

**COMMITTEE ON MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT LOCAL
AREA DEVELOPMENT SCHEME (2010-11)**

FIFTEENTH LOK SABHA

**MINISTRY OF STATISTICS AND
PROGRAMME IMPLEMENTATION**

**Effective Monitoring of the MPLAD Scheme to avoid
delays in execution of MPLADS works.**

FOURTH REPORT



LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT

NEW DELHI

11 August, 2011/ 20 Sharvana , 1933 (Saka)

FOURTH REPORT

COMMITTEE ON MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT LOCAL AREA DEVELOPMENT SCHEME (2010-11)

FIFTEENTH LOK SABHA

MINISTRY OF STATISTICS AND PROGRAMME IMPLEMENTATION

**Effective Monitoring of the MPLAD Scheme to avoid
delays in execution of MPLADS works.**

Presented to the Speaker, Lok Sabha on 4 May 2011

Presented to Lok Sabha on 11 August 2011



LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT

NEW DELHI

11 August , 2011/ 20 Sharvana, 1933 (Saka)

CONTENTS

	Page
COMPOSITION OF COMMITTEE ON MPLADS	(iii)
INTRODUCTION.....	(v)

REPORT

Background.....	1
CHAPTER – I Role of MPLADS Parliamentary Committees	5
CHAPTER – II Role of the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation	
A. Responsibilities of the Ministry	7
B. Monitoring through fund release mechanism	7
C. Software on Monitoring of MPLADS Works	10
D. Monitoring through Bi annual review meetings and field visits	12
E. Physical Monitoring in selected districts by NABCONS ...	14
F. Monitoring delays in execution of MPLADS works	20
G. Limitations in intensive monitoring	23

CHAPTER – III Role of the State Government/UT Government

A.	Monitoring through a Committee under the Chairmanship of the Chief Secretary	26
B.	Inspection by the Officers of the Nodal Department	28

CHAPTER – IV Role of the District Authorities and Implementing Agencies

A.	Inspection of 10% works by district authorities and Involving MPs in the Process	33
B.	Monthly review meetings by District Authorities	36

<u>Observations/recommendations</u>	40
Annexure 1.....	54
Annexure 2	55
Annexure 3	72

APPENDICES

I.	Minutes of the sitting of the Committee on MPLADS (Lok Sabha) held on 01 April 2010.....	75
II.	Minutes of the sitting of the Committee on MPLADS (Lok Sabha) held on 09 September 2010.....	78
III.	Minutes of the sitting of the Committee on MPLADS (Lok Sabha) held on 07 March 2011.....	81

**COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE ON MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT LOCAL
AREA DEVELOPMENT SCHEME (LOK SABHA) 2010-11**

Shri A.K.S. Vijayan - Chairman

Members

2. Dr. Rattan Singh Ajnala
3. Dr. Baliram
4. Dr. Pulin Bihari Baske
5. Dr. Kakoli Ghosh Dastidar
6. Adv. Ganeshrao Nagorao Dudhgaonkar
7. Shri D.B. Chandre Gowda
8. Shri Deepender Singh Hooda
9. Shri Kailash Joshi
10. Shri Kaushalendra Kumar
11. Shri Babu Lal Marandi
12. Shri Shripad Yesso Naik
13. Shri Jagdambika Pal
14. Kumari Saroj Pandey
15. Shri Amarnath Pradhan
16. Shri Rajendrasinh Rana
17. Shri Rudramadhab Ray
18. Shri Tufani Saroj
19. Shri Ajit Singh
20. Shri Gopal Singh Shekhawat
21. Shri Udai Pratap Singh (Hoshangabad)
22. Shri Vijay Inder Singla
23. Shri Jagdish Thakor
24. Shri Om Prakash Yadav

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri N.K. Sapra - Additional Secretary
2. Shri V.R. Ramesh - Joint Secretary
3. Shri Hardev Singh - Director
4. Shri C. Kalyanasundaram - Under Secretary

INTRODUCTION

I, the Chairman of the Committee on Members of Parliament Local Area Development Scheme (MPLADS) having been authorized by the Committee to submit the Report on their behalf, present this Fourth Report on the subject "Effective Monitoring of the MPLAD Scheme to avoid delays in execution of MPLADS works" pertaining to the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation.

2. The Committee on MPLADS (2008-09) had selected this subject for detailed examination. The examination of the subject, however, remained inconclusive. The Committee on MPLADS (2009-10), therefore, selected this subject again for examination keeping in view the importance of the subject. The Committee took the oral evidence of the representatives of the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation on the subject on 1 April 2010 and 9 September 2010. The subject was again selected by the Committee on MPLADS (2010-11) to finalise the Report on the subject and present the same to Lok Sabha. The Draft Report on the subject was considered and adopted by the Committee at their sitting held on 7 March 2011.

3. The Committee would like to thank the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation for placing before them the background notes on the subject and the replies to lists of points prepared by the Secretariat on the subject.

4. For facility of reference, the observations/recommendations of the Committee have been printed in bold letters at the end of the Report.

New Delhi

8 March 2011
17 Phalgun, 1933 (Saka)

(A.K.S. VIJAYAN)
Chairman
Committee on Members of Parliament
Local Area Development Scheme
Lok Sabha

REPORT

Background

1.1 The Members of Parliament Local Area Development Scheme (MPLADS) is a Centrally sponsored Plan Scheme fully funded by the Government of India. The Scheme was announced by the then Prime Minister in Parliament on 23 December 1993. The objective of the Scheme is to enable Members of Parliament to recommend works of developmental nature with emphasis on the creation of durable community assets based on the locally felt needs to be taken up in their constituencies. The present annual allocation under the Scheme is Rs. two crore per constituency. Durable assets of national priorities, viz. drinking water, primary education, public health, sanitation, roads, etc. are being created right from the launching of the Scheme.

1.2 The Scheme is administered by the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation. The Ministry has issued a set of guidelines to be followed by the Implementing Agencies. As per the guidelines, the Ministry is responsible for policy formulation, release of funds and for prescribing monitoring mechanism for implementation of the Scheme. A Department in each State/Union Territory is designated as the Nodal Department with the overall responsibility of implementation of the Scheme in the State. The District Authorities are vested with the actual responsibility of executing the works recommended by the Members of Parliament by following the established procedures of the concerned State Government. The funds are released by the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation in the form of grants-in-aid directly to the District Authorities. The District Authority is empowered to examine the eligibility of works recommended by MPs, sanction funds, select the Implementing Agencies, prioritize works and supervise the overall execution of works at the ground level. The District Authorities get the works executed through the Line Departments, Local Self Governments or other Government agencies. In some cases, the District Authorities get the works executed through reputed Non-Government organizations as well. As such, various organizations are involved in the

implementation of the Scheme. All the organizations in the channel of implementation of the Scheme, right from the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation to the Implementing Agencies at the field level, have to scrupulously follow the respective guidelines pertaining to the sanction of the works recommended by the MPs, release of funds and their management, time schedule, accounting procedures, etc. Timely sanction of the projects recommended by MPs and their expeditious completion as stipulated in the guidelines, are imperative for the success of the Scheme. So, there is a need to have an effective monitoring mechanism to avoid delays in execution of MPLADS works. In order to achieve this objective, a separate set of guidelines has been framed and issued by the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation to monitor the Scheme by the Implementing Authorities at various levels.

1.3 At the legislative level, there are two Parliamentary Committees, one each under the purview of Rajya Sabha and Lok Sabha, to monitor and review the implementation of the Scheme in respect of Members of Rajya Sabha and Lok Sabha, respectively. At the executive level, the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation is the apex level organization responsible for monitoring overall implementation of the Scheme. At the State level, the designated Nodal Department is responsible for effective supervision of the MPLAD Scheme and its implementation in various Parliamentary Constituencies in the State. The District Authority is responsible for coordination and supervision of the MPLADS works at the district level. Implementing Agencies, which are assigned the task of executing the work by the District Authorities, are also required to regularly visit the work spots to ensure that the works are progressing satisfactorily as per the prescribed procedure, specifications and time schedule.

1.4 The provisions on monitoring of the scheme have been enumerated in para 6 of the MPLAD Scheme guidelines as follows :-

SI. No.	Sub Para	Monitoring authority
1.	6.1	Role of MPLADS Parliamentary Committees
2.	6.2	Role of the Central Government
3.	6.3	Role of the State/UT Government

4.	6.4	Role of the District Authority
5.	6.5	Role of the Implementing Agencies

1.5 Even though the Ministry has framed these guidelines for effective monitoring of the Scheme, it is equally important that these guidelines are adhered to in letter and spirit by the Implementing Authorities at various levels. Ineffective monitoring at various levels leads to delays in completion of the MPLADS works recommended by MPs. Keeping in view the importance of the monitoring for the success of the Scheme, the Committee on MPLADS (2008-) had selected the subject “ Effective Monitoring of the MPLAD Scheme to avoid delays in execution of MPLADS works” for detailed examination of all aspects relating to the monitoring of the Scheme. Immediately after the selection of the subject, a preliminary List of Points on the subject was sent to the Ministry on 20 May 2009. However, the Ministry could not furnish replies to the List of Points despite several reminders by the Committee Secretariat till the end of the tenure of the Committee. As such, the Committee (2008-09) could not take up examination of the subject during its tenure.

1.6 Since the subject matter was of utmost importance for the successful implementation of the Scheme, the Committee on MPLADS (2009-10) again selected the subject for examination on priority basis. Subsequently, an additional List of Points on the subject was prepared and the evidence of the representatives of the Ministry on the subject was taken on 1 April 2010. Preliminary List of Points was envisaged to collect information on the monitoring being done by the State level Implementing Agencies. However, the Ministry could provide replies pertaining to four States and Three UTs only on 30 March 2010 that too after issue of eleven reminders by the Committee Secretariat. Another batch of replies obtained from two States, one Union Territory and two districts of Andhra Pradesh and three districts of Chhatisgarh was provided by the Ministry on 21 June 2010. The Committee, during their Study Tour to Maharashtra and Tamil Nadu in May, 2010 and Assam, Meghalaya and West Bengal in September-October, 2010 raised the points relating to the monitoring being done by these States at various levels as per the provisions contained in the guidelines.

1.7 Based on the information gathered by the Committee, a post evidence List of Points was prepared and sent to the Ministry for replies. Based on the same, further oral evidence of the representatives of the Ministry was taken by the Committee on 9 September 2010. Since the examination of the subject remained inconclusive, the Committee (2010-11) selected the subject again to finalise the report on the subject. Various aspects of examination of the subject by the Committee have been dealt with in the succeeding chapters of this report.

Chapter – I

Role of MPLADS Parliamentary Committees

2.1 The issues and problems relating to the implementation of the MPLAD Scheme were discussed in detail in both the Houses of Parliament separately during the period of the Twelfth Lok Sabha. Leaders of Parties/Groups in both the Houses felt the need to have some sort of surveillance mechanism so as to monitor the implementation of the Scheme more effectively. It was ultimately decided to have a Committee each to monitor and review periodically the performance and problems in the implementation of this Scheme with respect to the works recommended by the Members of respective Houses. The Committee on MPLADS, Rajya Sabha comprising ten Members, was constituted by the Chairman, Rajya Sabha on 5 September 1998 under the Chairmanship of Deputy Chairman, Rajya Sabha, to look into all aspects of the MPLAD Scheme. The Committee on MPLADS Lok Sabha consisting of 20 Members, was constituted by the Speaker, Lok Sabha on 22 February 1999. Later, the membership of this Committee was raised to 24.

The functions of the Committee on MPLADS, Lok Sabha are :-

- (a) to monitor and review periodically the performance and problems in the implementation of the MPLAD Scheme;
- (b) to consider complaints of Members of Lok Sabha in regard to the implementation of the Scheme; and
- (c) to perform such other functions in respect of the MPLAD Scheme as may be assigned to it by the Speaker from time to time.

2.2 A separate para has been included in the MPLAD Scheme guidelines on the role of MPLADS Parliamentary Committees. Para No. 6.1 of the guidelines states as under:-

“ here are two Committees of Parliament (Raya Sabha and Lok Sabha) on Members of Parliament Local Area Development Scheme which receive representations from MPs and the proposals submitted by the Government of

India to advise the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation, Government of India for appropriate action. The role of the Committees is decided by the Speaker, for Lok Sabha Committee, and Chairman Rajya Sabha for Rajya Sabha Committee on MPLADS.”

2.3 During the oral evidence on the subject on 9 September 2010 the Committee expected that they should be taken into confidence before any amendments are made to the MPLADS guidelines and also before circulars regarding amendments to guidelines are sent to the District Magistrates. In this regard, the Secretary, Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation stated as follows :-

“Sir the role of the Committee has also been stipulated in the guidelines. It is there in Section 6. These Committees were constituted as advisory Committees and I have full respect for the advice which they give. However, the process of formulating guidelines for any Central scheme is laid out in the Government and we follow that process. I will not want to make any commitment or give any assurance of changing the process of Government by which guidelines are formulated”.

2.4 The Committee took a strong exception to the above remarks of the Secretary, Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation.

CHAPTER - II

Role of the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation

A. Responsibilities of the Ministry

3.1 As per para 6.2 of the MPLAD Scheme guidelines, the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation is responsible *inter-alia* for the following in regard to monitoring of the Scheme :-

- (i) Monitoring the overall position of funds released, cost of works sanctioned, funds spent, etc.
- (ii) Monitoring the receipt of Completion Reports, Utilization Certificates and Audit Certificates from the District Authorities.
- (iii) Reviewing the audit objections and issues arising out of the Audit and Utilisation Certificates.
- (iv) Holding meetings in the States and also at the Centre at least once in a year to review the implementation of the MPLAD Scheme.
- (v) Developing software on monitoring of MPLAD Scheme works and operationalise the same through State Governments, UT Administrations and District Authorities.

The following topics analyse the steps taken by the Ministry to fulfil its responsibilities in monitoring implementation of the Scheme :-

B. Monitoring through fund release mechanism

3.2 The annual entitlement of Rs. two crore is released by the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation in two equal instalments of Rupees one crore each directly to the District Authorities under intimation to the State/UT Nodal Department and the MP concerned. The first instalment is released in the beginning of the financial year. The second instalment is released subject to the fulfilment of the following eligibility criteria :-

- the unsanctioned balance amount available with the accounts of the District Authority after taking into account the cost of all the works sanctioned is less than Rs. 50 lakh;

- the unspent balance of funds of the MP concerned is less than Rupees one crore; and
- Utilisation Certificate for the previous financial year and the Audit Certificate for the funds released for MP concerned in the year prior to the previous year have been furnished by District Authority.

(i) Utilisation and Audit Certificates

3.3 In regard to the use of utilization and audit certificates as monitoring tools, a representative of the Ministry stated during evidence as under :-

“We have two very important monitoring systems in place, that is the Audit Certificate and the Utilisation Certificate. We take the Utilisation Certificate of one year previous, and the Audit Certificate by the auditor appointed by the district of two years previous. The auditor has a test check. So, it is not hundred percent; it can never be hundred percent. The Chartered Accountants have some guidelines of their own. On the basis of that, they give an Audit Certificate. This tells the Ministry that the scheme or the project being implemented in the district is running as per the Guidelines and it is physically coming up. If there is any audit para or a situation, then the Ministry will not release the next instalment until the auditor s remark is satisfied in the Audit Certificate.”

(ii) Monthly Progress Report

3.4 Information on the unsanctioned balance amount and the unspent balance of funds are obtained by the Ministry through Monthly Progress Reports (MPRs). A representative of the Ministry informed that the Monthly Progress Report, which is a fund release mechanism, is used as a tool by the Ministry to monitor the implementation of the Scheme and stated as follows:-

“ he purpose of MPR is to see two things. Before releasing the second instalment, we must see that the unspent balance is less than Rs. 1 crore and unsanctioned balance is less than Rs. 50 lakh so that we get an idea that the thing is not that he is asking money just to keep it in a bank account. This shows the keenness of the Ministry that works are being executed, and as the progress of the works takes place, only then the money is released. So, it is usefully released.”

3.5 The Ministry was asked to furnish the salient features of the Monthly Progress Reports and the contributions made by the system for the timely completion of the projects taken up under the Scheme. The Ministry of Statistics and Programme

Implementation in a written reply stated in this regard that the Ministry envisaged and introduced a dynamic mechanism known as the Online Monthly Progress Reporting System (OMPRS) in February 2009 with a view to establish a common platform across the country to generate Monthly Progress Report (MPR) reflecting the status of MPLADS implementation on-line and in a common format, make available information at further disaggregated levels and enable faster release of funds.

3.6 The Ministry informed the Committee that the new system envisages entry of data in the templates, which is designed to capture House-wise information and year-wise information in the case of Lok Sabha constituencies (from the 14th Lok Sabha onwards), information in respect of works in SC/ST areas by the District authorities (instead of entry of only cumulative figures being done in the Ministry), and uploading the data in the web, to be accessed by the Ministry, State Governments, etc. The Monthly Progress Reports required for release of funds can be generated and hard copies obtained for processing of eligible cases by the Ministry. Also, provision has been made for generating reports.

