforeseen incident when according to original estimate the depth for drilling of 4,1/2" Bore well Installation and Hand Pump was of 150 ft. depth but on digging it was found that water could be available only at the depth of 270 ft. deep. So the sanctioned amount exhausted only at the drilling stage. Further at this depth, hand pump would not be feasible. It will have to be operated through an electric Pump.

Exceptional Cases :

5.12. This took place in one of our sample MPLAD Works, namely, "A.R.College Building" Mahendraganj, when the procured materials stored at site were looted, at the dead of night by a group of miscreants with lethal weapons from across the International Border with Bangladesh after manhandling the engaged chowkidar. In this way, the construction work had to be stailed for some months. But strong will and determination of the college authorities could not be dampened or deterred by such criminal acts. Instead, a modified Plan of Building was found erected speedily. It was hoped, that within this year some of the students, if not all, can be easily accommodated within the Building.

Staff Shortage :

(a) Block Level :

5.13. As already referred to earlier, 3 of the 8 samples indicated an inadequacy of staff-technical as well as clerical and typist staff particular did adversely affect the effective and smooth implementation of the scheme. Additional staff were required to ensure effective supervision of the execution of the work and importing of technical advice to the implementing authorities at the village level

(b) District Level :

5.14. The Deputy Commissioner of East Khasi Hills did specifically mention of his requirement a separate typist cum-Computer Operator for assisting the existing staff who are engaging in scrutiny the submitted approved MPLAD Works and other processing matters besides their normal duties. This pressure of work was easily perceivable by us while visiting the dealing staff. East Khasi Hills being the largest District in terms of population, had the maximum number of MPLAD Scheme for all the years. The West Garo Hills District was silent on this issue. Even then, perhaps, additional staff is necessary.

Monitoring :

5.15. The Guide-line provides regular monitoring to know the periodical Progress of the execution of the Schemes in question. But how this was enforced at the District Level it was not clear, although the questionnaire for this study did touch this very standpoint. At the State Level, they did however insist on the District Collectors to submit Progress Report for every two months as provided in the Guide-line. But the response was discouraging, they said. Perhaps, the heavy pre-occupation of the existing strength of staff may be one of the causes of their inability to comply with this requirement.

## CHAPTER VI

### REMEDIAL MEASURES & CONCLUSION :

6.1. To the extent that the Study could cope with, certain handicaps have been highlighted in the fore-going Chapter. To that extent also, the study may offer certain suggestions towards alleviating these bottlenecks hampering the expeditious implementation of the MPLAD Scheme in the State.

No of instalments for the release of Fund :

6.2. In case, the release of fund in two instalments was not considered advisable by the Block/District Authorities due to quantum of the sanctioned amount for any particular project or unreliability on the part of the local implementing Agencies, measures may have to be evolved so that not more than three instalments of the total sanctioned amount be split and released.

Plan and Estimate :

6.3. One of the great stumbling Blocks for an early execution of the scheme, as already pointed outlay on the non availability, defects of the Plan and Estimate. In this connection, the Study found that the practice adopted by the West Garo Hills District where the Plan and Estimate was to be formulated by the Block Junior Engineers and get the same approved by the concerned authorities is an ideal solution to this particular impediment. That



is, where-ever these documents (P & E) cannot be procured by the concerned beneficiaries, it will be the responsibility of the Block or any project office to see to it, even at the initial stage. In case, revision of the attached P&E is required, it is suggested that instead of troubling the poor villagers in recasting the same, the Project office may look into it in consultation with the concerned beneficiaries.

Enhancement of the Sanctioning Power of the  
Executive Engineer (C.D.) :

6.4. Here also, instead of running for countersignature of the Plan and Estimate by the competent technical Officers of the Construction Departments the sanctioning power of the Executive Engineers posted under C.R.Deptt. may be enhanced, from the present Rs.1.00 lakh to say Rs.5.00 lakhs for this purpose, as a special case.

