

**COMMITTEE ON THE WELFARE OF  
SCHEDULED CASTES AND  
SCHEDULED TRIBES  
(1994-95)**

(TENTH LOK SABHA)

**FORTY-FIFTH REPORT  
on**

**MINISTRY OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT  
(DEPARTMENT OF RURAL  
DEVELOPMENT)**

**Working of Integrated Rural Development  
Programme  
(Assistance Provided to SCs and STs)**



सत्यमेव जयते

*Presented to Lok Sabha on 25.4.1995  
Laid in Rajya Sabha on 25.4.1995*

**LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT  
NEW DELHI**

*April, 1995/Chaitra, 1917 (Saka)  
Price: Rs. 16.00*

८  
०१-५३ R  
N4.45;1

# CONTENTS

	<b>PAGE</b>
<b>COMPOSITION .....</b>	<b>(i)</b>
<b>INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>(iii)</b>
<b>CHAPTER I INTRODUCTORY AND ORGANISATIONAL SET-UP</b>	
A. Introductory .....	1
B. Organisational set-up at the Central Level.....	1
C. Organisational set-up at the State Level .....	3
D. Organisational set-up at the District Level ....	4
<b>CHAPTER II Monitoring and Evaluation</b>	
A. Monitoring.....	8
B. Evaluation.....	11
C. Concurrent Evaluation Studies .....	14
D. Recommendations of the working Group on Development of Scheduled Tribes .....	17
<b>CHAPTER III Performance</b>	
A. Physical Performance .....	21
B. Financial Performance .....	22
<b>APPENDIX .....</b>	<b>27</b>

**COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE WELFARE OF  
SCHEDULED CASTES AND SCHEDULED TRIBES  
(1994-95)**

**Shri Paras Ram Bhardwaj—**

*Chairman*

**MEMBERS**

*Lok Sabha*

2. Smt. Dil Kumari Bhandari
3. Shri Bapu Hari Chaure
4. Shri Harchand Singh
5. Smt. Kamala Kumari Karreddula
6. Shri Ganga Ram Koli
7. Shri Purna Chandra Malik
8. Shri Bheru Lal Meena
9. Shri K.H. Muniyappa
10. Shri Lalit Oraon
11. Dr. (Smt.) Padma Nammalvar
12. Shri Chhedi Paswan
13. Shri Raj Narain
14. Shri Premchand Ram
- \*15. Shri Arjun Charan Sethi
16. Dr. (Smt.) K.S. Soundaram
17. Shri Kodikkunnil Suresh
18. Dr. Ramesh Chand Tomar
19. Shri Phool Chand Verma
20. Shri Manikrao Hodlya Gavit

*RAJYA SABHA*

21. Shri Raj Babbar
22. Shri Ram Deo Bhandari
23. Shri Gaya Singh
24. Shri Hiphci
25. Shri Satya Prakash Malaviya
26. Kumari Mayawati
27. Shri V. Narayanasamy
28. Shri Kameshwar Paswan
29. Shri Ram Ratan Ram
30. Shri S.S. Surjewala

**SECRETARIAT**

- |                       |                               |
|-----------------------|-------------------------------|
| 1. Shri S.N. Mishra   | — <i>Additional Secretary</i> |
| 2. Shri G.C. Malhotra | — <i>Joint Secretary</i>      |
| 3. Shri Babu Ram      | — <i>Deputy Secretary</i>     |

---

\*Ceased to be Member of the Committee on his resignation from Lok Sabha w.e.f. 24 March, 1995.

## INTRODUCTION

I, the Chairman, Committee on the Welfare of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes, having been authorised by the Committee to finalise and submit the Report on their behalf present this Forty-Fifth Report (Tenth Lok Sabha), on the Ministry of Rural Development (Department of Rural Development)—Working of Integrated Rural Development Programme (Assistance provided to Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes).

2. The Committee took evidence of the representatives of the Ministry of Rural Development (Department of Rural Development) on 16 November, 1994. The Committee wish to express their thanks to the officers of the Ministry of Rural Development (Department of Rural Development) for placing before the Committee material and information the Committee wanted in connection with the examination of the subject.