3.7 The Ministry had also informed the Committee that at present, the information is received through both the Online System as well as the traditional hardcopy system. About 40% of the districts are sending the data online. The States/UTs are being continuously exhorted to ensure that the districts used the new system and send the data online. This was also emphasized at the recent All India Review Meeting held on 02.02.2010. Once more than 80% data is received online, the traditional hardcopy MPRs will be dispensed with and the release would be made solely on the basis of the online system.

3.8 When asked whether the Ministry analyzes the MPRs submitted by the District Authorities and initiates action for delay in completion of works etc, the Ministry in a written reply stated that the Monthly Progress Reports have information on the number and cost of works recommended, sanctioned, completed, expenditure incurred, etc. The Ministry analyzes the MPRs submitted by the District Authorities for determining the eligibility criteria required for processing the release of MPLADS funds. Delay in completion of works cannot be analyzed on the basis of information provided in the

MPRs as the time required for completion of works varies depending on size of the work. As the works are recommended on the basis of locally felt needs, no uniform time-limit can be prescribed for completion of all the works recommended by the MPs. To avoid delays in completion of works, the time limit for completion of the work is stipulated in the sanction letter, which includes a clause for penal action against the Implementing Agency in the event of its failure to complete the work within the stipulated time as per the State Government procedure. The Ministry has been exhorting the State/UT Governments to ensure that District Authorities complete the works at the earliest.

3.9 In regard to the above contention of the Ministry that the delay in completion of works cannot be analysed on the basis of the information provided in the Monthly Progress Reports as the time required for completion of works varies depending on the size of the work, the Ministry was asked whether there is any proposal to create more data space/add more features in MPRs for proper analysis of the factors responsible for delays and to enable it to monitor the delays in implementation of the works/progress in completion of the sanctioned works on monthly basis, the Ministry in its reply had stated that it will not be appropriate to include the reasons for delay in implementation of the works in the MPRs as the MPRs are meant for examining the eligibility for release of funds. Moreover, the Monthly Progress Report (MPR) does not contain details of individual works. The details of individual works are uploaded through the MPLADS Work Monitoring Software.

C. Software on Monitoring of MPLADS works

3.10 The software on monitoring MPLADS works was launched in November 2004 to enforce greater transparency and accountability in implementation of the Scheme and promoting e-governance. When asked about the progress made in operationalising the software, the Ministry in a written reply informed the Committee that consequent upon launching of Software on Monitoring of MPLADS Works, the District Authorities have uploaded full/partial data with regard to the works recommended by the MPs and sanctioned by the District Authorities in respect of 424 districts out of 430 districts. The software contains the date of receipt of proposal of work from the MP, date of sanction

by the District Authority, date of commencement of work, cost sanctioned by the District Authority, name of the executing agency, target date of completion, expenditure incurred, unspent balance returned to the District Authority, date of receipt of Utilization Certificates, etc.

3.11 The Ministry had developed this software with the help of National Informatics Centre (NIC) for monitoring of works being executed under MPLAD Scheme. The details of each work recommended by the MP and sanctioned by the District Administration is entered using this software. The Ministry informed the Committee that a Central database had been created at the Ministry and this database was updated by the Implementing Authorities through two web enabled Modules. The Module-I is for District level and Module-II is for Implementing Agency level. Web enabled application for monitoring of works is available at URL : <http://mplads.nic.in> . The details of MPLADS works monitoring software can be accessed universally, which can be monitored at various levels such as by the district authorities, State authorities, the Ministry, Lok Sabha Secretariat, MPs, Public, etc. Public can view/download some pre-defined reports of their interest. District Authorities enter/modify the data directly using this application.

3.12 When asked further whether this software is effective in ensuring timely implementation of the MPLAD Scheme, the Ministry in a written reply stated that this software is quite effective in monitoring implementation of MPLAD Scheme. As on 22 March 2010, the data in respect of 1,757 MPs had been uploaded on the software. State-wise summary of receipt of full or partial online data from nodal districts is placed at Annexure-1. However, the said data do not reveal the information whether the works which are under implementation on the recommendations of MPs of the 15th Lok Sabha, are being monitored by the Ministry by using this software. The Ministry was asked to furnish details in this regard. In a post evidence reply it was stated by the Ministry that data in respect of 1988 Lok Sabha MPs had been uploaded on MPLADS Software upto 15th Lok Sabha. When asked about the data in respect of how many MPs of Lok Sabha was still to be uploaded and by what time that work would be completed, the Ministry stated in a written reply that the data in respect of 1270 Lok Sabha MPs was yet to be

uploaded (including 10th, 11th, 12th, 13th, 14th and 15th Lok Sabha). It was further stated by the Ministry that it was making regular efforts to complete the job and that the district authorities have been requested to do the needful.

3.13 When asked whether any follow up action was taken by the Ministry after analyzing the details provided by the States through the monitoring software particularly on delays in completion of projects, the Ministry stated that no meaningful analysis could be made till the entire information is available with it.

3.14 In this regard, the Committee asked for the reasons for maintaining two data bases viz. one for Monthly Progress Report and the other for monitoring of the software, the Ministry stated that it was examining the feasibility of integrating online monthly progress reporting system and the works monitoring software for better and effective monitoring and also customize it for micro-level monitoring by District/State Authorities. The Ministry further stated that this integrated software would provide a complete database provided the correct and timely information regarding works was uploaded by the District Authorities. The Committee asked whether there was any proposal to have a few dedicated staff for the purpose of monitoring this integrated software. In reply, the Ministry stated that it monitors the Scheme at the macro level in the process of release of funds to the District Authorities. The technical support with regard to IT management was provided by the NIC, but the Ministry was also examining the requirement of few dedicated staff to manage the web based system of MPLADS.

D. Monitoring through Bi annual review meetings and field visits

3.15 In regard to the responsibilities of the Ministry in monitoring the Scheme, the Ministry in its Background Note had stated that the Minister of Statistics and Programme Implementation convenes bi-annual meetings at Delhi with the Nodal Secretaries of all the State/UT Govts. to monitor and review the progress of implementation of MPLAD Scheme. It was stated in the Background Note that the Ministry always emphasized the need for effective and speedy implementation of the MPLADS works during those meetings. When the Ministry were asked about fulfilment of respective responsibilities by the State Governments and district authorities in regard to monitoring of the progress

in implementation of the Scheme, inspection of the work sites etc, the Ministry stated in a written reply that the Ministry was regularly monitoring the implementation of the MPLAD Scheme in its bi-annual Review Meetings at the Centre. As on date, 10 such meetings had been held under the chairmanship of the Minister for Statistics and Programme Implementation.

3.16 During the first evidence held on 1 April, 2010, the Secretary, Statistics and Programme Implementation stated regarding the usefulness of these bi-annual review meetings as follows :-

“ very year twice we call a meeting of the States to discuss the problems in implementing the guidelines that have been issued. On the basis of those meetings, we try to streamline the procedures. But this is a two-way street. The States also have problems which they communicate and we also communicate the problems that we are facing “

3.17 In this regard, a representative of the Ministry further stated during the second evidence as follows :-

“We hold Bi-Annual All India review meeting under the Chairmanship of our Minister. This is a monitoring mechanism where we get all the feedback and we also do physical and financial review with the State Governments. The Nodal Officers are mostly the Planning Secretaries, and they are present in those meetings and they answer our questions. This is another monitoring mechanism which we have.”

3.18 On 2 February 2010, a review meeting on implementation of MPLAD Scheme was held by the Ministry with the Nodal Secretaries of State Governments and Union Territory Administrations in New Delhi. The Ministry furnished a copy of the Minutes of the meeting to the Committee. The entire review was completed within a day. The gathering was first addressed by the Minister of Statistics and Programme Implementation which was followed by a presentation on the MPLADS guidelines by the Additional Secretary of the Ministry. Then there was a general discussion and State-wise review. At the end of the Minutes, it was stated that the progress in respect of the States of Nagaland, Assam, Tripura, Puducherry, Chandigarh, Dadra & Nagar Haveli, Daman and Diu, Goa, Assam and Sikkim could not be reviewed since their representatives were either not present in the meeting or left before discussion.

3.19 In the background note, the Ministry had also stated that the Minister and other Senior Officers of the Ministry also visit various States/UTs to review physical and financial progress of the works and speedy implementation was stressed in those reviews as well. The senior officers of the Ministry undertake 2-3 meetings in a quarter with States/UTs and district officials to review the progress of implementation of the Scheme and also inspect the work sites. In this regard, the Ministry was asked to furnish information on the number of such visits made by the officers of the Ministry during the period from 2006-2010 and the follow up action taken after such field visits. The Ministry in its reply stated that the senior officers of the Ministry take up all important matters relating to implementation of the MPLAD Scheme with the concerned officers of the Nodal Departments of the State Governments including the inspection of the assets. The details of the States visited during the last three years are as under :-

2006-07 :- Karnataka, Kerala, Meghalaya, Punjab, Haryana, Chandigarh, Madhya Pradesh, Himachal Pradesh, Bihar, Orissa, Delhi, J&K, West Bengal and Uttaranchal.

2007-08 :- Karnataka, Rajasthan, Uttar Pradesh, Lakshadweep, Orissa, Guwahati, Uttarakhand and Haryana.

2008-09 :- West Bengal, Bihar, Maharashtra, Tripura, Uttar Pradesh, Jharkhand and Arunachal Pradesh.

2009-10 :- Madhya Pradesh, Orissa, Punjab, Chandigarh, Sikkim, West Bengal, Uttarakhand, and A&N Islands.

In regard to the follow-up action taken by the Ministry, the Committee were informed that the shortcomings found during the inspection are brought to the notice of the Nodal Secretaries for rectification and appropriate action.

E. Physical monitoring in selected districts by NABCONS

3.20 The Ministry in its Background Note had stated that the lack of a direct monitoring by the Government of India and an independent feedback mechanism under the MPLAD Scheme of the implementation at the grassroots level was a major

drawback. The need for such a mechanism was suggested by the Programme Evaluation Organisation, Planning Commission and the CAG. In order to provide for a mechanism to monitor the implementation of the Scheme at the grassroots level, an important initiative for physical monitoring of a sample of MPLADS works in selected districts of the country through an independent institution, was envisaged in 2006-07. In this regard, the Ministry has stated in a written reply that the work of monitoring was assigned to the NABARD Consultancy Services (NABCONS) based on their institutional infrastructure and mechanism, nation-wide presence, and prior experience in such monitoring works. All districts in the country were proposed to be covered in a phased manner over a period of seven years.

3.21 As per the information provided by the Ministry, the physical monitoring initiative envisages to cover a sample of about 50 works in each district. It is to be noted here that instead of taking a constituency or the works of an individual Member of Parliament, an administrative district has been taken as the reference unit, as the monitoring envisions to monitor the implementation in the district by the district authority and ameliorate the shortcomings, if any. The sample of works are to be a judicious blend of various parameters such as :-

- ❖ Works of different years.
- ❖ Works of different costs.
- ❖ Works of Lok Sabha and Rajya Sabha MP(s).
- ❖ Works of Societies/Trusts and
- ❖ Works of different sectors, such as Drinking Water, Education, Electricity, Health & Family Welfare, Irrigation, etc.

3.22 When the Ministry was asked to furnish the details of the districts covered so far and the time by which the remaining districts are likely to be covered, the Ministry stated in a written reply that it was decided to limit the number of districts in the first phase to 30 districts so as to gain operational experience. However, 43 districts were covered in the second phase during 2008-09. In the third phase in 2009-10, 60 districts had been covered. It was envisaged to cover about 75 districts every year. Under these

conditions, the Ministry anticipates that it would take 4-5 more years to cover all the districts of the country.

3.23 The Ministry was asked to furnish the findings of each phase of the monitoring. In this regard, the Ministry had furnished the following findings on the positive impact of the Scheme during the first phase of monitoring :-

- (i) MPLAD Scheme was a unique scheme having the characteristic feature of decentralized development and has resulted in the creation of fairly good quality assets towards economic and social infrastructure, which has had an overall positive impact on the local economy, social fabric and feasible environment.
- (ii) The works implemented under MPLADS had an overall positive impact on the local economy, society, physical environment, etc.
- (iii) The local community perceived that 74% of the sample MPLADS works implemented in different sectors had positive impact on the local economy in terms of connectivity, business opportunities, trade, employment, irrigation to some extent, etc.
- (iv) 86% of the sample works had a positive impact on the social structure/social fabric of the local community, as generally there was mutual harmony, common acceptance of projects, and no social conflict or encroachment on works for private benefits.
- (v) 63% of the sample works had positive impact on the physical environment and there was at least no negative impact of any sort due to any project in different sectors. In fact, there were few instances where advanced technology was getting used in some of the projects (for instance electrical crematorium) for environment protection, resource conservation (solar lamps), etc.

3.24 The Ministry had stated that the NABCONS s Report on first phase of monitoring had also mentioned a few instances of ineligible works sanctioned by District Authorities along with the following violations of MPLADS Guidelines :-

- (i) **Delay in sanction/Execution of works :-** It has been found that in about 45% of the works the time lag between MP s recommendation date and sanction date is more than 45 days and in about 40% of the works, the completion period exceeds 365 days.

(ii) Poor Maintenance of MPLADS assets :-

- About 30% of the works are lacking proper maintenance specially in the case of Roads, Pathways & bridges, Community Halls, School buildings etc.
- In 50% cases there is no formal system for handing over the asset to User Agencies.
- In about 60% of the cases no undertaking has been taken from any user agencies for upkeep and maintenance of the assets.

(iii) Erection of Plaques : In about 50% cases no plaque has been erected at the work site of MPLADS. Even in those cases where the plaque was erected, the details of projects as required were not indicated on the plaque. It has been observed that Implementing Agencies and User Agencies were ignorant about this requirement.

(iv) Inspection of MPLADS assets by District Authority :- In 60% of the cases, no structured and specific inspection of works is being carried out by District Authority. If inspection has taken place, no proper records of the inspection have been maintained at DC office.

(v) The works allotted to NGO/Society/Trusts :-

- In many cases there was no inspection procedure by District Authority for inspecting 100% works carried out by NGO/Society/Trusts.
- In some cases the agreements signed by District Authority with the trusts/societies, did not contain important 18% interest clause.
- There are few cases where works exceeding Rs. 25 lakhs have been allotted to a single NGO.

3.25 In regard to the findings of the NABCONS during the second phase of monitoring, the Ministry had stated that generally there had been a good response for continuation of the MPLAD Scheme by the general public and they expressed satisfaction about various aspects of the implementation of the works. The overwhelming perception of the local community (90-100%) was that the MPLAD Scheme has had a very positive impact. It was the only scheme at All India level, which focused on decentralized approach to scheme implementation based on involvement of the local communities, groups, sections of peoples and individuals right at the ground stage of identification of works facilities required as per the “felt needs” and wish list of the local people. In regard to the shortcomings, the Ministry has stated that similar shortcomings as reported in the first phase of monitoring were also noticed in the districts covered during the second phase.

3.26 The reports received from the districts covered under the first and the second phases had been examined in the Ministry and the major observations/shortcomings had been communicated to the concerned district authorities for taking appropriate action. The reports of the third phase were being received and examined. The Ministry was taking follow up action on the shortcomings pointed out.

3.27 The Ministry was requested to furnish the State-wise details of the violations and the action taken thereon by the Ministry. The Ministry in a written reply stated that the violations and shortcomings that had come to the notice of the Ministry through NABCONS Reports in both the phases relate to sanctioning of works not permissible under the Guidelines, diversion of the usage of the MPLADS assets from what it was initially sanctioned, encroachment of some assets, non-maintenance, poor scrutiny of works relating to Trusts/Societies, delay in sanctioning and completion of the works, etc. The Ministry has comprehensively detailed the lacunae/shortcomings that were reported in each district to the concerned district authority with a copy to the State Government also for further necessary action. The replies received from the districts are further taken up. The State wise, work-wise serious violations are enclosed at Annexure -2.

3.28 During the evidence on 1 April 2010, the Committee brought to the attention of the Ministry two specific cases of violations mentioned in the above mentioned Annexures, viz. non-location of assets in East district of Sikkim and non-use of a community hall which was constructed in 1996 in Lucknow, Uttar Pradesh and asked what action the Ministry and the respective State Governments had taken in these cases. In reply the Secretary, Ministry of Statistics and programme Implementation had stated as follows :-

“Sir, the action lies with the States. In fact, in both these cases, it is misuse or non-use of assets. So, the action is really in putting those assets to use. In all the cases that have been pointed out to us, we have brought it to the notice of the State Government, and in some cases action also has been taken.”

3.29 The Committee then pointed out the detection of several cases of violation of MPLADS guidelines during the first phase of NABCONS s monitoring of the Scheme, such as delays in sanctioning and execution of the works, unauthorized and improper release of MPLADS funds for ineligible works, full advance given to the implementing

agencies, works taken up in the religious places, funds given for repair and renovation, poor maintenance of the MPLADS assets, non-erection of plaques, non-inspection of MPLADS works by the district authorities, etc. and enquired whether any action had been taken by the Ministry, State Governments and district authorities on these violations. In this regard, the Secretary in the Ministry stated as under :-

“Sir we have taken on each of these cases. In certain cases the action to be taken is cease and resist; that they should not do it any further. In certain cases the State Government is expected to do rectification; that is if an ineligible work has been made, then the State Government is supposed to pay back that money into the account of the hon. MP. In most cases these actions are taken. There are a few instances where this rectification does not happen. But, those, I think, are relatively few.”