Actual Measurement :

6.5. Few MPLAD Schemes, were found implemented by some other Government Agencies like MeSEB, P.W.D., P.H.E. other than the C.R.D.Deptt. So it is not known whether they did the works on a Muster Roll basis or on an actual measurement. On the part of the Study, it would prefer an actual measurement to Muster Roll, as most of sanctioned MPLAD Works involved a handsome amount of an outlay. Besides, the Scheme's primary objective is to meet durable the local need of the people by creating the people's desired durable assets rather than taking weightage on employment generation like JRT etc. Schemes. This would, it is felt, accelerate the progress of the Execution of the various sanctioned MPLAD Works to a great extent.

Time Schedule :

6.6. Instead of making the beneficiaries from far distance to come and enquire, time and again, about their Project from the Block Offices, it would perhaps be better if a time-schedule for different schemes including of course, the MPLAD Scheme, be framed and followed accordingly for meeting beneficiaries requirement by the Block Officials and vice versa. That is, dates be fixed for different circles to visit the Block Offices. These dates be communicated to them through the respective Gramsevak, who, at the same time, should instruct them regarding documents or things to be made ready by them for submission to the Block Office.

Departmental versus local committee's implementation  
of the schemes :

6.7. The study would advocate flexibility on this issue, i.e., depending upon the nature, location, the quantum of the sanctioning amount of the Projects. In other words, those schemes involving special skill which is considered lacking at the place of its location, and these bearing a sanctioned amount of more than 5 lakhs in urban areas, and more than 2 lakhs in rural areas, be executed departmentally but with active participation of the local Committee. The rest be handed over to the local committee in order to instil a spirit of owning the Projects as theirs.



Local disputes :

6.8. Where-ever a sort of dissent prevailing among the local Committee Members or strife between the Local Committee and the local resident(s), leading to the inability to start with or to the stalling of the construction works, such incidents be brought immediately to the notice of the District authorities, who, if necessary may contact the concerned MP for his assistance in settling thing amicably.

Working Season :

6.9. If possible, it is desirable that work orders be issued to the beneficiaries sometimes in the months of September and October so that the execution of the Project could be started in these months themselves, i.e. at the end of the monsoon season and continue to the onset of the same. This of course, requires the co-operation on the part of MPs, also.

Avoidance of revision the P&E :

6.10. It was suggested in some quarters by our sample projects that in order to avoid the trouble of re-casting the Plan and Estimate of any project, it is helpful to know the amount so recommended by the concerned M.P. before the preparation of the detailed Plan and Estimate. The same may also be achieved by splitting the already submitted approved Plan and Estimate in such away, that the sanctioned amount could be adjusted to a certain phase of the Project. In that case, no recasting of the P&E may be necessary.

Equipment of Staff :

6.11. Inspite of all sincerity on the part of the involved staff at any level, if the volume of works they have to cope with is beyond their human capacity, they cannot wheel the machinery satisfactorily and expeditiously. It is, therefore, highly desirable that additional staff particularly at District Level be equipped as suggested by the Deputy Commissioner East Khasi Hills. The expenses on the cost of such staff may be met by deduction, say 2% or so, out of the recommended amount for each Project. From the same deducted amount they may also meet the P.O.L. expenses by the District Offices and of the Block Level too. Similarly, expenses on contingencies can be met from this deduction. At Block level, the District authorities may have to decide and to see that Block offices are well equipped with efficient and sincere staff.

Gearing up the Supervisions :

6.12. It was evident from the finding of the Study that supervision at the grassroot level was far from satisfactory. It is no surprised that they didn't know the actual causes of delay of any project in their respective circle. It is, therefore, imperative to adopt measures forcing all the Gramsevaks to conduct as on the spot regular supervisions of the MPLAD Works and other Rural Schemes alike and not to take infomation from eleswhere.

Progress Report compliance with :

6.13. Perhaps with the induction of additional hand at the District and Block Level (wherever necessary) the Offices of the District collect may then be able to devote enough time towards preparing Progress Report for onward submission to the State P.I.D. From the extent of progress of works as found

by the study, we opine that once on six months, progress report is enough to highlight the progress so achieved

Year-wise categorisation of the schemes :

6.14. To pin-point the extent of the progress achieved it is considered helpful to indicate the year of sanction of each scheme in the Progress Report, instead of indicating the series of Log Sabha. By so doing, it will enable the authorities to know a back log if any, of pending schemes for a particular sanctioning year. That is, an emphasis would be those schemes sanctioned earlier should also be completed ahead of those sanctioned later.