3. The Report was considered and adopted by the Committee on 17 April, 1995.

4. A summary of conclusions/recommendations contained in the Report is appended (Appendix).

NEW DELHI;  
April 20, 1995

30 Chaitra, 1917(S)

PARAS RAM BHARDWAJ,  
*Chairman,*  
Committee on the Welfare of  
Scheduled Castes and  
Scheduled Tribes.

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTORY AND ORGANISATIONAL SET-UP

#### A. Introductory

Integrated Rural Development Programme has been implemented since the mid-seventies as a centrally sponsored scheme with the resources being shared on 50:50 basis between the Centre and the States. Initially taken up in 2300 blocks of the country, the programme was extended on 2 October, 1980 to cover all the blocks of the country.

1.2 The objective of the programme is to provide productive assets and inputs to the identified rural poor families so as to enable them to increase their income level and cross the poverty line. With reference to the price level of 1991-92 a family with an annual income of Rs. 11000/- or less is considered to be below the poverty line. The assets could be in primary, secondary or tertiary sectors and are provided through financial assistance in the form of subsidy by the Government and term credit advanced by the financial institutions.

1.3 A special emphasis has always been laid to give proper representation to Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes in the implementation of IRDP. In order to ensure that families belonging to Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes are properly attended to under the programme it has been provided that at least 50% of the assisted families should be drawn from these target groups. The pattern of subsidy loan is also 50% for SC and ST beneficiaries. Since 1993-94, the ceiling on subsidy has been increased by Rs. 1000/- as a result of which it is now Rs. 6000/- for families belonging to SC/ST category.

1.4 Integrated Rural Development Programme is implemented through District Rural Development Agencies (DRDAs) especially set up for implementation of rural development programmes. The State Level Coordination Committee (SLCC) monitors the programmes at its own level. The Ministry of Rural Development is responsible for overall guidance, policy making, release of Central share of funds, monitoring and evaluation of the programme.

#### B. Organisational set-up at the Central Level

1.5 The Ministry of Rural Development which deals with the working of IRDP, has two Departments viz. Department of Rural Development and Department of Wasteland Development. Secretary who heads the Ministry of Rural Development is assisted by one Additional Secretary each for Department of Rural Development and Department of Wasteland Development. There are seven Joint Secretaries in the Department of

Rural Development each dealing with different programmes/schemes e.g. IRDP, JRY, DPAP/DDP etc. IRDP is also dealt by a separate Division headed by a Joint Secretary assisted by 4 officers of Deputy Commissioner/Deputy Secretary level. They are further assisted by two Under Secretary level officers and seven sections.

1.6 A Central Level Coordination Committee (CLCC) has been constituted to review the implementation of IRDP and allied programmes of Training of Rural Youth for Self Employment and Development of Women and Children in Rural Areas. Secretaries of the Ministry of Welfare, Department of Agriculture and Cooperation, Department of Expenditure, Department of Women and Child Development, Department of Small Scale Industries etc. constitute the CLCC under the Chairmanship of the Secretary, Rural Development Suggestions of the representatives of these Departments/Ministries are taken care of while taking new initiatives for better implementation of the programme.

1.7 The Committee desired to know what powers were vested in the CLCC to take action against the States where gross misutilisation of funds released for IRDP were reported. It was replied that on receipt of complaints against particular officials regarding misappropriation of funds, the Ministry had written to the concerned State Governments to take prompt action against the erring officials. As a result in some cases officials have been arrested, suspended or their services terminated.

1.8 It was also stated that in a few instances where release of Central Share of Funds by the State Governments had taken an inordinately long time the State Governments had been warned against such practices. The matter had also been taken up at the level of the Chief Ministers of the concerned States to expedite release of funds.