Another representative of the Ministry further stated in the matter as follows :-

“Regarding the issues which were raised in the NABCONS report, there are two sets of cases; in certain cases ineligible works were sanctioned and in certain other cases the property was used for purposes other than what is given in the guidelines. After receiving the NABCONS report we have sent these reports to all the district authorities who are responsible for the execution and we have asked them their remarks as well as rectification of the issues. Obviously, in the case where it is being used for other than the purpose for which it is sanctioned, the district authorities can take immediate action and they are expected to revert back to us. We are getting reports; they are coming to us”.

3.30 In regard to fixing accountability of the officials of the State Governments for such violations, the Committee asked the Ministry whether there was any proposal to frame any guidelines on accountability of State officials. The Ministry in a written reply stated that since the District Authority was responsible for implementation of MPLAD Scheme, they were responsible/accountable for any violation/misuse of the Guidelines. This was being reiterated in the review meetings being taken by the Ministry and States/UTs. As and when any violation was reported, suitable action was proposed, including recouping of MPLADS funds and action against the concerned officials.

3.31 NABCONS had recommended that there was need to institutionalize an appropriate mechanism for concurrent/regular/on-going monitoring of all MPLADS works in order to ensure the quality of works at implementation stage. In this regard, the Ministry was asked whether there was any proposal to take any steps to create such

a mechanism for concurrent monitoring. The written reply furnished by the Ministry stated that wherever any lacuna in quality was pointed out by the NABCONS, the Ministry took up with the concerned district to have a quality check mechanism. In the proposed revision of Guidelines, it is proposed to allow Nodal Authorities to have a third party inspection from their contingency funds (which can include a concurrent evaluation/monitoring). It was also proposed that district authorities undertake inspection of the site before, during and after execution of the work with photographs and also create awareness among the local communities by measures such as, distribution of handbills in the vicinity of the asset, erection of hoarding at the work site, informing the local bodies about the proposed work, etc. It was further informed that the implementation of works was in the State's purview and there was no proposal in the Ministry to have concurrent monitoring at Ministry level.

3.32 As a follow up of the above submission of the Ministry, it was asked by the Committee whether there was any proposal to continue the monitoring by NABCONS, as it was essential to have some sort of monitoring by the Ministry. In its written reply, the Ministry stated that it proposed to continue to monitor the implementation of the MPLAD Scheme in different districts through NABCONS at present. So far, 133 districts had been covered in three phases and in the fourth phase in 2010-11, 75 districts would be covered. It was proposed that the rest of the districts would also be covered in the next four-five years. In order to continue the process of monitoring, the Ministry would like to continue to monitor the implementation of MPLADS through NABCONS and/or other agency(ies).

F. Monitoring delays in execution of MPLADS works

3.33 The Ministry had stated in its Background Note that adequate mandatory provisions exist in the MPLADS Guidelines to avoid delays in execution of MPLADS works and for speedy and successful execution of these works. Paras 3.11 & 3.12 of the Guidelines stipulate that all works recommended by MPs shall be scrutinized and sanctioned within 45 days from the date of receipt of recommendation. In case of delay due to genuine reasons, clarifications for delay should be incorporated in the sanction letter. The same may also be intimated to the MP and State/UT Govt. by the District

Authority. Para 3.13 *ibid* also mandates that the sanction letter shall stipulate a time limit which should generally not exceed one year, for completion of the work by the Implementing Agency. The sanction letter may also include a clause for suitable action against the Implementing Agency in the event of their failure to complete the work within the stipulated time as per the State Government procedure.

3.34 However, NABCONS had reported after their first phase of monitoring that in about 45% of the works inspected by them the time lag between the date on which the recommendation was made by the MP and the date on which the sanction was issued by the District Authority was more than 45 days and in about 40% of the works the completion period exceeded 365 days. In this regard, when the Committee asked during evidence what action was taken by the Ministry in this regard, the Secretary (S&PI) stated as follows :-

“As you may have noticed from the NABCONS report, about 45 per cent of the works are sanctioned with a delay of more than 45 days which is laid down in the guideline and about 55 per cent happens within the stipulated guideline. Much of this occurs because of the State Government procedures. In States where there is a larger delegation of powers down the line, the process of sanctioning is quicker. In cases where the States have complex procedures requiring meeting of various committees, that tends to delay because the district administration simply does not have the authority to issue the sanction. This is what we are trying to find out. I do not think that we can have a single solution to the problem, which cuts across every State because I do not think it is within our authority to be able to tell the State Governments that they should change their procedures. It is a much larger issue.

3.35 In regard to the sanction of the works recommended by the MPs within 45 days as stipulated in the guidelines, the Government of Meghalaya had suggested during the study tour of the Committee on MPLADS (Lok Sabha) to the State that the timeframe for sanction of proposals submitted by a Member of Parliament may be extended to 90 days as the existing time limit of 45 days was not sufficient considering the fact that most of the beneficiary organizations, e.g. Traditional Heads, Local Durbars, etc. especially from remote areas, had been experiencing great difficulties in adhering to the

existing time schedule for submission of all the necessary documents to the District Authorities.

3.36 The Ministry was asked, how would it expect the maximum time limit of one year for the completion of the project in the case of increasing time limit from 45 days to 90 days, it was stated in a written reply that the issue was being examined by the Ministry keeping in view both the feedback from the districts as well as from the MPs. It was mentioned that sufficient time was required for site visits, getting NOC from land owning agency, preparation of technical estimates, technical scrutiny/approval & administrative approval and other clearances. In the All India Review Meeting held with the State/UT Governments under the chairmanship of the Minister of State (Incharge) of Statistics and Programme Implementation on 06.08.2010, there was a consensus that within 45 days the District Authority should inform the MP in cases of rejection for some valid reason and within 60 days for sanction. As regards completion of projects, time taken would vary depending upon the size and complexity of the project and was usually specified in the contract signed by the Implementing Agency with the contractor and having a penalty clause as per State PWD rules. Para 3.13 of the MPLADS Guidelines prescribe that the letter/order sanctioning the work may also include a clause for suitable action against the Implementing Agency in the event of their failure to complete the work within the stipulated time as per the State Government procedure. The Ministry could not impose any other penalty clauses.

3.37 In regard to the inclusion of time limit for completion of work in the sanction letter and its strict adherence, the Government of Delhi had stated that the processing time consumed in award of works after the issue of sanction letter was generally six months. The Committee received a suggestion in this regard that it was necessary to minimize the time period from receiving recommendations for the works under MPLADS upto the beginning of work by the Implementing Agency. The Government of Tamil Nadu during the study tour of the Committee to Chennai had suggested that a minimum time period of 60 days be prescribed for the executing agency to prepare the estimates, call for tenders and issue work orders for works costing upto Rs. One crore. If there were

delays beyond the time prescribed, the executing agencies may be made responsible for the delay by the State Nodal Agency.

G. Limitations in Intensive Monitoring

3.38 While briefing the Committee about the provisions in the MPLAD Scheme guidelines on responsibilities of the Ministry in monitoring the Scheme, a representative of the Ministry stated as under :-

“ he MoSPI as well as the State Governments at the Secretariat level are responsible, more or less, at the macro level whereas for the micro level monitoring, it is always the responsibility of the cutting edge, which is the district authorities as well as the implementing agencies like Rural Engineering Wing, or municipalities or PWD etc. Although there is no doubt that the monitoring could be somewhat more intensified but there are limitations to monitoring. We have found practically that there are some limitations to intensive monitoring both at the MoSPI level as well as the district and the State levels. Some of these limitations are limitations to the availability of staff which we have pointed out in our report because against the posts which are sanctioned, namely 21, we have only 13 people in position.”

As a follow up of the above submission of the representative of the Ministry, the Committee asked to furnish the details of the functions of the MPLADS Division and its staff strength. As per the reply furnished by the Ministry, the following are the functions of the Division :-

1. The release of funds in respect of 790 continuing MPs and a large number of Ex-MPs of 35 States/UTs.
2. Parliament Questions and other Parliamentary matters.
3. All policy matters relating to MPLADS Guidelines and interaction with other Ministries and Departments.
4. Clarifications/interpretation of MPLADS Guidelines by District Authorities, State/UT Governments and other stakeholders.
5. Bi-annual All India Review Meetings.
6. Lok Sabha and Rajya Sabha Committees on MPLADS.
7. CAG/furnishing of information for internal audit.

8. Training on MPLADS Guidelines.
9. Preparation of Budget and related matters.
10. MPLADS Software and Work Monitoring System.
11. Analysis of reports received from NABCONS and follow-up action with concerned District Authorities and State/UT Governments.
12. Review of implementation of MPLADS in various States by the officers of this Division.
13. RTI matters.
14. Relief and Rehabilitation Works due to calamity like Gujarat Earthquake, Orissa Cyclone, Tsunami, Bihar flood, AILA in West Bengal, Leh Rehabilitation works, etc.
15. Preparation and publication of Annual Report on MPLADS.
16. Handling cases in various Court in India including Supreme Court and High Courts.
17. Preparation and implementation of Annual Action Plan, Strategy Plan and Result Framework Document (RFD).
18. Preparation of Weekly and Monthly Reports.
19. Introduction of Electronic Clearance System (ECS) for release of fund to the District Authorities.
20. Online Monthly Progress Reports (OMPRs).
21. Administrative matters relating to MPLADS Division.

3.39 Information on the sanctioned strength (since inception of the Scheme in 1993 and the incumbency position as per the reply furnished by the Ministry are as follows :-

Sl. No.	Name of the Post	No. of Post since inception	In position
1.	Deputy Secretary	01	01
2.	Under Secretary	02	01
3.	Desk Officer	02	-
4.	Assistant	03	03
5.	Steno rade C	01	-
6.	Steno rade D	02	01
7.	UDC	03	-

8.	LDC	03	03
9.	Peon	04	04
Total		21*	13

Note: In addition, 7 posts for Account Branch was also sanctioned, which could not be created.

In addition to above, the Ministry has diverted 10 officers and staff for the work related to MPLADS as well. It is evident from the above information mentioned regarding responsibilities of the Division and its staff that the Division does not has adequate staff to handle the increased load of work since inception of the Scheme. Hence, the Committee asked whether any work study was proposed to be conducted by the Ministry with a view to increasing the staff strength according to the increase in work load. In this regard, it was replied by the Ministry that no works study had been undertaken at the level of Ministry to cover the increased load of work in MPLADS Division. However, MPLADS Division has been provided some additional staff in view of the increased work load since 2005.

3.40 During the recent visit of the Committee to Mumbai, it was stated by the Government of Maharashtra that there was a need for a separate cell, both at the State level and District level, with adequate skilled manpower and infrastructure facilities to enable them to supervise, monitor and coordinate the works. They had suggested that the Government of India may be advised to permit creation of staff for the same at District level and State level and its expenditure be booked under the Scheme. NABCONS had also suggested that a provision for exclusive MPLADS Cell at district level may be made for better implementation of the Scheme in view of the dissipated focus of the District Authority officials in the involvement of MPLADS.

3.41 The above suggestions were brought to the notice of the Ministry. The Ministry in its written reply stated that it was examining the proposal to further strengthen the implementation of the Scheme at the District level. However, creation of a separate cell at the level of District/State required consultation with the State/UT Governments as well as provision of required funds, as this may not get fully accommodated within the 2% contingency fund proposed if the cells were to be created both at District and State levels. However, the demand of the States seemed genuine.

CHAPTER - III

Role of the State Government/UT Government

4.1 As per para 6.3 of the guidelines, a Nodal Department in the State Government is responsible for coordination with the Ministry and proper and effective supervision of the MPLAD Scheme implementation in the State.

(A) Monitoring through a Committee under the chairmanship of the Chief Secretary

4.2 As per the provisions contained in para 6.3 of the guidelines, a Committee under the chairmanship of the Chief Secretary/Development Commissioner/ Additional Chief Secretary should review MPLADS implementation progress with the District Authorities and MPs at least once in a year. In regard to the regularity of the meeting of this Committee, the Secretary, Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation informed during the first evidence as follows :

“The State level monitoring committee meetings are not very regular. We have been impressing upon the States that they must hold these meetings. Now, we have actually asked them to give us the minutes of the meetings as and when they are held so that we can keep track whether the meetings are actually being held or not”.

4.3 In this regard, the Committee asked the details of the States which have not conducted such meetings during the last five years and the action taken by the Ministry on them as part of its monitoring role. The Ministry in a written reply stated that it was regularly monitoring constitution/meeting of the Monitoring Committees at the State level during all the Review Meetings taken to review implementation of the MPLAD Scheme. Barring Mizoram, Dadra & Nagar Haveli, Daman & Diu, all States/UTs have constituted the Monitoring Committees as required under para 6.4 (vi) of the MPLADS Guidelines. As and when meetings of the Monitoring Committees were held, the minutes were sent to the Ministry to apprise it about the discussions held. During the

recent Review Meeting of 2009-10, all the States/UTs had been asked to conduct regular meetings and invite the MPs thereto. A summary statement indicating the details of number of meetings held and MPs invited, etc. is at Annexure-3. Perusal of the Annexure-3 shows that the Ministry did not provide any information on 15 States/UTs in the column meant for number and dates of the Monitoring Committee meetings. In this regard, the Ministry was asked, how did they monitor the implementation of the Scheme in the absence of such vital information. Moreover, perusal of the column, whether MP was invited or not and the number of MPs attended the meeting no information was provided by the Ministry in the cases of 20 States/UTs. Six States had not at all invited the MPs to the Monitoring Committee meetings. Out of the remaining 7 States who had invited the MPs, 2 of them had not invited MPs for all the meetings of the Monitoring Committee. The Ministry was asked, what were the reasons for not inviting them and what action the Ministry had taken in this regard. In its written reply the Ministry stated that the State Level Monitoring Committees had been in position in all the States except UTs of Dadra & Nagar Haveli and Daman & Diu who had been reminded in the recently held All India Review meeting on 06.08.2010. The States and UTs provide a copy of the minutes of the State level review meetings to the Ministry most of the time. The Ministry also reviews this aspect alongwith the implementation of the Scheme with the concerned Nodal Secretaries of the States/UTs to conduct these meetings regularly and invite all MPs of that State/UT. It is mentioned that as per information in the Ministry more than 40 such meetings have been held in various States/UTs.

4.4 During the recent visit of the Committee to Maharashtra and Tamil Nadu, it was found that no meeting of the Chief Secretary level Committee was held even though the Committee was in existence in both the States. In the case of Tamil Nadu, it was stated that the Scheme is being reviewed alongwith the other Central Sector Schemes by a Committee headed by the Deputy Chief Minister of the State. During their study visit to Assam, the Committee were informed that the Committee has been constituted under the chairmanship of the Principal Secretary, Planning and Development Department. During the last three years, the Committee met twice on 13.2.2010 and 21.03.2010. During the visit to Meghalaya, it was found that the Committee under the chairmanship

of the Chief Secretary met only twice during 2007-10 (on 13.11.2007 and 6.4.2010). The Govt. of West Bengal, during the Committee's visit to Kolkata had informed that no separate Committee had been constituted in the State due to restriction on formation of Committee. However, the Committee were informed that the State Level Review Meeting is conducted by the Chief Secretary once in a year on regular basis in which the Commissioner, Kolkata Municipal Corporation, Divisional Commissioners and MPs are invited. Implementation of the MPLAD Scheme is also reviewed in this meeting. In this regard, the Committee enquired about the steps being taken by the Ministry to ensure conducting of Monitoring Committee meetings at least once a year as envisaged in the guidelines. The Ministry in its post evidence replies stated that the guidelines have already been framed for monitoring by the State/UT Governments at the highest level so that the implementation of the Scheme could be reviewed in the presence of MPs concerned. The Guidelines do not bar any State/UT Government to review this Scheme alongwith the other Central Sector Schemes at the level of Deputy Chief Minister/Chief Minister. It is also stated that the different States/UTs do follow the system of review as practised by them for regular monitoring of implementation of various other Schemes. However, the meetings of the Monitoring Committee are required to be conducted, if above mentioned meetings are held without the participation of MPs.

During the second evidence, a representative of the Ministry further stated as follows:-

“We understand that a large number of States have been calling meetings and on the other hand a large number of States have also not been calling meetings. In one State, there is a combined meeting I think, it is Tamil Nadu for all the Centrally- sponsored Schemes. But we have been saying that in case in that meeting, the Members of Parliament are not called, then there should be a separate meeting where MPs should be called and where only MPLADS should be reviewed. We understand that all the States have not been calling these meetings once a year.”