Conclusion :

6.15. It is heartening to note that the MPLAD Scheme does really meet the local need of the people, though presently, it confines more in and around urban areas. A sign is however well visible that it is being progressively extended to Rural areas. In course of field visits, the local people expressed their appreciation of the scheme as it tends to satisfy the desirability of plan formulation at the grass-root level. It is expected that findings of the study conducted under severe constraints may throw enough light to the authorities of the prevailing bottlenecks standing in the way of expeditious execution of the MPLAD Schemes in the State. There is, also, every hope that humble suggestions offered above by the study may help a lot in improving the implementation of the scheme in future in the State of Meghalaya.

## CHAPTER VII

### SUMMARY OF FINDINGS:

#### OBJECTIVES:

7.1 The principal objectives of this case study have been as desired by the GOI, (i) to identify bottlenecks causing for delayed execution and completion of the MPLAD works in the State and (ii) to suggest remedial measures thereof.

Submission of Lists of recommended MPLAD works by MPs :

7.2. During 1994-95, the study found that the gap of time between the submission of the first and the second /last lists of recommended MPLAD works by the MPs ranged between 1 month to 1 year -2 months whereas in a1995-96, the variance was significantly reduced to few months' time i.e. between 3 to 4 months only. ( para 3.7 - 3.9)

Administrative approval

7.3. Followed from fact stated at 7.2 above, there occurred a time-lag between the first and the last sanctioning orders for different sets of recommended MPLAD works with the variation of the district

authorities lying between 3 month time in respect of 1995-96 schemes.

- 7.4. Based on data obtained from the sample CRD blocks and the Tura Municipal Board, it was found that some 1994-95 schemes got sanctioned as late as in 1996. Obviously, they could not accomplish the targeted period of 45 days, as anticipated in the Guide-lines (para 3.11)
- 7.5. Security at Block Level of the relevant papers enclosed along with applications took for 1 week to 1 month's time according to the sample projects (CRD Blocks & TMB), should the documents were found in order, otherwise, it would take a longer period of time (para 3.12)

Preparation of Plans & Estimates :

- 7.6 Except in few instances in West Garo Hills District, the Plan and Estimate for every approved MPLAD work was done by the Technical staff of the CRD Blocks and got the same (P&E) approved by the competent authorities. In East Khasi, however, the procurement of approved P&E was the sole responsibility of the concerned beneficiaries. As a result, this entailed a part of the latter (beneficial) and hence unnecessary delay in the execution of the approved works (para 3.13)

Progress achieved

E.Khasi Hills

- 7.6. The 1994-95 and 1995-96 MPLAD schemes were shown separately . Out of 162 Nos. of works sanctioned for 1994-95, 108(66.67 P.C) were completed as on 30.6.97 . As for the 101 Nos. of 1995-96 schemes only 29 (28.71 P.C) stood completed by 30.6.97 (paras 4.1 & 4.2) .

- 7.7. Progress achieved

E. Khasi Hills

The 1994-95 and 1995-96 MPLAD schemes were shown separately. Out of 162 nos. of works sanctioned for 1994-95, 108 (66.67 P.C) were completed as on 30.6.97. As for the 101 Nos. of 1995-96 schemes only 29 (28.71 P.C.) stood completed by 30.6.97 (paras 4.1 & 4.2)

W. Garo Hills

- 7.8. Combining all the 10<sup>th</sup> Lok Sabha MPLAD schemes into a single List irrespective of the years of their sanctioning, the District had altogether 73 MPLAD schemes of which 63 nos. were shown to have been completed as on June '96 (para 4.3)

- 7.9. Block Level

1994-95 MPLAD schemes.