1.9 The Committee note that there is an exclusive Department i.e. Department of Rural Development headed by the Secretary and assisted by one Additional Secretary, one Joint Secretary, four officers of Deputy Commissioner/Deputy Secretary level, two Under Secretaries and seven sections. In the opinion of the Committee it is a well defined system to deal with a programme of IRDP's magnitude. The Committee, desire that out of the seven sections dealing with the programme at least one section should be entrusted to deal with the SC/ST beneficiaries exclusively under the Programme to facilitate smooth and expeditious disposal of their grievances besides maintaining a meticulous record of all the aspects of such beneficiaries.

1.10 The Committee are happy to note that a Central Level Coordination Committee (CLCC) with well defined functions has been constituted to review the implementation of IRDP and other allied programmes. The Committee also note that as a result of CLCC's efforts the State Governments in some cases have arrested, suspended or terminated the services of the corrupt officials. The Committee would like the Ministry to

---

Foot Note: (i) Ministry of Rural Areas and Employment, (ii) Department of Rural Areas, Department of Employment and Poverty Alleviation, (iii) Two Additional Secretaries each vide Ministry letter dated 20 April, 1995.

maintain that spirit in future also so that needy rural poors, especially SCs and STs, do not suffer on account of corrupt officials.

1.11 The Committee note that those States who take inordinately long time in releasing Central share of funds have been warned against such practices. The Committee feel that the Ministry have also taken steps to motivate the States for releasing Central share of funds. The Committee recommend that after exhausting all the means at their disposal in persuading the States to release without delay Central share of funds, the Ministry may take other suitable measures against the habitual defaulting States and devise method to ensure that the Central assistance is released without fail.

### C. Organisational set-up at the State Level

1.12 For dealing with the working of IRDP at the State level a State Level Coordination Committee (SLCC) has been constituted in each and every State/U.T. which ensures smooth implementation of the programme as per the guidelines issued by the Centre. This Committee has been empowered to take decisions and approve any innovative experiment for better and effective implementation of IRDP at the grass root level.

1.13 The composition of the SLCC consist of the State Level Secretaries of the Departments of Rural Development, Finance, Planning, Agriculture, Irrigation, Cooperation, Forest etc. The Committee is headed by the Chief Secretary or the Agriculture Production Commissioner or the Development Commissioner varying from State to State.

1.14 The Committee have been informed that the State Level Coordination Committee meets periodically in all States. The frequency of these meetings varies from once in two months in some States to once in six months in some other States.

1.15 When the Committee desired to know what executive and administrative powers were vested in the SLCC for taking action against the corrupt officials it was replied that the Chairman of the Committee, as the administrative Head of the State Departments could instruct the respective Departments to take action against the corrupt officials.

1.16 When the Committee asked whether SLCC conducts surprise visits to the Districts/Blocks to oversee the implementation of IRDP, it was replied that the Members of the SLCC were required to conduct regular visits to the Districts/Blocks to oversee implementation of their programmes. Secretary, Department of Rural Development (State) also visits the Districts/Blocks several times during a month.

1.17 So far as involvement of any representative from SC/ST category in the SLCC is concerned the Committee have been informed that the Managing Director of the SC/ST Development Corporation is a Member of the SLCC to serve the purpose. Moreover, any person belonging to SC/ST category can be a Member of the SLCC in the capacity of Secretary/

Head of the Department/Corporation. It has been elaborated that the State Government is authorised to involve any other Officials/non-officials with the SLCC if necessary.

1.18 The Committee note that a State Level Coordination Committee has been constituted in each and every State to ensure smooth implementation of Integrated Rural Development Programme as per the guidelines issued by the Centre. They also note that the frequency of the periodic meetings of the SLCC varies from State to State. The Committee desire the Ministry to instruct all the State Governments to conduct periodic meetings of the SLCC at least once in a month so that shortcomings in the implementation of the programme are wiped out in time for the benefit of the rural poor including SCs and STs.

1.19 The Committee are not satisfied with the reply of the Ministry that Members of the SLCC are required to conduct regular and surprise visits to Districts/Blocks for overseeing the implementation of the programme. The Committee recommend the Ministry to ensure that the SLCC actually conduct periodical and surprise visits to the Districts and Blocks to oversee the implementation of the programme at the grass root level. In the opinion of the Committee it will help in providing not only proper leadership and timely guidance to Districts/Blocks but also a forum for a meaningful dialogue between the policy makers at the State level and the implementors at the field level.