(B) Inspection by the Officers of the Nodal Department

4.5 As per para 6.3 (vi) of the guidelines, the State/UT Government may authorize its Officers not below the rank of Deputy Secretary/Executive Engineer to inspect MPLADS

works as and when they make official fields visits. It may also check and review the number of MPLADS works inspected by the District authorities. In this regard, during the Study tours of the Committee to Maharashtra, Tamil Nadu, Assam, Meghalaya and West Bengal, the Committee asked for the details of the officers authorized by the State Government for the above purpose, the number of inspections carried out by them during the last 3 years, review made on the number of MPLADS works inspected by the district authorities and the follow up action taken based on the inspections and reviews conducted by State officials. The replies furnished by the State Governments to the above questions of the Committee are as under :-

(i) Assam

The Officers of Evaluation & Monitoring Division of the Planning and Development (P&D) Department inspect the MPLAD Scheme alongwith the other Schemes. The Director of P& D Department also inspects the MPLAD Schemes periodically. The Principal Secretary himself also reviews the implementation of the Schemes with the District Authority. The number of inspections conducted during 2008-2010 are as follows :-

<u>Year</u>	<u>No. of inspections</u>
2008	2 (Two)
2009	3 (Three)
2010	1 (One)

Regular review meetings with the District Authority are conducted. All issues are followed up as per guidelines for resolution and corrective action by the District Authority.

(ii) Maharashtra

The Planning Department vide its letters dated 17 & 27 January 2007 and 6 January 2010 has given instructions to the Divisional level officers and District Authorities to inspect the MPLADS works. As per the instructions issued by the State

Government, inspection is done at the divisional and District level. The State Government has not provided any information on the number of inspections conducted by the officers.

(iii) Meghalaya

A notification has been issued by the State Government vide Notification No. PIR 18/2002/140 dated 10.08.2006 authorizing the Executive Engineer of DRDA to inspect MPLADS works whenever they undertake official field visit. As per report from DC, Shillong, inspection is carried out by the Executive Engineer of DRDA.

(iv) Tamil Nadu

The Principal Secretary to Government, Rural Development & Panchayati Raj Department and Commissioner of Rural Development & Panchayat Raj and other State level Officers like Additional Directors & Superintending Engineer, inspect the works undertaken under MPLADS during their field visits. Besides at the District level, the District Collectors Project Directors, DRDAs, Executive Engineers and other senior District officials inspect MPLADS works. On an average each State level official goes for inspection for 8 days in a month. Approximately, 2,016 MPLAD works have been inspected in the last 3 years. The State level officials review the number of MPLADS works inspected every month with the District Authorities. The instructions given to the district authorities by the State authorities on the implementation of the Scheme during their inspection is being reviewed during the subsequent monthly review meetings of Project Directors & Executive Engineers of DRDAs. The feedback is also cross-verified during the subsequent visits to the districts.

(v) West Bengal

(a) The Nodal Department has appointed an Executive Engineer to monitor/review technical feasibility/implementation of the projects undertaken mainly in special cases or in cases where there are complaints. The details of such inspections conducted by the Executive Engineer in the districts of Purulia and Bankura provided by the State Government were furnished to the Committee. The nodal

department redresses the problems pinpointed by the Executive Engineer in consultation with the District Authorities.

4.6 The Ministry also furnished written replies obtained from a few States in the matter. The Govt. of Sikkim in its reply had stated that generally the State Government officers do not inspect the MPLADS works. In Arunachal Pradesh, the District Planning Officers inspect the MPLADS works from time to time. All the works are usually being inspected by Municipal Officers in Delhi. The Union Territory of Andaman and Nicobar had not furnished any information in this regard.

4.7 Perusal of the above information shows that except Tamil Nadu, the other States have not provided any concrete information on the number of inspections carried out by the officers of the Nodal departments in the State. Since no information was provided by the Government of Maharashtra in regard to the number of inspections conducted by State Government officials, it was pointed out that it is the duty of the Ministry to see whether the Guidelines are adhered to by the States. In this regard, the Ministry was asked whether it had taken up the matter with the Government of Maharashtra as to why they had not provided any information in this regard. The Ministry was also asked to furnish the details of the DS/EE level inspections conducted by other States. In a written reply the Ministry stated that it takes up the matter regarding implementation and monitoring of the Scheme during the bi-annual Review Meetings with the Nodal Secretaries of the State/UT Governments as well as during State level review meetings with district officials. It was also mentioned that the different States/UTs had their own administrative structure for touring and inspection by officers of various level to implement the various Schemes of the Government. In view of this, it would not be appropriate to impose a fixed number of days of touring/inspections for monitoring to each and every State/UT. Further, the MPLADS Guidelines have also not specified any number of inspections; however it has only mentioned that at least 10% of works should be inspected by the district officials.

4.8 Perusal of the above replies furnished by the States shows that none of the States have provided the details of the review conducted by them on the number of MPLADS works inspected by the District Authorities. The Ministry was asked whether it

asked for such details regarding number of inspections carried out by the district authorities. It was also requested to furnish the position in respect of other States in the matter. In reply, the Ministry stated that the District Authorities were the implementing authorities for the works recommended under the Scheme. In the absence of inspection register, the details about the number of inspected works may not be available and hence all district authorities had been instructed to maintain a inspection register, which would facilitate in getting such information.

CHAPTER - IV

Role of the District Authorities and Implementing Agencies

A. Inspection of 10% works by District Authorities and involving MPs in the Process

5.1 As per the guidelines, the District Authority is responsible for overall coordination and supervision of the works under the Scheme at the district level and they are required to inspect at least 10% of the works under implementation every year. They should also involve the MPs in the inspection of projects to the extent feasible. In this regard, during their Study Visits to Assam, Maharashtra, Meghalaya, Tamil Nadu and West Bengal, the Committee asked for the details of the inspections carried out as per the above mentioned provision and the follow-up action taken on findings of those inspections. They also enquired whether the MPs are involved in the inspection of the projects. The replies furnished by the States are as under :-

(i) Assam

Each and every Scheme was physically verified by the District Authority before release of the second installment. A format had also been devised for the purpose. Details of inspection reports which were with District Authorities can be examined if needed. Honble MPs are well informed about the progress of work of their recommended schemes and also of any issues regarding specific schemes during the implementation.

(ii) Maharashtra

The inspection of MPLADS works was done by the District Authorities. But, it was not possible to inspect the prescribed 10% of works by the District Authorities due to heavy work-load and insufficient staff. Generally, MPs were invited for the commencement as well as inauguration of the works but they were not involved in the inspection. It was not possible all the time to involve the MPs in the inspection as it was very difficult to co-ordinate & arrange visits according to suitable date & timings of the MPs and the District Authority.

(iii) Meghalaya

Inspection had been done by the District Authorities as required but the Deputy Commissioner, Tura informed that he could not cover the 10% of the works recommended by the MPs due to reasons beyond his control. So far none of the MPs had been involved. In regard to the follow-up action taken on the findings of the inspection, the State Government had stated that corrective measures have been suggested.

(iv) Tamil Nadu

The District Collector inspects the MPLADS works along with the other developmental works during their field inspections. Since the Project Directors and Executive Engineers inspect the works 12 & 15 days respectively every month, they inspect more than 10% of the works under implementation every year and also involve the MPs, wherever possible and they are also invited for the inauguration of the works after completion. The District Collectors review the follow-up action during their review meetings with implementing departments on the action taken on the instructions issued during their previous inspection of the field visit. The inspection notes were always prepared and communicated to all concerned.

(v) West Bengal

Sanctioning Authorities and their designated representatives regularly inspect works in the area where schemes under MPLADS are undertaken. The Members of Parliament are invited but in most cases the representatives of the Members of the Parliament accompany the officials of the District Administration during inspection. The District Authorities ensure the quality of the work. They also inspect whether the plaques were installed. They also ensure completion of work within the stipulated period of time and try to avoid inordinate delay in completion of Schemes.

5.2 The replies furnished by the Governments of Maharashtra and Tamil Nadu were brought to the attention of the Ministry and it was asked whether it had studied both the cases and had taken any action in this regard. The position in regard to the other

States was also sought from the Ministry. The Ministry in its written reply stated that during the various review meetings taken by the senior officers of the Ministry, it has been reported that inspection of works are carried out by them. However, no record for the same is maintained. In the absence of record, it was not possible to say whether less or more than 10% inspection of the works was taken up every year. Further, the shortage of staff at district level did hamper the inspection of work in most of States.

5.3 In regard to the involvement of Members in the inspection process, the Ministry stated that para 6.4 of the MPLADS guidelines states that the District Authority should involve the MPs in the inspections of the project to the extent feasible. However, the Members of Parliament can inspect the work during visit to their constituencies as and when required and they may convey their observation to the DCs/DMs.

5.4 In the monitoring by NABCONS it was found that no structural and specific inspection was being carried out by the District Authorities in 60% of the cases and no proper records of the inspection had been maintained in the District Collector s Office. The above observation of the NABCONS was brought to the attention of the Ministry and when it was asked, how did the Ministry propose to deal with that situation as inspection by district authority was the basis of the monitoring of implementation of the Scheme, the Ministry in a written reply stated that in various review meetings with the district officials, it had been reported that inspection of works was carried out by them but, no record for the same was maintained. Accordingly, the Ministry had directed the District Authorities to carry out the mandatory inspections and maintain the proper register for inspection. In this regard, a representative of the Ministry further informed the Committee during the oral evidence as follows :-

“ hen Sir the role of the district authority has been laid down. or monitoring they must inspect 10 per cent of the projects. We have recently reiterated and said that the district authority should do it. I have been touring the States and I have found the Deputy Commissioners saying that they do 100 per cent inspection whenever they pass that way. hey told me “It is not 1 per cent inspect. I have been doing more than that.” We have insisted them to maintain a register. Secondly, we have said “If the District authority or the District Magistrate has no time, then you can send your number two to do this inspection.” We have told them that they can send the CDO or the Additional District Magistrate or the Joint Magistrate to do this inspection. The definition of

district authorities includes all these Officers. We have asked them to maintain a register about doing 10 per cent inspection. In the case of Trusts they have to do 100 per cent inspection. We have not been getting full report for which we have reiterated from time to time with the Deputy Commissioners. Of course, the Deputy Commissioners have been reiterating their limitations. One of the limitations is the Contingency fund.”

B. Monthly review meetings by District Authorities

5.5 As a part of their monitoring role, the District Authorities should review every month MPLADS works implementation with the Implementing Agencies. They should also invite the MPs concerned to such review meetings. Perusal of Annexure 3 shows that out of 35 States/Union Territories, only 4 States viz. Assam, Goa, Kerala and Uttar Pradesh had given details of the review meetings held at the district level. During the Committee's Study Visits to Assam, Maharashtra, Meghalaya, Tamil Nadu and West Bengal, the offices of the Chief Secretary of the above States were asked to furnish the details of such review meetings held by the district authorities during the past three years and the participation of MPs in the review meetings. The replies furnished by them are as below :-

(i) Assam

District Development Committee (DDC) Meetings are held every month. Implementation of MPLAD Schemes are also reviewed. The suggestions/recommendations if any received from the honorable MPs are followed up. The details of the DDC meetings are monitored for every district in the P&D Deptt. including the implementation of MPLAD Schemes regularly. At the District level the District Authorities extend invitation to MPs. MPs are well informed from time to time. Follow up action as per guidelines are initiated.

(ii) Maharashtra

Number of such meetings varies from district to district. Generally, three to four meetings are held in a year. Review of the MPLAD works is done from time to time along with the other subjects when the officers of Implementing Agencies are present. MPs are invited to the review meetings. MPs take review of proposed, sanctioned and

completed works. Also, the information required by the MPs is provided from time to time i.e. MPR, lists of works sanctioned and the up to date position of the works. Implementing Agencies are communicated the instructions given by the MPs.

(iii) Meghalaya

The District Authorities hold monthly review meetings with the Implementing Agencies. Strict compliance with the stipulation in para 6.4 (vi) of the Guidelines that the District Authority should review every month MPLADS works implemented with the Implementing Agencies was found to be difficult as the District Authorities are overburdened. It is, therefore, suggested that the review may be done on a quarterly basis. The MPs were invited but they have not attended any meetings so far. The Monitoring Cell has been constituted for monitoring of MPLADS works in the West Garo Hills jurisdiction for inspecting and reviewing the progress of implementation of Schemes under the District.

(iv) Tamil Nadu

The District Collector reviews the implementing agencies twice every month pertaining to the implementation of MPLAD works. The meetings of the District Level Vigilance and Monitoring Committee under the chairmanship of the MP concerned are conducted once in three months in the Districts and the MPs of the District also participate in the meetings. The MPs are also invited for the meetings of the Governing Body of DRDA. The observations made by the MPs during the meeting are minuted and followed up by the implementing departments. These are also reviewed by the District Collector during the monthly meeting of Implementing Agencies.

West Bengal

The District Magistrate and the Commissioner, Kolkata Municipal Corporation review and monitor implementation of the programmes with the Implementing Agencies preferably in the presence of on ble MPs every month. Mostly the representatives of the on ble MP attend the meeting. Recently this department has issued instructions to the District Authorities and the Commissioner, K.M.C., for the review of the MPLADS

work implementation at the district level with the MPs invited to be convened at least every quarter vide memo No. 980(19)/DP/32S 1/2001 dated 22.04.2010. This is as per MOSPI's letter No. C/16/2009 MPLADS dated 31.03.2010. The eligible MPs are regularly invited in the meeting held by the District Authorities. But due to their busy schedule they often send their representatives in the meeting. The District Authorities direct the Implementing Agencies to streamline implementation of the scheme in accordance with the guidelines on MPLADS.

5.6 In regard to the above-mentioned circular dated 31 March 2010 of the Ministry, the Ministry informed the Committee in a written note that it had come to the notice of the Ministry that such Review Meetings did not take place regularly. Therefore, the States/UTs had now been asked by the Ministry to ensure that Review Meetings with MPs might be held by the District Authorities at least once in each quarter.

5.7 On perusal of the above information furnished by the Ministry, it was enquired whether the District level review meetings were now held at least once in each quarter and whether there was a proposal to add any data space in the Monthly Progress Report and in the software on Monitoring MPLADS works to enable the districts to furnish information on holding of review meetings by the Chief Secretary/District Authorities. The reply furnished by the Ministry in this regard was as under :-

“ The Ministry has issued instructions for holding of review meetings atleast once in each quarter. No feedback has yet been received from the District Authorities in this regard. The Ministry is again reiterating these instructions. However, suggestion regarding inclusion of an entry in the MPR for the review meeting at district level could be considered during the proposed revision of Guidelines.”

5.8 Annexure 3 also throws light on the fact that only three States, viz. Goa, Kerala and Uttar Pradesh had given information whether MPs were invited to the Monthly Review Meetings. Since the MPs were unable to attend the district level review meetings due to their busy schedules, the Ministry was asked whether there was any proposal to adopt the Tamil Nadu model in which MPLADS works were reviewed in the District Vigilance and Monitoring Committee as stated above. The Ministry in its written reply stated that it did appreciate the review mechanism followed by the Government of Tamil Nadu, however, such practice followed by one State Government need not be

made mandatory for other State/UT Governments. MPLADS guidelines prescribe that the District Authority should involve the MPs in the inspection of projects to the extent feasible. However, it may not be possible to impose any particular model on the States/UTs.

5.9 During the briefing meeting on the subject “Review of MPLAD Scheme guidelines” the Committee drew attention of the representatives of the Ministry to the fact that the Ministry of Rural Development was forcing the District Administrations to conduct the District Vigilance and Monitoring Committee meetings regularly and the reports were being sent by the District Authorities to that Ministry, and asked the Ministry to forcefully ask the District Administrations to regularly conduct quarterly review meetings in which local MPs are invited and to inspect 10 per cent of the MPLADS works as stipulated in the guidelines. In this regard, the Secretary, MOSPI stated during the briefing as below:-

“I would look into as to what RD (Ministry of Rural Development) is doing and see how I can make use of the same sort of template for myself. I have noted that point. It is a very useful point”.

5.10 The MPLADS works are actually executed by the Implementing Agencies. The Officers of the Implementing Agencies are responsible to regularly visit the work spots to ensure that the works are progressing satisfactorily as per the prescribed procedure, specifications and time schedule.

Observations/Recommendations

6.1 The Committee take a serious view of the provisions made in para 6.1 of the MPLAD Scheme guidelines which *inter alia* stipulate that there are two Committees of Parliament which receive proposals submitted by the Government of India to advise the Ministry for appropriate action. The Committee also take strong exception to the remarks made by the Secretary, Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation during evidence that both the MPLADS Committees of Parliament have been constituted as advisory Committees. During the Twelfth Lok Sabha, the issues and problems relating to the implementation of the MPLAD Scheme were discussed by both the Houses of Parliament. Leaders of parties/groups felt the need to have some sort of surveillance mechanism so as to monitor the implementation of the Scheme effectively. Eventually both the MPLADS Committees of Rajya Sabha and Lok Sabha were constituted to monitor and review periodically the performance and problems in the implementation of the MPLAD Scheme. Functions of both the Committees have been well laid out. The Committee observe that this provision, which the Committee find derogatory and uncalled for, has been incorporated in utter disregard of the status of Parliament in our polity. The Ministry has incorporated this provision in the Scheme guidelines for its own convenience. The Committee deprecate the callous attitude and approach of the Ministry in the matter. The Committee, therefore, direct the Ministry to amend this guideline as follows :-

Role of MPLADS Parliamentary Committees:

There are two separate Committees of Parliament (Rajya Sabha and Lok Sabha) on Members of Parliament Local Area Development Scheme to review periodically the performance and problems in the implementation of the MPLAD Scheme, to consider complaints of Members of Lok Sabha/Rajya Sabha (as the case may be) in regard to the implementation of the Scheme and to perform such other functions in respect of effective and efficient functioning of the MPLAD Scheme as may be assigned to it by the Speaker/Chairman (as the case may be) from time to time.