The Pynursla Development Block in East Khasi Hills were able to complete the execution of all their respective schemes sanctioned for 1994-95 during 1996-97. The Tura Municipal Board too indicated to have completed its loan 1994-95 scheme during 1995-96. The rest had still a back-log ranging between 1 to 22 of the 1994-95 schemes (Paras 4.4-4.6)

1995-96 schemes

7.10 Out of 91 nos. of 1995-96 schemes sanctioned to the 5 sample CRD Blocks in E. Khasi, 49 nos. (or 53.85 P.C of them were completed as on June 97, whereas the 3 samples in W. Garo Hills 47.06 P.C. rate of achievement when out of 17 nos. of schemes sanctioned only 8 nos. of them were completed (para 4.7)

7.11 On the financial side, the study found that out of a total sanctioning amount of Rs.223.82 lakhs for the 1994-95 schemes in E.Khasi Hills, the amount spent up to 31.7.96 stood at Rs. 177.72 lakhs or 79.40 P.C. with regard to 1995-96, the expenditure incurred amounted to Rs. 52.91 lakhs or 53.64 P.C. as against a total sanctioned amount of Rs.98.46 lakhs on the same period (31.7.96). In West Garo Hills, the achievement rated at 86.69 P.C. or Rs. 86.69 lakh out of a sanctioned amount of Rs.100 lakhs for the entire 10<sup>th</sup> Lok Sabha MPLAD scheme. (Para 4.9)

7.12 Bottlenecks

The Bottle-necks, as found by the study included -

- (a) Instalments for the release of amount sanctioned extended up to 4 (four) series, at Block level in East Khasi Hills District.
- (b) Plans and Estimates (P&E): A lot of problems was found encountered by beneficiaries in East Khasi Hills in obtaining a proper Plan and Estimate for their MPLAD works and also in getting a recasted P&E whenever the sanctioned amount did not tally with the estimated amount originally arrived at.
- (c) Muster Rolls : The insisting of showing the quantum of works executed in form of Muster rolls based on the national rates of wages, instead of actual work measurement, resulted in giving rise another factor of delaying the execution of the work.
- (d) Local disputes : This included a.misunderstanding among the members of local committee, or between a part of the village and the locality where the scheme located etc.
- (e) Site selection : In some instances, though there had been no dispute at all, yet, it took un-necessarily a long time for the involved participa
- (f)
- (g) nts to finally decide the site for the installation of the MPLAD work.
- (h) Torrential rain : One of the common factors experienced by many sample beneficiaries in East Khasi Hills as most of the approved works were related to construction activities.
- (i) Technical Problem : Two instances were found :
  - (i) The raising of 4 " Bore Well Installation and Hand Pump
  - and (ii) Hanging Bridge when the execution of these schemes were delayed due to technical problems.
- (j) Exceptional case : The looting of the collected

reconstruction materials by the miscreants.

- (k) Shortage of staff : This condition was expressed right from the District (E.Khasi Hills) down to Block level.

7.10.

#### ANNEXURE-II

The position of the selected MPLAD works as could be observed during the Field visits performed during March '97 to 13.5.97 in connection with case study on MPLAD schemes.

- | Sl. | District  | Construction of Community Hall, R.R. Colony.  |
|-----|-----------|---|
| 1.  | E.K. Hill | Umpling (1994-95) sanctioned amount Rs.10.00 lakhs-completed-   |
| 2.  |           | Construction of C.C. Drain" at Lawjynriew, Nongthymmai (1995-96) for Rs. 1.00 lakhs. Torrential rain delayed the works for about 4 months. Two and three times tried to meet the Headman for site inspection but he was not free to take us to the site. He however asserted that the work was completed during March (meeting was on the first week of March '97). |
| 3.  | "         | Construction of the Third Floor of Eriben Presbyterian High School, Nongthymmai, Shillong (1995-96) for Rs.1.00 lakh during April 97.   |