1.20 The Committee note that the State Governments are authorised to include any official or non-official as a Member in the State Level Coordination Committee. They recommend the Central Government to instruct the State Governments to include at least one knowledgeable person belonging to the SC/ST community as official or non-official member in the SLCC so that his views are taken care of while framing policies for the betterment of SCs and STs.

#### **D. Organisational Set up at the District Level**

1.21 As regards the organisational set up at the District level the Committee have been informed that at the district level the programme is implemented through District Rural Development Agencies (DRDAs) which are registered societies under the Registration of Societies Act. The DRDAs are generally headed by the Collector/Deputy Commissioner/Sabhapati of Zila Parishad/CEO of Zila Parishad depending upon the practice prevailing in the State.



1.22 The Committee have been informed that the prescribed staffing pattern for DRDAs should be administered as per the following Table:

**CHAIRMAN (Collector / D.M.)**

**Project Director / Officer**

APO (Credit)-1 APO (TRY- SEM & Rur- al Industries) 1	APO (Women)-1 LDC-1 Driver-1	APO (Planning & Monitoring)-1 Statistical In- vestigator (with data entry capabilities) -2 LDC-1	Accounts Officer-1 Accountants-3	Office Manager Superinten- dent / Head- clerk-1 LDC-2 Driver-1 Class-IV-1 Chowkidar-1
---	---------------------------------------	---	--	--

1.23 It is pointed out that the State Governments have been instructed to restructure the staffing pattern as per the table mentioned above. Any deviation from broad staffing pattern provided now may be considered and approved by SLCC keeping in view the State norms. The expenditure on these posts would be borne from within the administrative infrastructure allocation of the DRDAs.

1.24 The Committee have also been informed that the DRDAs are the overall incharge of the planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the programme in the District. The main functions of the DRDAs are as under:

- (a) To keep the District and Block level agencies informed of the basic parameters and the requirements of the programme and the tasks to be performed by all these agencies.
- (b) To coordinate and oversee the surveys, preparation of perspective plans and Annual Plan of the blocks and finally prepare a District Plan.
- (c) To monitor and evaluate the programme implementation by Government and non-governmental agencies to ensure its effectiveness.
- (d) To secure inter-sectoral and inter-departmental coordination and cooperation.
- (e) To give publicity to the achievements made under the programme and disseminate knowledge and build up awareness about the programme.
- (f) To send periodical returns to the State Government in the prescribed formats.

1.25 It has been stated that all the DRDAs have Governing Bodies. The Chairman/President of the DRDA is also empowered to form an Executive Committee to assist the DRDA. The Governing Bodies include all MPs and MLAs of the District, member of the weaker sections and others under the chairmanship of the District Collector. The Executive Committee can consist of all the District level officers and any other

officer deemed necessary for the planning and implementation of the programme. The Governing Body of the DRDA should meet once a quarter and the Executive Committee once a month.

1.26 To a query of the Committee it was replied that the District Annual Plans were prepared by lead banks in consultation with other line Departments and the same was approved by the Governing Body of the DRDAs before it was finally implemented. Moreover all necessary decisions for effective and qualitative implementation of the programme are to be vetoed by the Governing Body of the DRDAs.

1.27 The Committee desired to know what administrative and financial powers were assigned to the PO/PD of the DRDAs to coordinate and implement IRDP independently. In reply it was stated that the PO/PD was the administrative and functional head of the DRDAs. He had adequate financial powers to take decisions in normal implementation of the programme. The decision of sanctioning subsidy was taken at his level only. It was however stated that the PO/PD did not have any disciplinary authority over Block Staff.

1.28 When the Committee wanted to know the constraints faced in empowering the PD/PO of the DRDA with disciplinary powers over the Block Staff, it was replied that the Block Staff responsible for implementation of IRDP were either on deputation from respective line departments or were directly recruited at the Block level. The PD/PO of the DRDA on the other hand generally belongs to the State Government and holding the post on deputation basis. It was further stated that with the constitution of strong elected bodies under Panchayati Raj Institutions there would be a more direct line of control over Block Officials.