The amendment to the above guideline should be carried out by the Ministry within one month from the date of presentation of the Report and the Committee would like to be apprised of the action taken in this regard.

6.2 The Committee note that the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation (MoSPI) uses utilization certificate and audit certificate, the fund release mechanisms, as tools to monitor implementation of the Scheme. However, the Committee are concerned to note that there are delays in release of MPLADS funds till the fulfilment of conditions laid down through these mechanisms. Such delays in release of funds result in non-implementation of the Scheme in those constituencies which creates a false impression in the minds of the people that there are lacunae in implementation of the Scheme. Both the Ministry and the Nodal Departments in the States should be proactive in this regard. They should take up with the District Authorities the cases of delay in furnishing these documents. There should be a definite coordinating role for the Nodal Department in ensuring timely submission of Utilization and Audit Certificates by the District Authorities. The Committee, therefore, recommend that the following provision may be made in the guidelines :-

The Nodal Department in the States should coordinate with the District Authorities for timely submission of Utilisation Certificates and Audit Certificates. Wherever, there is a delay in submission of these documents, the Nodal Department should take up the matter with the District Authorities and ensure timely submission of these documents to the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation .

6.3 The Committee are concerned to note that the Ministry does not analyses the Monthly Progress Reports submitted by the District Authorities for taking action against those responsible for delays in completion of MPLAD Scheme works. The reasons adduced by the Ministry in this regard are that the Monthly Progress Reports (MPRs) have information on the number and cost of works recommended, sanctioned, completed, expenditure incurred, etc. which the Ministry uses for determining the eligibility for release of funds. As per the

Ministry, delay in completion of works cannot be analyzed on the basis of information provided in the MPRs which is presently furnished on-line in the electronic form by 40% of the districts. Moreover, MPRs do not contain the details of the individual works. The details of individual works are uploaded through the MPLADS Work Monitoring Software which was launched in November 2004. Even after a lapse of six years, data in respect of 1,270 Lok Sabha MPs of 10th to 15th Lok Sabha are yet to be uploaded into the Software. The Committee feel it is important to monitor the MPLADS works of 15th Lok Sabha so as to ensure their effective implementation. The Committee, therefore, recommend that the Ministry should take immediate steps to upload data pertaining to 15th Lok Sabha on priority basis within a definite time frame. The Ministry has also not given any definite information whether any follow up action was taken by it after analyzing the details provided by the States through the Work Monitoring Software particularly on delays in completion of the projects. Since both MPRs and Monitoring Software are not being effectively used for monitoring the MPLADS works, the Committee recommend that an integrated software incorporating features of both the on-line Monthly Progress Report and Work Monitoring Software should be immediately developed and launched at the earliest. The proposed integrated software should be simple, user friendly and less time consuming for the District Authorities to upload relevant information pertaining to the implementation of the Scheme. Moreover, a definite role should be assigned in the form of guidelines to the Nodal Departments of the States to monitor various aspects of the implementation of the Scheme through the proposed integrated software. The Committee also recommend that the Ministry should also monitor the overall implementation of the scheme in a State on monthly basis by using the Integrated Software and take-up within a time frame with the Nodal Departments the major violations/deviations including inordinate delays in completion of the projects.

6.4 The Committee note that the Ministry is monitoring the implementation of the MPLAD Scheme through the Bi-annual Review Meetings at the Centre. During these meetings, physical and financial review is done with the nodal officers who are mostly Planning Secretaries. Perusal of the minutes of one such review meeting held on 2 February 2010 shows that the entire review process with all the States was completed within a day which also included an address by the Minister of Statistics and Programme Implementation. The Committee are particularly concerned to note in the minutes that the progress in respect of States of Nagaland, Assam, Tripura, Puducherry, Chandigarh, Dadra and Nagar Haveli, Daman and Diu, Goa, Assam and Sikkim could not be reviewed since their representatives were either not present in the meeting or left before discussion. The above submission in the minutes is a pointer towards the lack of seriousness with which such Review Meetings are held. It appears that these meetings are being held more as a bi-annual ritual rather than as a serious business for effective implementation of the Scheme. Moreover, the presence of Members of Parliament and the District Magistrates is imperative for any meaningful discussion and follow-up action. The Committee, therefore, recommend that the Ministry may hold such review meetings once a year but it should spread the discussions region-wise. In a day, the delegates of a few States, which should include nodal Secretaries, Members of Parliament and the District Magistrates of the concerned States, should be invited for a holistic discussion on various aspects of implementation of the Scheme in their respective States.

6.5 The Committee note that senior officers of the Ministry undertake 2-3 meetings in a quarter with the States/UTs and the district officials to review the progress of implementation of the Scheme and also to inspect the work sites. During 2009-10, eight States were visited by the officers. In regard to the follow-up action taken by the Ministry on these inspections, the Ministry furnished information, in a routine manner, as is often given by the Ministry to the queries of the Committee, that the shortcomings found during the inspection are brought to the notice of the Nodal Secretaries for rectification and appropriate action. The Committee note with regret that the Ministry had not furnished even a single case

in which the shortcomings were brought to the notice of the State Government and the action taken by them thereon. In this regard, the Committee are of the view that such inspections by the senior officers of the Ministry should be result oriented. These should not appear to be a mere formality but leave a lasting impression on the District Authorities and Implementing Agencies to make them aware that the Ministry is monitoring them at the highest level. The Committee, therefore, recommend that violations noticed during those inspections and the delays in completion of the projects should be taken up by the Ministry on case to case basis with the District Authorities and ensure that the rectifications are carried out as per the action suggested by the Ministry.

6.6 The Committee note that the Ministry has engaged the NABARD Consultancy Services (NABCONS) for physical monitoring of samples of MPLADS works in selected districts of the country. So far 133 districts have been covered in three phases of monitoring. The fourth phase of monitoring is presently underway. It is heartening to note that the conclusions arrived at by NABCONS after its monitoring of the MPLADS works that the Scheme is a unique Scheme having the characteristic features of decentralized development and has resulted in the creation of fairly good quality assets towards economic and social infrastructure. 86% of the sample works monitored had a positive impact on the social structure/social fabric of the local community as generally there was mutual harmony and common acceptance of projects. There was also no social conflict or encroachment on works for private benefits. However, there have been instances of violation of MPLAD Scheme guidelines, such as delay in sanction/execution of works, poor maintenance of MPLADS assets, non-erection of plaques at work sites, etc. In this regard, the Committee note that the Ministry has sent these reports to all the District authorities who are responsible for the execution and has asked for their comments as well as rectification of the issues. It is very essential that the violations in implementation of the Scheme be followed up by the Ministry for their complete rectification so as to ensure effective implementation of the Scheme. The Committee, therefore, recommend that a separate Cell may be created in the MPLADS Division in the Ministry to

monitor such violations and to ensure that the violations are rectified immediately. Any delays in rectification of violations should be brought to the notice of the nodal departments and they together with the district authorities, should be assigned a definite role in the form of guidelines in this regard.

6.7 The Committee take note of the recommendation of the NABCONS that there is a need to institutionalize an appropriate mechanism for concurrent/on-going monitoring of all MPLADS works in order to ensure quality of works at implementation stage. Presently the Ministry monitors the implementation of the Scheme mainly through the fund release mechanisms of Monthly Progress Report, Utilization Certificate and Audit Certificate. It is also noted that presently the implementation of the works is in the purview of the States and there is no proposal with the Ministry to have concurrent monitoring at its level. The Committee feel that it is imperative to have an effective macro level monitoring at the Ministry's level and micro level monitoring in the States to ensure quality and timely completion of MPLADS works. The Committee, therefore, recommend that the Ministry should continue the physical monitoring being made by it through NABCONS even after the completion of the current monitoring by engaging NABCONS and/or other agency. The States should be asked to monitor the Scheme concurrently either on their own or through a third party inspection by using the contingency fund which is proposed to be increased soon. The Committee also recommend that these responsibilities of the Ministry and the Nodal Departments should be appropriately incorporated in the MPLAD Scheme guidelines.

6.8 The Committee are concerned to note that NABCONS had reported after their first phase of monitoring that in about 45% of the works inspected by them the time lag between the date on which the recommendation was made by the MP and the date on which the sanction was issued by the District Authority was more than 45 days, and in about 40% of the works, the completion period exceeded 365 days. The reasons quoted by the Ministry for this state of affairs is that the process of sanctioning is quicker in the States where there is more delegation of

power down the line and in the States which have complex procedures requiring meeting of various Committees, etc., there are delays in issue of sanction for MPLAD Scheme works. The Committee, however, are not convinced that it is not within the authority of the Ministry to tell the State Governments to simplify their procedures. Several Central Schemes are being implemented by the State Governments along with their own Schemes. It is understandable that there might be difficulties in following different sanctioning procedures for different schemes. However, the Committee are of the view that delays in sanctioning and in completion of MPLADS works is mainly due to complex procedures being followed by some of the State Governments. The Committee, therefore, recommend that the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation and Planning Commission may jointly study the procedures being adopted by the States/Union territories for MPLADS works and a model simplified procedure may be circulated to the States/ UTs for their suggestions. Based on their suggestions, an all India conference of nodal officers of the Planning and Development Departments of the States and Union Territories may be organized to adopt an uniform and easy to follow procedures for sanctioning, etc.

6.9 The Committee note that there is a proposal with the Ministry to amend the present provision in para No. 3.12 of the Guidelines which stipulates that all the eligible works should be sanctioned within 45 days from the date of receipt of recommendation from the MP. This issue of increasing time limit for sanction is being examined by the Ministry keeping in view the feedback received from the districts as well as from the MPs. The matter was discussed in the All India Review meeting held by the Ministry with the States/UT Governments on 6 August 2010 and a consensus was reached that within 45 days the District Authority may inform the MP in cases of rejection for some valid reason and the period may be increased to 60 days for sanction. The reasons put forth by the Ministry for the necessity of this amendment is that sufficient time is required for site visits, getting NOC from land owning agency, preparation of technical estimates, technical scrutiny/approval, administrative approval and other clearances. As per NABCONS Reports, presently 55% of the MPLADS works are sanctioned within 45

days. The proposed increase in time limit for sanctioning of MPLADS works will result in delaying of sanctioning of all the projects including those projects which are presently being sanctioned within 45 days. Moreover, there is a provision in the guidelines, (para 3.12) that a clarification for delay should be incorporated in the sanction letter in case of delay due to genuine reasons. Since there is already a provision to take care of the delays due to genuine reasons, the Committee are of the view that there is no need to increase the time limit from 45 to 60 days. The Committee, therefore, recommend that the proposal for increasing the period for sanction of work from 45 to 60 days may be dropped. The Committee also recommend that the District Administration should furnish the estimates of the work recommended by the MP along with the eligibility and technical feasibility of the recommended work within the stipulated period to cut short the delay in execution of the recommended works.

6.10 The Committee note the contention of the Ministry that micro level monitoring of the implementation of MPLAD Scheme rests with the District Authorities and Implementing Agencies. However, the Ministry has conceded in this regard that the monitoring at its level and at the level of the State Government can be intensified but the same could not be done due to limitations such as availability of staff. In this regard, the Ministry has further submitted that the MPLADS Division in the Ministry does not have adequate staff to handle the increased work load since inception of the Scheme. The Committee feels that it is important to follow up the findings of NABCONS, findings during the field visits of the officers of the Ministry and the findings of the Ministry through the Work Monitoring Software. The Committee, therefore, recommend that a Cell be set up in the MPLADS Division of the Ministry for the purpose. Moreover, the Ministry should request the Ministry of Finance (Department of Expenditure) to conduct a work study of the MPLADS Division and on the basis of the work study, appropriate steps should be taken to augment the staff strength of the Division to enable it to handle the increased work load.

6.11 The Committee note the suggestion of the State Government of Maharashtra that there is a need for a separate Cell both at the State level and District level with adequate skilled manpower and infrastructure facilities to be able to supervise, monitor and coordinate the works. NABCONS have also suggested that provision for exclusive MPLADS Cell at the District level may be made for better implementation of the Scheme in view of the dissipated focus of the District authorities in implementation of the Scheme. Since the district officials are involved in implementation of several schemes, it would be appropriate that a separate Cell with a few dedicated staff be created at the District level. The Committee, therefore, recommend that the Ministry should hold consultations with the States/UT Governments in this regard and based on the consultations, immediate steps should be taken by the Ministry to incorporate a provision in the MPLAD Scheme guidelines regarding setting up of such Cells at the District level. The Committee would also like the Ministry to co-ordinate with all concerned and keep track of the progress made in this regard.

6.12 The Committee further note that the contingency expenses are being met from the provision of 0.5% of annual allocation of MPLAD Scheme funds. Presently there is a proposal to increase the contingency fund to 2% in view of the inadequacy of the existing provision. As there has been no increase in the annual allocation of the MPLAD Scheme funds since 1995, including the proposed increase in contingency expenditure and the expenditure of the proposed cells at the district level, would further reduce the annual allocation of MPLADS funds. The Committee, therefore, recommend that a separate fund under non-Plan head be provided by the Ministry to meet the contingency expenses as well as the administrative expenses of the proposed Cells.

6.13 The Committee are concerned to note that the meetings of the State level Monitoring Committees under the chairmanship of the Chief Secretary, are not held regularly. As per the provisions contained in the MPLADS guidelines (para 6.3), the Monitoring Committees should review MPLADS implementation progress with the District Authorities and MPs at least once in a year. Perusal of the

information provided by the Ministry in this regard shows that 15 States/UTs have not provided any information in the column meant for the number and dates of the Monitoring Committee meetings held. Moreover, 20 States/UTs have not provided any information as to whether the MPs were invited to the meetings of the Monitoring Committee or not. In order to ascertain whether the meetings of the Monitoring Committee are held or not, the Ministry has now asked the States/UTs to provide the minutes of the meetings. In some States, the issues pertaining to the implementation of the MPLAD Scheme are discussed along with the other Central Sector schemes by Review Committees headed either by the Ministers or the Chief Secretary. Participation of MPs and the District Authorities in such review meetings is not explicitly known. The Monitoring Committee stipulated in the guidelines is the apex level body in the State to monitor the implementation of the MPLAD Scheme. The Committee, therefore, recommend the following in this regard :-

- (i) The Ministry should convey to the individual States/UTs which have not conducted Monitoring Committee meetings the concerns expressed by this Committee in this regard and ensure that they hold the Review Meetings regularly as stipulated in the guidelines.
- (ii) A suitable provision should be made in the guidelines that the States should mandatorily furnish the minutes of the Monitoring Committee meetings to the Ministry.
- (iii) Data space should be provided in the Work Monitoring Software for feeding the details of the meetings of the Monitoring Committee therein.
- (iv) It should be mandatory for review of MPLAD Scheme implementation in the cases of States where the MPs and District Authorities are not invited in the Review Meetings held by them for review of Central Sector Schemes.

6.14 The Committee are dismayed to note that four out of the five States visited by them, viz. Assam, Maharashtra, Meghalaya and West Bengal have not

furnished any information on the number of inspections conducted by State level officers thereby concealing the fact of conducting very few inspections. Only the State of Tamil Nadu had stated that the State level Officers go for inspection on an average of eight days in a month. Approximately, 2,016 MPLAD works have been inspected during the last three years. This may be one of the reasons that the State of Tamil Nadu has shown a very high performance of utilization of 97.31% of MPLADS funds allocated so far to the State. Effective field level inspection of the MPLADS works at the State level is very essential for success of the Scheme. The guidelines in this regard stipulate that the State/UT Governments may authorize its officers not below the rank of Deputy Secretary/Executive Engineer to inspect MPLADs works as and when they make official field visits. Since the guidelines have not stipulated any fixed responsibility on the part of the State officials to inspect the MPLAD Scheme, the State governments have not taken due interest in this regard. The Committee, therefore, recommend that a provision should be made in the guidelines that the State officials should inspect a minimum percentage of the MPLADS works in a district every year. An inspection register should be maintained at the State level and follow up action should also be taken on the findings during those inspections. The Ministry should also take steps to feed information relating to inspection conducted by the State officials in the Work Monitoring Software.

6.15 The Committee regret to note that none of the States visited by the Committee during 2010 have provided the details of the review conducted by the State officials on the number of MPLADS works inspected by the District Authorities during their field inspections. Only the State Government of Tamil Nadu had informed the Committee in this regard that the State level officials review a number of MPLADS works inspected every month with the District Authorities. On being asked to provide information in respect of other States in the matter, the Ministry had stated that the details about the number of inspected works may not be available in the absence of inspection register. The Committee take a serious view of lackadaisical approach of the Ministry in furnishing the replies. The responsibility of the Ministry does not end with the formulation of

the guidelines. It is also the duty of the Ministry to ensure that the guidelines are followed by the State Governments in letter and spirit. The Committee, therefore, recommend that the Ministry should direct all the States/UTs that the State officials, during their field inspections, should review without fail the number of inspections conducted by the District Authorities.