4. " Construction of crech at Riatsamthaian Shillong (1994-95) Rs.2,26,507/- said to have been completed in August, '96. Nonavailability of cement for some months hindered the construction.
5. " Construction of sacred Heart M.E. School Building Lumparing (1995-96).Rs.1.50 lakh completed in December, 1996. Monsoon delayed the work.
6. " Construction of Creche at Madan Laban, Shillong (1994-95) for Rs.50,000/-. At the work time of inspection March '97, 75% was done. Torrential rain stopped the work for 3 months. Delay in receipt of the 2<sup>nd</sup> instalment of the sanctioned amount also caused another delay for 2 months.
7. " Construction of kitchen and septic tank for Hisam Hindel Mission (1994-95). Rs.1.50 lakh as 1<sup>st</sup> instalment drawn on 28.2.96, 2<sup>nd</sup> instalment on 23.4.97. Rain disturbed the work for one month.
8. " Construction of Budhabanu Saraswati College, Upper Mawprem (1994-95) Rs.1.50 lakhs. The first instalment was drawn on 26.10.96, but till the date of submission (30.4.97) of the filled in schedule, the 2<sup>nd</sup> instalment was yet to be received, although, the building was reported since April 1997 through borrowing from other college's fund.
9. " Reconstruction and repair of public drain from Jaiawpdeng up to Umkhrach River (1994-95). Sanctioned amount Rs. 5.00 lakh. Starting of the work had to be postponed from April to October '95 due to monsoon. Non-availability of cements too lingered the work for 5 weeks or so. By April '97 only 2% of work remained to be done.
10. " Widening of the existing footpath from Pata Main Road to Mawlai cemetry at Mawlaidatbaki (1995-96) for Rs.50,000/-. Completed in 18.1.97.
11. " Drilling of 4 Dia Borewell and installation of handpump, at Nongrimbah, Laitumkhrach, Shillong, sanctioned in 1994-95 for Rs. 50,000/-. Originally, the depth for drilling was anticipated to be of 150 ft. depth or 45.72 m but on drilling it was found that the water was available only at the depth of 270 ft. or 82.29m. The sanctioned amount was therefore exhausted for drilling works only. Besides, the 2<sup>nd</sup> instalment was withhold for want of relevant documents. The situation rendered it impossible for use of Hand-pump but of electric pump as opened by the beneficiaries. The scheme has therefore to be raised accordingly and implemented with additional financial assistance.

12. " Construction of Crech-cum-Community Hall at Malki, Shillong (1994-95) for Rs.8,16,685/-. Bottlenecks said to include (a) Torrential rain for about 5 months or so in a year.  
(b) Shortage of cement in the market caused for another 10 months delay in the execution of the work. The work could however be completed on 7.6.97 as per concerned BDOs completion Certificate.
13. " Construction of class-room and toilet for Laitumkhrah Sishu Vidyalaya, Shillong (1994-95).Rs. 50,000/-. The first instalment was shown to have been drawn in 15.4.95 when the actual work was started in 10.7.96 only. No reason as assigned for the delay. The work was however found to have been completed sometimes in July, '97.
14. " Indoor stadium- cum-Community Hall of Mission Compound Local Durbar, Shillong (1995-96) for Rs. 3.00 lakhs. 1<sup>st</sup> instalment drawn for Rs.1.50 lakhs on 13.8.96; 2<sup>nd</sup> instalment of Rs.60,000/- on 20.5.97. Position of work as seen be observed. Pillars and Tie-beams erected. No mentions made of the bottlenecks either in the Schedule-cum-questionnaires or through verbal enquiries.
15. " Football ground Umphyrnai Rngi, 1995-96 for Rs.1.20 lakh. Completed in August, 1996.
16. " "Indoor Stadium-Cum-Community Hall", Smit (1994-95). Rs. 5.00 lakhs. It was a big project. Hence though started as far back as on 14.4.95, but till the time of site inspection, the work was yet to be fully completed. Roofing R.C.C. walling completed but plastering yet to be finalised. Bottlenecks- (1) Delay in the release of the instalments - splitted into 7 parts- 1<sup>st</sup> on 4.4.95 and 7<sup>th</sup> on 28-11-96.(2) Not less than three times of visits for each instalment.  
(3) Torrential rain.  
(4) Now, the sanctioned amount was exhausted, they were approaching for additional amount to meet the shortage.
17. " Construction of "Little Flower L.P. School Mawmuthoh" of 1994-95 for Rs.1.25 lakh Work was found completed - started on November, '95 and completed in April '96, although the 2<sup>nd</sup> instalment was received on 11.10.96 only.
18. " "Renovation of Ingsad, Khyrim Syiemship, Smit" of 1994-95 scheme for Rs.2.00 lakh.  
Bottlenecks : The Block officials rejected the Plan and estimates submitted by the Beneficiary, who was the Syiem (the title for one of the traditional Chiefs of the District) of Khyrim Syiemship. Despite several meetings with the Block officials remained it