1.29 To a further query of the Committee it was stated that the State Governments were directed by the Ministry in 1983 to set up Grievance Cells attached to each DRDA with a view to avoiding corruption at grassroot level. Separate vigilance cells were also suggested for conducting flying checks on receipt of any complaint and also on their own.

1.30 The Committee desired to know the composition of the Grievance cells attached to each DRDA and whether any SC/ST member had been included in the Grievance cells. In reply the Ministry stated that the information was not available with them.

1.31 The Committee note that the District Rural Development Agencies are the overall incharge of planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the Integrated Rural Development Programme in the District. They also note that the DRDAs have been provided a basic staffing pattern to discharge their day-to-day work. The Committee, however, desire that a SC/ST cell with adequate staff should be set up and attached to each DRDA to deal with matters pertaining to SC/ST beneficiaries exclusively. Taking into consideration the ignorance and illiteracy of SC/ST people residing in backward Districts, the Committee opine that these exclusive cells can provide them proper guidance and protect them from unscrupulous exploitation.

1.32 The Committee note that the Governing Body of the DRDA includes members of the Weaker Sections to assist the DRDA in discharging its duties. The Committee consider it an healthy trend and would like to recommend that the Executive Committee also whenever constituted, should include members belonging to the Weaker Sections so that they can be able to participate in the planning and implementation of the programme at the grass root level.

1.33 The Committee are dissatisfied to note that the Project Officer/Director of the DRDA has no disciplinary authority over the Block Staff. When the sole responsibility of implementing the programme at the grass root level lies with the PO/PD the Committee fail to understand the constraint in empowering him with disciplinary powers over the Block Staff. Taking into consideration many preoccupations of the District Collector and notwithstanding the fact that the PO/PD is drawn on deputation, the Committee would like the Ministry to instruct the State Governments to empower the PO/PD of DRDA with adequate disciplinary authority over the Block staff so that corruption can be nipped in the bud.

1.34 The Committee are pained to note that although the Central Government issued instructions to the State Governments in 1983 for setting up of Grievance Cells to avoid corruption at grassroot level, the Ministry do not have information about the composition of these cells. The Committee apprehend whether these cells have been established at all. They, therefore, recommend the Ministry to collect detailed data about the establishment and composition of the grievance cells and apprise the Committee accordingly. The Committee also desire that after scrutinizing the data collected from various States, the Government should take suitable action against the State Governments wherever any deviation to their instruction is noticed.

## CHAPTER II

### MONITORING AND EVALUATION OF THE WORKING OF IRDP

#### A. Monitoring

As regards the mechanism/checks devised by the Central Government for periodical and thorough monitoring of the working of IRDP in various States/U.Ts the Committee were informed that the Ministry of Rural Development had issued guidelines from time to time to the States/UTs for proper implementation of IRDP at the grass root level. The latest guidelines were issued in April 1991 under the title "Manual for IRDP and allied Programmes of TRYSEM and DWCRA".

2.2 The Committee were also informed that in the IRDP guidelines it had been clearly laid down that the follow up on the Projects given to the beneficiaries under IRDP should be done through the Vikas Patrika which should be kept up-to-date by the field officials. The annual physical verification of the assets provided under IRDP is also required to be undertaken at the end of every year.

2.3 It has also been stated that the performance report with regard to the key indicators are to be sent by the States/UTs for all the District Rural Development Agencies to the Centre in monthly, quarterly and yearly proforma which has been made precise and need oriented during the VII Plan. A qualitative monitoring system at the Block and District level has been introduced since March 1988. In this system a minimum number of inspections to be carried out at different levels has been prescribed as below:

(a) District Magistrate/Chairman DRDA	10 per month
(b) District Rural Development Officer and Project Officers DRDA	20 per month
(c) Asstt. Project Officer (Monitoring)	40 per month
(d) Sub-Divisional Magistrates	20 per month
(e) Block Development Officers	20 per month
(f) Asstt. Development Officers	20 per month

2.4 The inspecting officers during their field visits need to fill up a proforma on the basis of their discussions with the IRDP beneficiaries. This on the spot inspection should take care that the same villages are not repeated till all the villages in the block are inspected at least once.