6.16 The Committee are anguished to note from the Report of the NABCONS that no structured and specific inspection is being carried out by the District Authorities in 60% of the cases and no proper records of the inspection have been maintained in the District Collector's Office. As per the guidelines, the District Authority is responsible for inspecting at least 10% of the works under implementation every year. Out of the five States visited by the Committee, two States, viz. Maharashtra and Meghalaya had expressed their inability to inspect the prescribed 10% of works by the District Authorities due to heavy work load, insufficient staff, etc. According to the Ministry, inspections are carried out by the District Authorities but no record of the same is maintained by them. Moreover, the Ministry is not getting full report of 100% inspection of works executed by societies and trusts as stipulated in the guidelines. Inspection by the District Authorities forms the basis of the monitoring of the Scheme. Proper inspection and timely submission of report thereof by the District Authorities will result in creation of quality assets under the Scheme besides avoiding delays, corruption, etc. The Committee, therefore, recommend that it should be mandatory for the District Authorities to maintain two inspection registers- one for showing the details of inspection of works carried out by the trusts and societies and the other for showing the details of works given to other agencies. A provision should be made in the guidelines in this regard. The Ministry may also take steps to feed information pertaining to inspections by the District Authorities in the Work Monitoring Software. The Ministry may also request the Members of Parliament through periodic circulars, that they may inspect the MPLADS works during their visits to various places in their constituency.

6.17 The Committee are constrained to note that only four States, viz. Assam, Goa, Kerala and Uttar Pradesh, had furnished to the Ministry the details of the monthly review meetings held at the district level as stipulated in the guidelines. In view of the above, the Committee asked for the details of the meetings from the States visited by them during 2010. While Tamil Nadu Government had stated that the District Collector reviews the implementation of MPLADS works with the Implementing Agencies twice every month and the MPs are reviewing the Scheme during District Level Vigilance and Monitoring Committee meetings, Meghalaya suggested that the monthly review may be held on quarterly basis as District Authorities are overburdened. Taking note of the above, the Ministry has reportedly asked the States to ensure that review meetings with MPs may be held by District Authorities at least once in each quarter. As the review at district level in the presence of MPs is likely to help in correction of deviations/mistakes and reduction of time and cost overruns on the part of the Implementing Agencies, the Committee recommend that the Ministry needs to forcefully call upon the States to ensure that Review Meetings are conducted at least every quarter in the presence of MPs either exclusively or during the District Vigilance Committee Meetings. The Ministry may follow the model of the Ministry of Rural Development in this regard. The Ministry should also take steps to furnish the details of district level review meetings by the district authorities through Monthly Progress Report and Works Monitoring Software.

6.18 The Committee note that the Implementing Agencies are responsible for regularly visiting the work spots to ensure that the works are progressing satisfactorily as per the prescribed procedure, specifications and the time schedule. Effective supervision on the part of the Implementing Agencies is essential for the creation of quality assets as desired by the people in fulfilling their local needs. The guidelines while stipulating maintenance of work register by the District Authorities, has not set any such responsibility for the Implementing Agencies. It is equally important for the Implementing Agencies to maintain their own work register. The Committee, therefore, recommend that a provision should be made in the guidelines that a work register should as well be

maintained by the Implementing Agencies showing details of the physical and financial progress of works being undertaken by them. These registers should also contain the details of the spot visits made by the Implementing Agencies. Responsibility may also be fixed on the part of the District Authorities to verify the work Register during their inspection of the works.

6.19 The Committee would like to be apprised of the action taken by the authorities concerned on the above recommendations within three months from the date of presentation of this report to the House.

New Delhi

**8 March, 2011
17 Phalguna, 1933 (Saka)**

**(A.K.S. VIJAYAN)
Chairman
Committee on Members of Parliament
Local Area Development Scheme
Lok Sabha**

ANNEXURE-1

Statewise Summary of Receipt of Full or Partial online data from Nodal districts against the total no. of Districts as on 22/03/2010

Sl No.	State	Total No. of Districts	Data Received	Data Not Received	Data Received			
					Total LS MP's	Total RS MP's	14th LS MP's	Sitting RS MP's
1	Andhra Pradesh	23	23	0	105	54	39	15
2	Arunachal Pr.	3	3	0	10	2	2	1
3	Assam	14	14	0	59	10	14	6
4	Bihar	32	28	4	51	18	35	9
5	Goa	2	2	0	8	3	2	1
6	Gujarat	22	22	0	83	16	26	7
7	Haryana	11	11	0	26	10	10	4
8	Himachal Pr.	4	4	0	12	8	3	3
9	J & K	6	6	0	6	4	5	3
10	Karnataka	25	25	0	63	20	28	8
11	Kerala	13	13	0	66	22	18	5
12	Madhya Pradesh	29	29	0	91	23	28	11
13	Maharashtra	34	34	0	236	55	48	20
14	Manipur	2	1	1	1	1	1	1
15	Meghalaya	2	2	0	10	6	2	1
16	Mizoram	1	1	0	1	1	1	1
17	Nagaland	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
18	Orissa	21	21	0	80	23	21	8
19	Punjab	11	11	0	71	25	13	7
20	Rajasthan	24	24	0	89	15	23	5
21	Sikkim	1	1	0	3	3	1	1
22	Tamil Nadu	30	30	0	68	51	39	16
23	Tripura	2	2	0	2	2	2	1
24	Uttar Pradesh	63	63	0	303	94	80	32
25	West Bengal	18	18	0	185	35	42	14
26	A & N Islands	1	1	0	3	0	1	0
27	Chandigarh	1	1	0	6	0	1	0
28	D & N Haveli	1	1	0	2	0	1	0
29	Daman & Diu	1	1	0	1	0	1	0
30	Delhi	1	1	0	14	9	7	5
31	Lakshdweep	1	1	0	2	0	1	0
32	Pondichery	1	1	0	3	3	1	1
33	Chhattisgarh	10	10	0	49	13	11	5
34	Uttaranchal	5	5	0	9	6	5	4
35	Jharkhand	14	14	0	40	9	14	3
		430	424	6	1757	541	526	198

ANDHRA PRADESH

PHASE I

DISTRICT-EAST GODAVARI:- Not much serious violations was found except the common points mentioned in part C of the reply.

DISTRICT-KARIM NAGAR:- Not much serious violations was found except the common points mentioned in part C of the reply.

PHASE II

DISTRICT-RENGAREDDY:- Not much serious violations was found except the common points mentioned in part C of the reply.

DISTRICT-CHITTOOR :- Unauthorized usage of MPLADS works:- The premises of Godown in the premises of Mandal Parishad Office, Punganur and construction of community hall at V.kota are being used as commercial shopping complex and are rented out by the concerned Mandal Parishad .

DISTRICT-GUNTUR

Ineligible Works :-The NACONS report mentioned the following works as ineligible :-

- ❖ **Construction of Prohibition and Excise Employees Welfare & Computerization Centre :-** The building seems to be an asset for the office or for an association of employees only.
- ❖ **Completion of Balance Works towards Mutton and Fish Market :-** Completion of incomplete works is not permissible under the Scheme. Moreover, works towards commercial ventures / shops are ineligible as per the Guidelines

ARUNACHAL PRADESH

PHASE I**DISTRICT-LOHIT**

❖ **Improper usage of MPLADS Assets :-**

- i. **Multi purpose community hall at Namsai** has been converted to an office (SE Hydropower).
- ii. **Multipurpose community hall at Mahadevpere** is being occupied by CRPF.
- iii. **Maternity unit 4 bedded attached to PHC Mahadevpur.** has been converted to a nurse's quarter.

ASSAM

PHASE I**DISTRICT-JORHAT**

Non eligible work :- The NACONS report mentioned the following works as ineligible :-

- ❖ **Renovation of an old school ,Renovation of a college hostel, Renovation of principal room in a College, Providing marble flooring to a building, Part work in Titabor stadium and Jorhat stadium.**

- ❖ Two works of construction of Community Hall in religious place or attached to religious places.
- ❖ The work of Dhekiakhowa Samuhik Unnan Prokalpa, which comes under other public facilities category, has been used for commercial purpose.
- ❖ Two works have been occupied by the BDO and the Army and one work is not accessible due to security reasons.
- ❖ The work of Diamond Club KVK and Cherianial Jorhat, have been kept under lock and key.

PHASE II DISTRICT-CACCHHAR

- ❖ **Sanction of Ineligible works:-** The NACONS report mentioned the following works as ineligible
 - i. In the case of the road projects **Imp. Of GC college –Ramnagar via Satsang Ashram, Imp of road with BT of damaged portion in SMB area, Imp of Road from Chamra Godam to Badrighat ,Silchar**, it has been found that only patch works has been done and hardly no maintenance and completely deteriorated.
 - ii. In the Bridge projects **Construction of Bridge 2/3 Udharbond-Doyapur, Construction of Bridge 2/2 over Gorgori Nalla @ 2km of SMD road to JHARGUL via Burilia Tillah**, replacement of components of old wooden bridge has been done and no maintenance has been found.
 - iii. **Construction of community Hall Near Bara Masjid** which is attached to religious place.

BIHAR

PHASE I

DISTRICT-NALANDA:- Not much serious violations was found except the common points mentioned in part C of the reply.

DISTRICT-PATNA:- Not much serious violations was found except the common points mentioned in part C of the reply.

PHASE II

DISTRICT-MADHUBANI

Sanction of Ineligible works :- Renovation type work has been awarded to Giridhar Public Library, Madhubani of 5 lakh project. It was used for election training and reported that it is mostly closed and not much impact or use.

DISTRICT-GAYA

- ❖ **Ineligible work :-** The NACONS report mentioned the following works as ineligible.
 - i. The one hall of about 20'x 30' had been constructed for Bar Association of Ghaziabad which is an accommodation of Private Professionals rendering services for their profit.
 - ii. Widening of Dhualana Gulawati Marg from 10 Km. to 14 Km. has been sanctioned.

CHATTISGARH

PHASE I

DISTRICT-RAIPUR:- Not much serious violations was found except the common points mentioned in part C of the reply.

PHASE II

DISTRICT-RAIGARH

Ineligible work :- A Mango Nursery (horticulture), Pussore:- The asset has been created involving a cost of Rs. 5.62 lakh for growing horticulture crops. It is not clear, which agency is managing the Nursery. While social forestry is permissible, any activity related to earning of livelihood is not permissible.

GOA

PHASE II

DISTRICT-SOUTH GOA

❖ **Sanction of ineligible works :-**

- Improving and widening of road Agallie Junction to corporation bank, Vidyanagar, Margao which is coming under **the repair /renovation type work.**
- The following Community Halls were constructed near and within the premises of religious places.
 - i. Construction of Community Hall to Shantadurga Bhumipurush Saunsthan, Quepem.
 - ii. Construction of water tank (tail) for Shantadurga Bhumipurush saptakoteshwar Saunsthan Quepem.
 - iii. Construction of Playground & recreation Centre at Padma Narayan Estates near Multi Complex, Gogal.
 - iv. Construction of Community Hall for Dahajan Samaj at Karanzal in V.P. Madhai, Ponda.
 - v. Construction of Community Hall near Mahadev Temple at Cotambi, Quepem and it is closed as here are differences between two factions of the local community.
 - vi. Construction of Community Hall near Staten Temple at Xeldem, Quepem
 - vii. Construction of Community Hall for Mahamaya Davalaya at Nundem. Sanguem.

❖ **Unauthorised Usage:-**Unauthorised usage has been observed in the following cases:-

- i. Few **coaching classes** are being conducted in the premises Gymnasium and Multipurpose Open-air Court at Chandrawado Fatorda for MMC Margao.
- ii. Public health Centre for Lions club ,(PHS) Majorda- Consaulin,marmagoa is used for meetings ,rented for the services of medical GP thrice a week.
- iii. Playground at Raia VP is **hired out** to schools for open sports tournaments for protection in addition to the utilization by PRI.

GUJARAT

PHASE I

DISTRICT-ANAND:- Not much serious violations was found except the common points mentioned in part C of the reply.

PHASE II

DISTRICT-SURAT :- Not much serious violations was found except the common points mentioned in part C of the reply.

DISTRICT-DAHOD

Sanction of Ineligibile works:- These two projects Deepening tank at Village Chhetroadiya Ta.Zhalod, Public Park and Tank Development in Dahod are coming under 'Repair and Renovation'.

HARYANA

PHASE I

DISTRICT-ROHTAK

- ❖ Full advance has been given to all 55 sample works.
- ❖ Works by Trust: - One agency Aurobindo Institute of Indian Culture benefited by obtaining funds under MPLADS for 9 projects involving a financial sanction of Rs.1.29 crore during the period from March 1999 to July 2003. Also it has been observed that there are no norms for awarding works to Society / Trust / NGO. No inspection has been done by the District Authority on the works carried out by NGO/Trust/Society.

PHASE II

DISTRICT-KURUKSHETRA

- ❖ **Sanction of Ineligible Work :-** The one sample work viz. Construction of Room on first floor in Kashyap Rajput Sabha was in the category of ineligible works, as an asset cannot be for a single community.
- ❖ **Ambiguous Nature of Works :-** There are few works for which more details on construction of assets under MPLADS are required.
 - i. Construction of Reading room and Toillet in district court Kurushetra :- Whether asset created under MPLADS are used by general public or by lawyers.
 - ii. Construction of Panchayat Ghar :- Whether it is a office of the Panchayat and what activities take place there.
 - iii. Construction of Bhojnalaya in Gurukul :- The utility of the Bhojnalaya for public / students.
 - iv. Construction of Mathematical Lab in Mahavir Public School.
 - v. Construction of Room on first floor of Kashyap Rajput Sabha.

DISTRICT-SIRSA

Unauthorised Usage :- It has been observed that a part of the Bai Bhawan in Kalanwali was given on rent to Deaddiction centre.

HIMACHAL PRADHESH

PHASE I

DISTRICT-HAMIRPUR:- :- Not much serious violations was found except the common points mentioned in part C of the reply.

PHASE II
DISTRICT-SHIMLA

Ineligible work :- The construction work of multipurpose Complex, Nagar Panchyat, Kothai involving cost of Rs. 3 lakh has been given to private business persons for their profit. This complex is working as a business hub.

JAMMU & KASHMIR

PHASE I
DISTRICT-JAMMU

- ❖ **Ineligible works :-** Construction of Retaining Wall/Toe wall of Nallah On Kameshwar Temple road for parking area in Akhnoor and Construction of Bathing Ghhat / Retaining wall at Devak river in Purmandal block, are ineligible works under MPLADS as these works were taken up in religious places.

DISTRICT-KATHUA

Ineligible Works :-

- i. **Upgradation of Block Kathua – Kalibari Road :-** It seems that already existing road has been repaired and maintained.
- ii. **Purchase of crates for protection of land and houses in Kathua :-** It is not clear what is meant by purchase of 'crates'. Purchase of all moveable items except vehicle, earth movers, equipments for hospital, educational, sports, drinking water and sanitation purposes belonging to Government are prohibited under the Guidelines.
- iii. **Improvement and Construction of Drain etc at Bahayia Link Road:-** The 'improvement' of the already existing drain relates to repair and maintenance work.
- iv. **Construction of Painting Centre at Basohli:-** It is not clear whether the work is a community development asset or for the earning of livelihood.

JHARKHAND

PHASE I
DISTRICT-RANCHI

- ❖ **Ineligible works :-** The following projects are coming under ineligible works.
Police Building, Kukri (Auditorium + 6 rooms) of 25 lakh and Police Building, Kukri (Completion of extension of guest house) of 10 lakh sanctioned for construction of Kukhri Guest house constructed for Jharkhand Armed Police.
- ❖ Total of Rs.53.89 lakh worth of four works have been sanctioned to the same Trust, Purshree Trust.

PHASE II
DISTRICT-WEST SINGHBUM

Sanction of Ineligible works:- ए सदर प्रकल्प अन्तर्गत उपायुक्त, पश्चिमी सिंहभूम, चाईबासा के आवास के समीप गौशाला तालाब पथ का निर्माण। which was earlier implemented under MPLADS, but had again been renovated under MPLADS.

KARNATAKA

PHASE I

DISTRICT-BANGLORE URBAN:- Not much serious violations was found except the common points mentioned in part C of the reply.

PHASE II

DISTRICT-BANGALORE RURAL

❖ **Ineligible works:-** The following works were not found eligible:-

- Three works included repairs/rejuvenation of government schools like repairs to school building at Kanasawadi, special repairs works at Arodi Government Model Senior Primary School at Arodi Gram Panchayat limit Arodi., Govt. Higher Primary School at Doddaballapura town, were not eligible as per MPLADS Guidelines.
- **26 road works** out of the 30 sample road works related to metalling, asphaltting and improvements to various stretches of existing roads.

DISTRICT-BIJAPUR

❖ **Sanction of Ineligible Work :-** The following works were reported to be ineligible as the MPLADS Guidelines.