was reported, stand without any good gesture of helping the beneficiaries to tide over the hurdle. Hence, no instalment was released and no work could be started. The Syiem of Khyrim blamed the BDOs officials for their alleged non-co-operative spirit.

19. " "Renovation of Smit Market" of 1994-95 for Rs. 50,000/-. This MPLAD work met exactly the same fate as that of sl.18 above.
20. " "The construction of the office building of Mawphlang Lyngdohship (1994-95). Amount sanctioned for Rs.42,500/- on 17.6.96. The amount remained unutilised due to pending settlement of land for the site of the building. Site proposed belonged to PWD. It was reported to be nearing settlement through mutual exchange of land between the PWD and the beneficiary (Mawphlang Lyngdohship).
21. " "Improvement of Mawngap social and Cultural Club, Mawngap (1994-95)". Sanctioned for Rs. 1.00 lakh. Torrential rain stopped the work for 4 months. The work was completed on 27.2.97.
22. " "Community Hall for Nongtraï village "(1994-95 for Rs.40,000/-. Actually, it was just an extension of the existing building on the date of visit (13.5.97). Roofing (C.I. sheet) and beams constructed. Delay as could be perceived, was the mishandling of the work by the outgoing/deposed Headman.
23. " "Ground for Festival Dance at Umeit.(Mawsynram Dev.Block)(1994-95). Sanctioned amount Rs.65,000/-. 1<sup>st</sup> instalment released on 21.4.95, 2<sup>nd</sup> on 2.3.96 and third yet to be released - Item of works raised (i) Masonry walling (ii) Land levelling (iii) RCC steps (iv) RCC sheds - 2 storeyed- Progress very satisfactory.  
Bottleneck : Due to delay and non-release of the different instalments.
24. " "Football ground Mawlyngbna" 1994-95 for Rs. 65,000/- 1<sup>st</sup> instalment released since 21.4.95. Work started on 24.4.95. A significant amount public contribution both in form of financial and labour was well noticeable. How they procured a large area of land and earthworks and walling. They alleged of the in-ordinate delay by the Block offices in releasing the instalments. Their several visits to the Block office yielded no response nor they came to inspect themselves (Block officials) of the work.
25. "Footpath Dong Shiliang Mawsynram" 1994-95, for Rs.40,000/-. The work was delayed far more nearly 2 years due to local dispute. By the time of visit (13.5.97), it was however found nearing completion.