2.5 During evidence when the Committee desired to know whether the above mentioned inspections were held properly the representative of the Ministry replied that the inspections were supposed to be held properly.

2.6 The Committee wanted to know the picture depicted by such inspections. The representative of the Ministry apprised "It indicated three things. Firstly, it indicated the capabilities for absorbing increase outlays through effective district administration and that people's participation must be increased where district administration funds are emasculated and where peoples' representative are not strong. Secondly, it indicates about the programmes. Earlier the anti-poverty Schemes were token programmes. Earlier the anti-poverty Schemes were token programmes under NREP or RLEGP. For the first time in the Eighth Plan, apart from not being token, they are going in for more and more programmes for backward districts where they are making an impact on the quality of life of poor people. Thirdly, in majority of States rural development funds are the only funds available in the districts.... In the name of Sectoral flow funds are dried up."

2.7 When the Committee pointed out that the inspections depicted a picture of lack of implementation of the Programme as well as the efficiency of the Officers, the representative of the Ministry submitted that the efficiency was depending on supervision and good inspection. He elaborated that the officers should have full powers to conduct inspection and the capacity to punish the bad.

2.8 The Committee have further been informed that apart from such inspections which are basically to be undertaken by the State Officials, Senior Officers of the rank of Deputy Secretary and above in the Ministry of Rural Development are appointed Area Officers for different States/ U.Ts. These Area Officers visit the allotted States/UTs from time to time and inspect the actual implementation of the programme. They also participate in the State Level Coordination Committee meetings providing these by a source of effective link between the policy maker *i.e.* Government of India and the implementing Agencies *i.e.* States and Union Territories. The programme is also reviewed at the meetings with State secretaries of Rural Development, Bank Officials and with the Project Directors of DRDA in the workshops held in June-July every year. All the Project Officers/Directors and a few District Collectors are called for this meeting where the problems at the grass root level are discussed and suitable decisions are arrived at. Apart from Project Director's Workshop Secretaries Conference is also held on annual basis. The resolutions and suggestions made by the Project Director's Workshop are placed before this High Level Secretaries Conference where all the Secretaries incharge of Rural Development Departments of 30 States/UTs are invited to find solutions to the basic problems in implementation of I.R.D.P. It ultimately enables the Ministry to make policy changes accordingly.

2.9 During evidence the representative of the Ministry of Rural Development elaborated that the Area Officers included not only the officers of the Ministry of Rural Development but also the Officers of Planning Commission and other Departments. The representative further stated that he conducted meetings of the Area Officers on the basis of the Reports sent by them. Then the Chief Secretaries of States/UTs and others are asked to take follow up action.

2.10 The Committee desired to know how many times the Area Officers appointed by the Ministry of Rural Development had inspected the actual implementation of IRDP in the respective States/UTs allotted to them during the last five years. The Committee also desired to know whether any shortcoming was noticed as a result of such inspections and if so the nature of shortcomings and the action taken by the Ministry thereafter. In reply it was stated that the Area Officers appointed by the Ministry had been instructed to visit their respective States at least once during a quarter. The nature of shortcomings noticed were stated to be shortage of adequate staff/high number of vacant posts; poor quality of implementing staff; delay in release of matching grants by the States; and inadequacy of infrastructural development. It was further stated that the Ministry had issued instructions to the States/UTs for recruitment of more technical staff, enhancement of training facilities etc.

2.11 The Committee note that the Ministry of Rural Development has been issuing guidelines from time to time to the States/UTs for proper implementation of the working of IRDP at various levels. The Committee also note that the performance report with regard to the key indicators are to be sent by the States/UTs for all the District Rural Development Agencies to the Centre in monthly, quarterly and yearly proformas which have been made precise and need oriented during the VII Plan. The Committee desire the Ministry to ensure that all the States/UTs are sending the performance report of the DRDAs in the monthly quarterly, and yearly proformas to the Central Government. They also recommend that any deviation made by any State/UT in this regard should be set right without loss of time.