- i. Construction of Lawyers Association building :- An asset only for lawyers.
- ii. Construction of Ambedkar Bhawan:- Office building is not permissible under MPLADS Guidelines.
- iii. Construction of Ajeet Bhawan to Sainik School:- Used as guest house for Central School. It is ineligible as it forms part of office infrastructure.
- iv. Construction of Police Thane :- Provision of office building is not permissible.
- v. Renovation of Wood Gym and Relying of Hockey Ground:- Renovation is not permissible.
- vi. Construction of Cultural building at Police ground:- It is not for community use. It is being used by Police Welfare Association only.
- vii. Improvement of road from Shegunasi to Mamadapur
- viii. Improvement of road, asphaltting of road and W.B.M. (8.04 Km) in Bijapur city
- ix. Improvement of road near Sanskritik Bhavan
- x. Improvement of road from Indi road to Shastri Market
- xi. Improvement of road from Nagthan to Jambagi (5 Km) (1997-98)
- xii. Improvement of road from Domanl to Savalsang (2000-01)

❖ **Diversion of use of assets :-** In the following cases the works were used other than the purpose envisaged while sanctioning the work.

- i. The Sports & Cultural building :- Constructed for Budhvihar at Bijapur was used as a Hostel for Bhikkus of the Budhvihar.
- ii. The building constructed for the purpose of library was used as Administrative office by the Karnataka Milk Federation, Bijapur.

KERALA

PHASE I

DISTRICT-ALAPPUZHA

Improper usage of MPLAD Assets :- It has been reported that 'Community Hall at Krishnaapuram' is exclusively used as the Gram Panchayat office.

PHASE II

DISTRICT-KANNUR :- Not much serious violations was found except the common points mentioned in part C of the reply.

DISTRICT-MALAPPURAM

Diversion of Use :- The work of construction of building for Mappila Study Centre at Tirurangadi:- An amount of Rs. 10 lakh was accorded for the construction of the said study centre in February 2001 and the work was completed in December 2002. The asset remains vacant for long time and now it is being used as Panchayat Office.

MADHYA PRADESH

PHASE I

DISTRICT-BETUL:- Not much serious violations was found except the common points mentioned in part C of the reply.

PHASE II

DISTRICT-BHOPAL

❖ Ineligible Work :-

- i. **The work of construction of Guardroom, Boundary Wall, Tulsimanas, Shamla Hills:-** An amount of Rs. 5 lakh was sanctioned for the construction of the said structure which is, not a community asset for the general public.
- ii. **The work of construction of building for Sharda Vihar, Jan Kalyan Samiti, Bhopal:-** An amount of Rs. 10 lakh was sanctioned for the construction of said asset which was used as residential accommodation for the staff of school.

❖ Ambiguous Nature of Work :-

- i. **The work of construction of Rainbasera, Hamidiya Parishad, Bhopal:-** An amount of Rs. 7 lakh was sanctioned for construction of the said asset. Though it is being used for stay of attendants of patient of hospital, it is not clear whether the asset is used only on non-profit basis and not for earning livelihood / profit.
- ii. **The work of construction of Aushadhalaya Bhavan, Ramanandnagar:-** An amount of Rs. 7 lakh was sanctioned for the creation of said asset. The purpose of creation of this asset is not clear. However, it is being used for stay of staff.

iii. The work of construction of Sahityakar Bhawan, Shamla Hills Bhopal:- An amount of Rs. 5 lakh was sanctioned for the creation of said asset. It is not clear whether this asset is for community use. It appears that it is being used by a section of people for their professional purpose.

iv. The work of construction of Meditation Hall and other works at Kerba Dam :- An amount of Rs. 10 lakh was sanctioned for the construction said asset. However, it is not clear whether this is put to community use or being used by a confined group of people.

❖ **Diversification of Use :-**

The work of construction of Community Hall, Badziri (work code - 01) :- An amount of Rs. 8.7 lakh was sanctioned for the construction of the said asset. It is being used as Women's Sewing Training Centre.

DISTRICT-REWA

Ineligible Works :-

- i. The work of construction of drainage and road in Police line at Rewa costing Rs. 9.16 lakh is has been carried out in Government premise.
- ii. The Provision for X-ray machine to Ramkrishna Seva Sansthan at Godhar, Rewa costing Rs. 6.1 lakh is ineligible work as it has been provided to the president of RKSS which is privately owned by an individual.

DISTRICT-UJJAIN

- ❖ **Sanction of Ineligible work :-** The one work viz. repairing of bund in Jastakhedi Lake
- ❖ **Ambiguous Nature of Work :-** The following assets are found to be ambiguous with regard to admissibility :-

- i. Construction of Sant Ravi Das Ghat on Shipra River
- ii. Extension work of Ram Ghat on Shipra River .

MAHARASHTRA

PHASE I

DISTRICT-AURANGABAD

- ❖ **Ineligible works: -** Construction of cultural hall at Shivajinagar, Vaijapur, Construction of cultural Hall at Sayyadpur, Aurangabad, Construction of cultural Hall at Shivur, Vaijapur and Construction of Public Toilet Block at Waki, Kannad were carried out on land belonging to temple trusts. One concrete road constructed at Pratapnagar, Aurangabad was for a private cooperative housing colony. This road was constructed exclusively for the benefit of a private housing colony, in a privately owned land, the ownership of which was under legal dispute.

DISTRICT-WARDHA

❖ **Ineligible works:** - The following three works falls under ineligible works:-

- i. A cultural hall at Sidhivinayak Temple at Kelzer, Selu and a compound wall to Dargah Sharif Khwaja Sheikh Farid Dargah at Girad, Samudrapur were carried out at places of worship.
- ii. A community hall was constructed near Collector's office for providing office space to Government departments.

PHASE II

DISTRICT-AHMED NAGAR

❖ **Sanction of Ineligible works :-**

- i. It has been reported that all community halls / cultural halls were constructed near the temples or temples were constructed inside the community hall.
- ii. Public Gallery at police parade ground of Rs. 7.49 lakh sanctioned in the year 2005 constructed for police department in which public access was restricted.

❖ **Encroachment :-** For the following 4 cases the encroachment of MPLADS works was observed.

- i. The Sabhamondop near khadkapura mandir, Village Kharda (Khadakpura) Ta Jamkhed was constructed near Masjid, scrap dealer Mr. Hussain Banemia using it for storing scrap and it was also used as animal shed.
- ii. The Sanskrutik Bhavan at Rahimpur Taluka Sangamner was locked for all time and Milk society was having the key of the hall.
- iii. The Library Hall at Wambori Tal, Rahuri was used as class room. It was not constructed as per plan and other construction was done above the hall.
- iv. The key of Cultural hall at Hatgaon Tal Shegaon was with a private doctor which should have been with PRI.

DISTRICT-CHANDRAPUR

❖ **Sanction of Ineligible Works :-**

- i. **The waiting hall in Collector's office, Chandrapur:-** The construction of waiting hall is not a work for general public and is not permissible under MPLADS Guidelines.
- ii. **Construction of multipurpose hall in Collector's office:-** The construction of multipurpose hall is not a work for general public and is not permissible under MPLADS Guidelines.
- iii. **Kisan Bhawans :-** 'Kisan Bhawans' have been sanctioned, but the exact purpose and whether they are eligible as per Guidelines is not clear.

❖ **Encroachment of MPLADS works were observed in following three cases :-**

- i. **Construction of Rangmanch in Shivaji High School, at Pandarpauni, Tal. Rajura:-**A poor family had been found to be taken shelter on the stage in school.
- ii. **Beautification of Gandhi Chowk at Warora, Tal. Warora:-** The asset is being used as 'GADITAL' by small transport operators, which is a blatant change of the usage.

❖ **Diversion of Use of Assets :-**

The diversion of use of assets was reported in the following cases :- **Construction of Stadium** at Mul, Tal. Mul:- The board displayed on the asset clear implied use of the building as office premises of **Taluka Sports Officer**. The use of the hall needs monitoring from District Sports Authority.

DISTRICT-MUMBAI SUBURBAN :- Not much serious violations was found except the common points mentioned in part C of the reply.

MANIPUR

PHASE II

DISTRICT-IMPHAL WEST

❖ **Sanction of Ineligible works:-**

- i. Rs. 4 lakh has been sanctioned to the project 'Construction of wall fencing and drainage in and around Imphal West DC Bungalow, Babupara' which has been done in and around the **residential building belong to State Government**.
- ii. Total of Rs.63 lakh has been released from MPLADS fund for the projects **Construction of market complex at Khumbong, Construction of first floor at Khumbong market, and Construction of Khumbong vendor hall** which are coming under Commercial establishments.
- iii. Rs. 24 lakh has been sanctioned for **Construction of working women hostel, Imphal** which is also coming under commercial Establishment.

❖ **MPLADS assets could not be traced:-**

- i. Even after sanctioning of Rs.25 lakh from MPLADS fund ,the project **Women Maternity Shed at Thongkhong, Lakshmi Bazaar** could not be traced.
- ii. Library at Langol sanctioned for Rs. 5 lakh.
- iii. VIR from NH 39 to Hathinkhaw lane, Kanglatombi sanctioned for Rs 4 lakh

❖ **Unauthorized Usage :-** The **Community Hall at Kanglatongbi, Imphal West** has been using as market centre.

MEGHALAYA

PHASE I

DISTRICT-SHILLONG

Works by Trust: - One agency **Aurobindo Institute of Indian Culture** benefited by obtaining funds under MPLADS for **9 projects** involving a financial sanction of **Rs.1.29 crore** during the period from March 1999 to July 2003.

ORISSA

PHASE I

DISTRICT-KHURDA

- ❖ Encroachment was observed in the hostel building of Narayan Mansingh High School, Antekiari, Banpur, reported that this has been given on rent.

PHASE II

DISTRICT-BOLANGIR

- ❖ The following works are coming under repair/renovation type which is prohibited under MPLADS such as:-

- i. Impvt.of road Bhaler to Chhatapipal
- ii. Impvt.of road Beherapali to Bandhapada
- iii. Impvt.of road from old chowk to mausima chawk, Titlagarh
- iv. Special repair works at Dist HQ hospital, Bolangir.

DISTRICT-PURI

- ❖ **Sanction of Ineligible works:** - The following two works have been taken place in the premises of religious places.

- i. Construction of Baba Rabi Narayan Ashram Bidyalaya, Tala Bania.
- ii. Construction of Library Building of Baba Rabi Narayan Gurukula Ashram Vidyalaya Sri Ram Nagar, Tala Bania.

- ❖ **Release of Advance:** - In all cases 100% advance has been released in one installment

PUNJAB

PHASE I

DISTRICT-LUDHIYANA

Sanction of Ineligible works :- Special repair of Balmiki Dharmshala at Ward.no-4.

PHASE II

DISTRICT-JALANDHAR

- ❖ **Sanction of Ineligible works :-**

- i. Repair of drains/path in Goraya.
- ii. New construction, addition. & alteration at Nari Niketan Trust building, Jalandhar.
- iii. Construction /repair of rooms GPS Vill. Samrai.
- iv. Uplifting of Burlton Park Jalandhar.

All these works are coming under the repair and renovation category.

- v. Construction of Administration block-Lyallpur Khalsa College(M),Jalandhar which is being used as **official purpose**.
- vi. Hostel for working women, Jalandhar which is being used as **commercial purpose**.

- ❖ Encroachment were found :- Encroachment were found in the Public Library/reading hall Judicial Court Compound, Jalandhar which was occupied by the BAR Association.

RAJASTHAN

PHASE I

DISTRICT-JODHPUR:- Not much serious violations was found except the common points mentioned in part C of the reply.

PHASE II

DISTRICT-ALWAR

Sanction of Ineligible work :- The one work viz. construction of community hall and toilets near Bharitrihari Temple .

DISTRICT-UDAIPUR

Ambiguous Nature of Work :- The work of construction of building at Rajasthan State Bharat Scout & Guide, Divisional Head Quarter:- An amount of Rs. 5 lakh was accorded for the construction of said asset, however it is not clear whether the asset created is for the use of general public or for the use of the organisation as an office or its activities.

SIKKIM

PHASE II

DISTRICT- (EAST DISTRICT) SIKKIM

MPLADS Assets are not traceable :- The two MPLADS assets, Improvement of link road at Lingdum and Construction of playground and fencing work at Cheda School near Museum of Tibetology, Deorali could not be located by the study team and also by the official of Rural Management and Development Department.

TAMILNADU

PHASE I

DISTRICT-THIRUVANNAMALAI

- ❖ Ineligible Works :-

- i. Community Hall at Town Panchayat Compound in Chengam is being used as the panchayat office.
- ii. Special Repairs to Kalasthambadi-Porkunnam Road in Tiruvannamalai block: Two stretches of special road repair works were sanctioned in October 2006.
- iii. Construction of Shopping Complexes: The shopping complex were sanctioned in Kilchettipattu village, Singamvadi village, Kilpennattur village and Kilsimpakkam villages .

- ❖ Asset in idle nature:- PHC at Ulandai at Vandavasi block though completed and inaugurated in March 2006, is yet to be put to use.

PHASE II

DISTRICT-RAMNATHPURAM

Ineligible works :- As per the report the following two works are found to be ineligible as per the Guidelines.

- i. **Group Houses of Peraiyur:-** The work seems to relate to construction of individual houses for the poor people, which violates the MPLADS Guidelines, as no individual asset can be created under the MPLAD Scheme.
- ii. **Retaining wall – Muthuramalinga Thevar Samadhi –** deepening of the Oorani :- It seems that a retaining wall has been constructed around a Memorial or Samadhi.

DISTRICT-KANCHEEPURAM

Case of encroachment:-It has been reported that Houses have been built inside the Irrigation tank at Madambalkam by the encroachers.

UTTAR PRADESH

PHASE I

DISTRICT-AGRA

❖ The following road works are related to maintenance/ upgradation only.

- i. **Road from Nagla Budi towards Dayalbagh - 1.15 kms :-** During 2001-02 The MPLAD fund of 9.03 lakh was used for the upgradation of the road from earth work to soling. In 2002-03 the same road was further upgraded to PC level by using MPLAD fund of 9.32 lakh.
- ii. **Construction of Road from Gadi Ramsukh to House of Pramukhji – 2.60 kms :-** It was reported that the road has been already constructed by MLA fund, and it was again taken up for upgradation under MPLADS.

DISTRICT-LUCKNOW

- ❖ **Improper usage of assets: -** The different Parks constructed under MPLAD scheme being used as dumping ground of construction material and in the case of the project **Amethi ke aage upto Waliulla Beg farm black topping**, it is not benefiting the people as it ending in a private farm.
- ❖ **MPLADS assets in idle nature: -** **Community Hall Sudarshanpuri Yashbagh** which was completed by Sulabh International (NGO) is not being put to use from the beginning itself which was completed in 1996 and may collapse at any time due to the lack of maintenance.

PHASE II

DISTRICT-BARAILY

❖ Ineligible works :-

- i. The work of road from Nahar Ki Pulia to primary school in village Puranpur involved strengthening of existing road upto the stage of Premix painted road and filling of patholes, which can basically be classified as maintenance works and therefore not eligible under MPLADS.

- ii. The work of construction of boundary wall and beautification of Mazar of Shri Kan Bahadur Khan in District Jail premises is ineligible as it is within the government premises and as it relates to beautification.
- iii. The development of Post Mortem House involved repair / renovation work within the premises of a government building and therefore ineligible.
- iv. The construction of Bar Association Building is an asset created for the organization of private professionals rendering their services for personal profit.

DISTRICT-GAZIABAD

❖ **Ineligible work :-**

- i. One hall of about 20'x 30' had been constructed for Bar Association of Ghaziabad which is an accommodation of Private Professionals rendering services for their profit.
 - ii. Widening of Dhualana Gulawati Marg from 10 Km. to 14 Km. has been sanctioned.
- ❖ **Diversion of use :-** Construction of old age home in Nagar Nigam Ghaziabad, eight one room sets with kitchen and bathrooms having provision of tube well with submersible pump for water supply and a boundary and gate had been constructed. The premises has been converted as Panch Karm Yoga and Nisarg Ashram under Bhagirath Seva Sansthan by Nagar Nigam Ghaziabad which is also not under use.

DISTRICT-GORAKHPUR

- ❖ **Ineligible Works :-** Road from Mahartha to Kanapar has been sanctioned for repair/maintenance.
- ❖ **Diversion of Use :-** A sanction has been accorded for construction of Veterinary Clinic as well as Artificial Insemination Centre while the project is reported as yet incomplete, a godown has been constructed at the site for private use.

DISTRICT-ETAH

- ❖ **Work for commercial purpose :-** The use of computers purchased for 'Veerangana Avanti Bai Mahavidhayalaya' and 'Shri Swami Atmanand Higher Secondary School Kamlapur' have been diverted for commercial purposes.

UTTARANCHAL

PHASE I

DISTRICT-HARIDWAR

❖ **Ineligible works: -**

- i. The works, cleaning of Minor in Libberhedi, Narsan Block, Harchandpur Minor, Kheda Minor, Lakhnoti Minor and Ulheda Minor, Earthwork (towards forest) in Sirhedi Shahjahanpur as they fall under **repair and maintenance works** and are prohibited under MPLADS.