26. " "Footbridge at Nonglait Village" 1995-96 for Rs. 25,000/-. No work started so far except collection of few quantities of gravels. No instalment so far released. The BDO, was waiting for local village Durbar's Resolution authorising person or persons to draw the money.
27. " Construction of school building at Lawsohtun village by Sengkhasi"1995-96 - Rs.50,000/-. Rs. 28,000/- drawn since 28.8.96 but till March '97, they had not been able to submit the U.C. and other required relevant papers. Even the base portion was not yet completed.
28. " "Construction of Lum Jingtup M.E. School Mawshun" (1995-96) Rs. 1.00 lakh. The old building was renovated. The work was in full swing and the progress was found satisfactory as per information gathered from the Junior Engineer i/c.
29. " Construction of St. Anthony's Roman Catholic Primary School (1995-96) Rs. 2.00 lakh. At the time of visit - foundations laid and some pillars starting erected.
30. " Improvement of football ground Umkor, Pynursla (1995-96) Rs. 60,000/-. Improvement already completed in other sides but for the western wing kept in abeyance, as some land required from the PWD Road.
31. " Fencing of Laitlyngkot High School, Maw-u-mon village (1995-96) Rs. 1.50 lakh. Materials and masonry stones already collected and also yet to be collected. Work was suspended for waiting the reliable mason who used to be engaged by the mission.
32. W.Garo Hills "Construction of Selbelgiri L.P. School building" (1995-96) sanctioned amount Rs.5.00 lakh. Brick-building (21x6)M for 5 rooms. C.I. sheet roofing completed. Plastering of R.C.C. walls going on.
33. " "Durama College Building, Hawakhana, Tura (1994-95). Amount sanctioned Rs. 1.00 lakh. 1<sup>st</sup> instalment drawn already. As the beneficiary, the Principal could not be met as he had been out of station, certain information was gathered from the BDO. As to the position of the project, so far it was reported, nothing was done excepting the clearance of jungle. It was informed that because the sanctioned was considered to be too meagre, hence the Principal of the college felt reluctant to start the execution of the work with such amount of grant.
34. " "Construction of R.C.C. 100 -Drum Wangala Building"(1995-96) at Asanangiri. Sanctioned amount Rs. 10.00 lakh. The execution was delayed for about a year in arriving at a consensus in the selection of site for the building. The site

having been settled, the execution started on 2.5.97. Found during the visit - pillars being erected. The project implemented by the BDO.

35. " Construction of the Hanging Bridge latter named as "Timber Footpath Bridge" of 55 m. (1994-95) for Rs. 1.20 lakh. The technical feasibility of the scheme as originally planned was found doubtful by the experts. This caused the postponement in the execution of the scheme. It was only after the Plan was drastically recasted that the work could be started in an early part of the year 1997. Due to distance and the road condition the site could not be visited physically.
36. " Improvement of Library of Donbosco Youth Centre, Tura (1994-95)- Rs. 1.00 lakh books procured since 16.10.95.
37. " Zikzak Community Hall (1994-95) - Rs. 75,000/- completed in December, 1996.
38. " "Mahendraganj Community Hall" (1994-95) Rs.75,000/-. Yet to be completed as on date of visit (8.5.97), though the initial execution was said to have taken place since March '96. Plastering of wall and floor and fitting of doors/windows were the activities found going on during the visit.
39. " Construction of drainage and sanitary facilities at Mahendraganj Bazar (1995-96) for Rs.50,000/- by the Mahendraganj Development Committee.  
Bottleneck - Delay in acquiring spaces of land for the construction of drain and sanitary facilities led to the late execution of the work. By the time of visit, almost 75% of work was done.
40. " "Pond Filling at Mahendraganj Bazar" (1995-96) for Rs.1.00 lakh i.e. the earth filling of the two existing ponds so as to provide mere space for the market area. The area proved to be reclaimed - (a)  $5(21.64 \times 67.056) M = 1451 m^2$  and (b)  $(16.764 \times 33.528)m = 562.06339m^2$ . Dispute between the Local Committee and the owners of small shops adjacent to the ponds led to the non-execution of the project till the date of our visit. Each side stucked to its own rigid stand.
41. " Matcha-Kolgre Church to Nehru Park Road (1995-96) i.e. A 1 KM distance jeepable Road linking Nehru Park, on the main road to Matcha - Kolgre Church Building. Rs. 2.00 lakh said to have been completed since August, '96. But was not yet jeepable due to absence of bridges and culverts.
42. " "Footpath at Lower Bapupara" tura, (1995-96) for Rs. 1.00 lakh. Though shown to have been completed, but according to our findings, except a few metres at the lower end, the rest

remained undone. The person i/c of the project was out of station, hence, discussions were held with his wife who happened to be a School-Mistress. She alleged of the non-co-operation by the adjacent residents leading to the then situation of the work.

Note : The above list included these samples the beneficiaries, (the persons in-charge of which) could not be found during the field study and hence, no reply to the prescribed Schedule-Cum-questionnaire was furnished but certain information were collected from their relatives and the concerned BDOs.