- ii. The work given to Baburam Degree College, Saliyar, Bhagwanpur and Khadnza work in Roorkee for Sarvagya School are also ineligible as they are privately owned.
- ❖ **Cases of Encroachments:** - The Khadnza work from Rajbir's house to Dandi basti in Aumgabad Village and the protection wall in Village Toda Kalyanpur, were encroached partially were used as a **dumping ground** by the user community.
- ❖ 18 works of costs **Rs.240.02 lakhs** have been allotted to a single NGO' Delta Development Agency.

DISTRICT-ALMORA

- ❖ **Sanction of ineligible works :-** Sanction of Hall for Collectorate, Almora - Rs. 3.7 lakh has been released for the construction of hall in Collectorate and is being used by the official staff
- ❖ **Unauthorized usage:-** Unauthorised usage have been found in the following sample works:-
 - i. **Waiting room, Government. Hospital, Ranikhet,** being used as a store room instead of waiting hall for treatment of patients which is of Rs.2.7 lakh project.
 - ii. **Library in Ranikhet, Kachehri** the project of Rs. 4 lakh being used by lawyers as an office of bar association to organise their meetings.
 - iii. **Waiting hall, Tehsil campus, Ranikhet** being used by lawyers and their clients.

WEST BENGAL

PHASE I

DISTRICT-NORTH 24 PARAGANAS

Case of Encroachment :- Encroachment was reported in the case of the land ear-marked for construction of the **Electric Crematorium in Madhyamgram** causing delay in the completion of the work. Two work sanctions have been given to this project of Rs.25 lakh and Rs. 2 lakh in 2004 and the project is under implementation.

DISTRICT-SOUTH 24 PARAGANAS

- ❖ **Ineligible works:** - It has been reported that **other movable medical equipments** has been provided to the various diagnostic centers and **computers** have been provided to **private educational institutes**. It has been reported that whether the society is getting the benefit directly or indirectly were not visible.
- ❖ Out of 50 cases, in 47 cases **full advance** has been released to Implementing Agencies.

PHASE II

DISTRICT-HOWRAH

- ❖ **Sanction of Ineligible works:-**
 - i. The work on the **repair of Ceiling of Belur Girls High School** of Project of Rs. 7.5 lakh.
 - ii. **Ambulance for Al- Ameen Mission** which was sanctioned to a trust.

DISTRICT-MURSHIDABAD

❖ **Sanction of ineligible works:-** All the road works given below are coming under the Repair and Renovation Category.

- i. Conversion of Brick Bat road into Bitumenous road from Halud Masjid to Dkhin Darwaja via New Palace
- ii. Improvement of road from Ayeshbagh primary school to bust stop via house of Nitya Bhatta and Dhananjay das under Notungram GP under Jiagunj PS
- iii. Improvement of road from Akilpara mandir to Akilpur Primary School under Kamnagar GP
- iv. Improvement of road from Prasadpur Primary School to Prasadpur, Purbapara, Abu Bakar's house in Kamnagar.
- v. Improvement of road from Mian Lakshmi Tala to Mian railgate side Jamtala
- vi. Development and Construction of road from Jamtalmore to Kantomore via Deepchandpur under Frakka PS
- vii. Strengthening of road from Suryabati to Kakhrajole vill under Biprasekhar GP under Burwn block
- viii. Development and Construction of road from the house of Hafizur Rehman at Syed Kulut to Sijgram GP office at Sahapur under Sijgram GP in Bharatpur I Block
- ix. Development and Construction of road from the shop of Manick Sk at Uttarpar Tematha More to Geetgram Main canal via Dhan Kal under Bharatpur GP in Bharatpur I Block.

❖ **DA released the full recommended and sanctioned amount in a single installment to all the works**

DISTRICT-PURULIA

❖ **Ineligible Works :-**

- i. **Construction of recreation and barrack at Belguma Police Line :-** There is no utility for the general public from the work.
- ii. **Renovation of existing building of G.D.Lang Institute:-** An amount of Rs. 5 lakh was sanctioned for the purpose of renovation of the existing building, which is an ineligible work.
- iii. **Purchase of two Ambulance Vans (Maruti Car) for Sister Nivedita Old Age Home at Bagmundi (S.No.- 23, Annexure-II) :-** An amount of Rs. 5.41 lakh was sanctioned for the purchase of two ambulances . However, purchase of two ambulances for Old Age Home is ineligible.

❖ **There is some element of doubt with regard to the eligibility of the following two works:-**
Extension of Male Ward Sanitation facilities and installation of generator at RN Pur, SD Hospital – It has been mentioned that the generator has been installed for continuous power supply for the benefit of the patients. But **only hospital equipments can be provided, under the current as well as the previous guidelines, only for Government Hospitals.**

DELHI

PHASE-I

❖ **Ineligible works:** - The following works are coming under the ineligible works

- i. Upgradation of open nallah from St. Anthony Public school to Gurudwara near National Park at Lajpat Nagar.
- ii. Upgradation of Research Library for Ghalib Institute.
- iii. Strengthening of Vishwas Nagar main road by dense carpet from Swarna Cinema to Dharam Khata.
- iv. Strengthening of GT Road by providing AC mix from Ghanta Ghar round upto Barf Khana Chowk.
- v. Development of play ground in Govt. Sr. Sec. School at Kazipur vllage of Nazafgarh.
- vi. Strengthening of Vishwas Nagar main road by dense carpet from Swarna Cinema to Dharam Khata.
- vii. Strengthening of T-point at Balco Apartment by providing Mastic in IP extension 2006.

CHANDIGARH

PHASE I

Not much serious violations was found except the common points mentioned in part C of the reply.

PUDUCHERRY

PHASE I

❖ **MPLADS Assets in Idle nature :-**

- i. The **Community Hall at Vadukuppam, Netapakkam Commune, Ariankuppam Block**, completed on 28.8.2006 had not been put to use, awaiting inauguration by the M.P.
- ii. The **Community Hall at Ramji nagar in Ariankuppam Block** completed is of no use as of now as it had not been inaugurated.

DADRA AND NAGARHAVELI

PHASE II

❖ **Asset in private land :-** The pump house of one of the piped water supply scheme viz. Khedi-Maragpada was located in a private plot.

Information regarding compliance of the Guidelines regarding Constitution of the Monitoring Committee and review of the Scheme as per para 6.4(vi) of the Guidelines on MPLADS

(As per information received in the Ministry till 22-3-2010)

State/UT	Whether Monitoring Committee constituted or not	No. and Dates of the meeting held	Minutes received or not	Whether MP was invited or not and No. of MPs attended meeting	No. of District following para 6.4(vi)	District wise No. of meeting held at District level	Whether MP was invited or not and No. of MPs attended meeting	Action taken against defaulting District Authorities not following para 6.4(vi)
	(Pont 1)	(Pont 2)	(Pont 3)	(Pont 4)	(Pont 5A)	(Pont 5B)	(Pont 5C)	(Pont 6)
Andhra Pradesh	Yes	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Arunachal Pradesh	Yes	-	No	-	-	-	-	-
Assam	Yes	21.03.2007(I) 13.02.2008 (II)	- Yes	- Yes	-	Kamrup(Metro) & Kamrup District (18-11-2008)	No	-
Bihar	Yes	21-02-2008	Yes	Yes	-	-	-	-
Chattisgarh	Yes	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Goa	Yes	04-09-2006 14.11.2007	Yes Yes	Yes/2 Yes/2	2 2	(North Goa-12 South Goa-15)	(Yes/2)	No adverse report recd. Against Distt. Authorities
Gujarat	Yes	10-06-2009	No	-	-	-	-	-
Haryana	Yes	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Himachal Pradesh	Yes	-	No	-	-	-	-	-
J&K	Yes	20-08-2009	Yes	No/Nil	-	-	-	-
Jharkhand	Yes	-	No	-	-	-	-	-
Karnataka	Yes	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kerala	Yes	23.07.2007 04-07-2008	Yes Yes	No	All District	Thiruvananthapuram-3, Kollam-3, Pathanamthitta-5, Alappuzha-5, Kottayam-1, Idukki-1, Kanyakulam-8, Thrissur-9, Palakkad-1, Malappuram-2, Kozhikode-4, Kannur-6, Kasargode-4, Wayanad-no separate M.P. to this District	Yes/Distt. MPs are attending the meetings	-
Madhya Pradesh	Yes	30.01.2008	-	-	-	-	-	-
Maharashtra	Yes	06-02-2009	-	-	-	-	-	-
Manipur	Yes	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

		16-01-2009	Yes	No	-	-	-	-
D&N Haveli	No	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Daman & Diu	No	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Delhi	Yes, but under the chairmanship of Fpn.& Planning Minister of Govt. of Delhi being single District State	15-01-2009	Yes	No	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Lakshadweep	Yes	24.05.2005 09.02.2007 08.05.2007 11.08.2009	Yes Yes Yes Yes					
Puducherry	Yes	06-02-2007 26.02.2008	No Yes	No		No		

* Partial information received.

APPENDIX – I

CONFIDENTIAL

MINUTES OF THE SEVENTH SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE ON MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT LOCAL AREA DEVELOPMENT SCHEME, LOK SABHA (2009-10)

The Committee sat on Thursday, 01 April 2010 from 1130 hours to 1315 hours in Room No. Parliament Library Building, New Delhi.

PRESENT

Shri A.K.S. Vijayan - Chairman

MEMBERS

2. Dr. Rattan Singh Ajnala
3. Dr. Baliram
4. Adv. Ganeshrao Nagorao Dudhgaonkar
5. Shri D.B. Chandre Gowda
6. Shri Kailash Joshi
7. Shri Kaushalendra Kumar
8. Shri Shripad Yesso Naik
9. Shri Jagdambika Pal
10. Shri Rajendrasinh Rana
11. Shri Gopal Singh Shekhawat
12. Shri Vijay Inder Singla
13. Shri Om Prakash Yadav

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri S. Bal Shekhar - Joint Secretary
2. Shri Hardev Singh - Director
3. Shri C. Kalyanasundaram- Under Secretary

REPRESENTATIVES OF THE MINISTRY OF STATISTICS AND PROGRAMME IMPLEMENTATION

- | | | | |
|----|---------------------|---|--------------------------------|
| 1. | Shri Pronab Sen | - | Secretary |
| 2. | Shri Pankaj Jain | - | Additional Secretary |
| 3. | Dr. Ravendra Singh | - | Dy. Director General |
| 4. | Shri S.K. Jain | - | Senior Technical Director, NIC |
| 5. | Shri R. Rajesh | - | Director |
| 6. | Shri Dharam Pal | - | Deputy Secretary |
| 7. | Smt. Kiran Vasudeva | - | Under Secretary |
| 8. | Smt. Mini P. Kumar | - | Deputy Director |

2. At the outset the on ble Chairman welcomed the Members and the representatives of the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation to the seventh sitting of the Committee on MPLADS (2009-10). The Chairman stated that the subject “Effective Monitoring of the MPLAD Scheme to avoid delays in execution of MPLADS works” was selected during the tenure of the last Committee (2008-09). However, the Committee could not take up the subject for examination due to inordinate delay in submission of replies to the List of Points by the Ministry. He further stated that information on other representations/complaints forwarded by the MPLADS Committee Branch was also delayed in the Ministry, sometimes for months together which reflected poorly on the working of the Ministry. He emphasized that the Ministry should accord top priority to the information sought by the Committee and send the same expeditiously.

3. The Committee then took the oral evidence of the representatives of the Ministry on the subject. The Chairman and the Members raised various issues connected with the implementation of the MPLAD Scheme, viz. cases of violation of MPLADS guidelines found during the first phase of the monitoring of the Scheme by NABARD Consultancy Services (NABCONS) and the action taken by the Ministry against those responsible for the violations, non-holding of review meetings by the State Level Monitoring Committees headed by the Chief Secretary and by the district authorities with the implementing agencies, not

inviting Members of Parliament to the review meetings, etc. The representatives of the Ministry replied to the issues raised by the Chairman and Members.

4. The honorable Chairman thanked the representatives of the Ministry for appearing before the Committee and for furnishing the information that the Committee desired in connection with the examination of the subject.

5. A copy of the verbatim proceedings of the meeting has been kept for record.

The Committee then adjourned.

APPENDIX – II

CONFIDENTIAL

MINUTES OF THE TENTH SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE ON MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT LOCAL AREA DEVELOPMENT SCHEME, LOK SABHA (2009-10)

The Committee sat on Thursday, 09 September 2010 from 1130 hours to 1330 hours in Room No. Parliament Library Building, New Delhi.

PRESENT

Shri Kailash Joshi - In the Chair

MEMBERS

2. Dr. Rattan Singh Ajnala
3. Dr. Baliram
4. Dr. Pulin Bihari Baske
5. Adv. Ganeshrao Nagorao Dudhgaonkar
6. Shri D.B. Chandre Gowda
7. Shri Kaushalendra Kumar
8. Shri Jagdambika Pal
9. Shri Amarnath Pradhan
10. Shri Rajendrasinh Rana
11. Shri Rudramadhab Ray
12. Shri Tufani Saroj
13. Shri Ajit Singh
14. Shri Gopal Singh Shekhawat
15. Shri Vijay Inder Singla
16. Shri Om Prakash Yadav

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri V.R. Ramesh - Joint Secretary
2. Shri Hardev Singh - Director
3. Shri C. Kalyanasundaram- Under Secretary

REPRESENTATIVES OF THE MINISTRY OF STATISTICS AND PROGRAMME IMPLEMENTATION

1. Dr. T.C.A. Anant - Secretary
2. Shri Pankaj Jain - Additional Secretary
3. Dr. Ravendra Singh - Dy. Director General
4. Shri S.K. Jain - Senior Technical Director
5. Shri A.K. Choudhary - Director (MPLADS)
6. Shri R. Rajesh - Director (MPLADS)

2. Since the Chairman of the Committee (Shri A.K.S. Vijayan) could not attend the sitting of the Committee due to unavoidable reasons, the Committee chose Shri Kailash Joshi, MP and member of the Committee to act as the Chairman for the sitting as per rule 258 (3) of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha.

3. At the outset, the Acting Chairman welcomed the Members and the Committee discussed their scheduled study tour programme to Guwahati, Shillong and Kolkata from 27 September to 01 October 2010.

4. The Acting Chairman welcomed the representatives of the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation who were then called in the meeting. The Committee took their evidence on the subject “Effective Monitoring of the MPLAD Scheme to avoid delays in execution of MPLADS works”. hereafter, the Secretary of the Ministry briefed the Committee on the subject. He stated that the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation as well as the State Governments at the Secretariat level were responsible for macro level monitoring of the Scheme. The District Authorities and the Implementing Agencies were responsible for micro level monitoring. The briefing covered various aspects of

the subject, viz. staff strength of the Ministry dealing with the MPLAD Scheme, proposed increase in the contingency expenses, fund release based on rectification of objections pointed out in the Audit Report, on-line Monthly Progress Report and its compliance by the District Authorities, usefulness of the software on monitoring of MPLAD Scheme and its proposed modification to make it more effective, third party assessment of the Scheme through NABCONS, monitoring of the Scheme through bi-ennial meetings held with the State Authorities by the Ministry, etc. Thereafter, the Members raised issues relating to the implementation of MPLAD Scheme. The discussion covered various issues including the role of the MPLAD Committees of Parliament in monitoring the Scheme, procedures being adopted by the Ministry on complaints received on implementation of the Scheme, difficulties in identification of the SC/ST areas as per the MPLADS guidelines, impact of delimitation of Lok Sabha constituencies on unspent balance of MPLADS funds of 14th Lok Sabha, contributions by a Member of Parliament from his/her MPLADS funds to a society or a trust in which he/she or his/her immediate family member is the President or a Member and issue of circulars by the Ministry on amendments to the guidelines without consulting the Committee on MPLADS.

5. A copy of the verbatim proceedings of the meeting has been kept for record.

The Committee then adjourned.

APPENDIX – III

CONFIDENTIAL

MINUTES OF THE FOURTH SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE ON MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT LOCAL AREA DEVELOPMENT SCHEME (LOK SABHA) HELD ON MONDAY, 7 MARCH, 2011.

The Committee sat on Monday, 7 March 2011 from 1500 hours to 1600 hours in Committee Room D Parliament House Annexe New Delhi.

PRESENT

Shri A.K.S. Vijayan - In the Chair

MEMBERS

2. Dr. Baliram
3. Adv. Ganeshrao Nagorao Dudhgaonkar
4. Dr. Rattan Singh Ajnala
5. Dr. Pulin Bihari Baske
6. Kumari Saroj Pandey
7. Shri Jagdambika Pal
8. Shri Rudramadhab Ray
9. Shri Udai Pratap Singh

LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT

- | | | | |
|----|-------------------------|---|----------------------|
| 1. | Shri N. K. Sapra | - | Additional Secretary |
| 2. | Shri Hardev Singh | - | Director |
| 3. | Shri C. Kalyanasundaram | - | Under Secretary |

2. At the outset the Hon'ble Chairman welcomed the Members to the sitting of the Committee. The Committee then took up for consideration the Draft Report on the subject "Effective Monitoring of the MPLAD Scheme to avoid delays in execution of MPLADS works" and unanimously adopted the same with minor amendments.

3. XXX XXX XXX XXX

4. XXX XXX XXX XXX

The Committee then adjourned.