2.12 The Committee note that a definite number of inspections to be carried out at different levels by States Officials has been prescribed by the introduction of a qualitative monitoring system since March, 1988. But they are unhappy to note that casual reply given by the representative of the Ministry that the aforesaid inspections are supposed to be held properly. In their opinion mere issuance of guidelines to the States for conducting a minimum number of inspections on monthly basis would serve little purpose unless and until there is constant persuasion by the Central Government in this regard. The Committee, therefore, desire the Ministry to motivate the State Governments for carrying out inspections meticulously in commensurate with the prescribed norms. They also recommend the Ministry to persuade the State Governments to take action against the officials who fail to comply with the orders/guidelines in this regard.

2.13 The Committee simultaneously recommend that the State Officials who conduct monthly inspections of the working of IRDP at the grass root level should be given independent power and authority to carry out such inspections and to arrest any incidence of on-implementation of the programme, misappropriation of fund etc.

2.14 The Committee are glad to note that the Ministry of Rural Development have devised many appreciable methods e.g. appointment of Area Officers, conducting Project Directors Workshop, Secretaries Conference etc. to monitor the working of IRDP in various States/UTs. They are also happy to note that the Ministry have issued instructions to the State Governments/UT administrations to do away with the shortcomings which came to notice as a result of the inspections conducted by the Area Officers of the Ministry. The Committee feel that it is a step in the right direction and would like to encourage the Ministry to keep up their efforts in future also.

## B. Evaluation

2.15 The Committee have been informed that Integrated Rural Development Programme has been evaluated by a number of Organisations in recent years. The Reserve Bank of India (RBI), National Bank for Agriculture and Rural Development (NABARD), and the Institute for Financial Management and Research (IFMR) published their findings in 1984. The Programme Evaluation Organisation (PEO) of the Planning Commission brought out its evaluation study in 1985. These studies have established the fact that IRDP is a sound programme.

2.16 The Committee were further informed that in 1987 the Public Accounts Committee (PAC) had done extensive review of the programme and had observed that the strategy adopted for tackling rural poverty by evolving IRDP was the best under the prevailing circumstances.

2.17 Hanumantha Rao and Rangaswamy in a study in 1988 on the Efficiency of Investments in IRDP in Uttar Pradesh have *inter-alia* concluded that in terms of income generation, the performance of secondary and tertiary sector activities particularly the latter has been much better than the primary sector activities especially among the low income households and in the infrastructurally developed region.

2.18 A recent study on the IRDP which covered 960 households in Uttar Pradesh was made by Robert V. Pulley for the world bank. This study describes IRDP as one among the world's most ambitious efforts at credit based poverty alleviation. According to the study, providing some poor households with capital to invest in income generating assets can be an effective means of raising their income. Simultaneously, the study states that the programme has not led to the beneficiaries continued access to banking services. It also points out that the gains in

productivity of investment and credit recovery can possibly be met by altering certain features of IRDP.

2.19 When the Committee wanted to know the proposed changes in the policy and administrative features of IRDP to meet the gains in productivity of investment as well as credit recovery it was replied that IRDP being such a large programme, spread throughout the country, it is clear that policy and administrative responses to the programme management cannot be an one-shot affair but have to be a continuing and dynamic exercise.

2.20 It was, however, simultaneously stated that the Ministry of Rural Development had taken several new initiatives since 1988-89 to do away with the shortcomings pointed out by the aforesaid studies for better implementation of IRDP. They are as follows:

- (i) Introduction of Group Life Insurance Scheme.
- (ii) Diversification of Activities to innovative Programmes like fruit and food processing units, fish farming etc.
- (iii) Improvement of the Status of Projectisation and Professionalisation at State and District Levels.
- (iv) Incentives for setting up of small industries in rural areas;
- (v) Marketing of IRDP products on Model lines;
- (vi) Special courses for TRYSEM trainees to develop qualities of entrepreneurship and Management skills;
- (vii) Adoption of Service Area Approach for sanction of Projects and disbursement of loan.
- (viii) Panchayat-wise Allocation of Physical target;
- (ix) Greater coverage of women and Physically handicapped;
- (x) Additional dose of assistance to families unable to cross the poverty line for no fault of their own;
- (xi) Enhancement of the ceiling on subsidy to 50% for Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes.
- (xii) Abolition of Purchase Committees in about 50% of the Blocks in each District to provide full freedom to the beneficiaries in the purchase of assets.
- (xiii) Constitution of a High Power Committee under the Chairmanship of Shri D.R. Mehta, Deputy Governor, RBI to review various aspects of IRDP and to suggest suitable modifications to improve the Programme.
- (xiv) Extension of Family credit Plan to 213 Districts having district offices of NABARD.
- (xv) Abolition of cut-off line for selection of beneficiaries.



- (xvi) Introduction of Development Audit to take complete stock of the achievements during 1993-94.
- (xvii) Submission of Audit Report of the previous year by end September of Current year;
- (xviii) Package of Assistance under the Programme to be at least Rs. 12000/- per family.
- (xix) Constitution of Special Committee to suggest measures for improving credit flow in North-eastern Region.

2.21 After going through the aforesaid initiatives taken by the Ministry the Committee desired to know how many families were given additional assistance during the last three years and the number and percentage of SC/ST families amongst them. In reply it was stated that during the Seventh Five Year Plan a total of 51.8 lakh old families were assisted under IRDP. Since 1991 and upto 1993-94 an additional 2.32 lakh families have been given supplemental dose of assistance. It was also stated that the number and percentage of SC/ST families given supplementary assistance was not available with the Ministry.

2.22 To a further query it was replied that the practice of giving supplementary assistance on a continuous basis was not to be encouraged. The Ministry also stated that they had accepted the recommendation of the Expert Committee of the RBI on IRDP that beneficiaries who had not crossed the poverty line with the initial assistance extended to them could be given a supplementary dose of assistance only after a case by case scrutiny of borrowers performance had been made.

2.23 When the Committee desired to know how did the Ministry ensure that the State Governments were adhering to the advice/instructions given to them under the new initiatives, it was replied that the advice to the State Governments given in circulars issued by the Ministry to implement policy changes were reviewed in Central Level Coordination Committee meetings. Area Officers appointed by the Ministry also inspected whether State Governments were adhering to the advice/instructions given to them under the new guidelines. The Committee were also informed that from the feed back received it had been found that most of the States in turn had passed on necessary instructions to the DRDAs to revise guidelines from time to time as directed by the Ministry.

2.24 The Committee note that the evaluation study of IRDP conducted by the Reserve Bank of India, National Bank for Agriculture and Rural Development, Institute for Financial Management and Research, World Bank etc. has hailed the programme as a sound and ambitious effort towards poverty alleviation of the rural poor. The Committee would, however, like the Ministry to encourage more such evaluation studies in future for the economic betterment of the rural poor including SCs & STs.

2.25 The Committee note that the Ministry have taken several steps to do away with the shortcomings pointed out by the aforesaid evaluation studies. They are, however, unhappy to note that the number and percentage of SC/ST families given supplementary assistance is not available with the Ministry. The Committee, therefore, recommend that henceforth whenever supplementary assistance is given to the beneficiaries, as detailed record of such assistance given to the SC/ST beneficiaries should be maintained meticulously by the Ministry.

2.26 The Committee note that the Ministry do not encourage the practice of giving supplementary assistance on a continuous basis and the same is extended only after a case by case scrutiny of the borrowers performance. The Committee agree with the method adopted by the Ministry for extending supplementary assistance to the beneficiaries. They, however, suggest that while scrutinizing the performance of the borrowers, special attention be paid towards the SC/ST beneficiaries as they are unable to cross the poverty line due to the prevailing social stigma and other vulnerable factors.

2.27 The Committee note that the feedback received in the Ministry has show that most of the States have passed on necessary instructions to their respective District Rural Development Agencies to revise guidelines as desired by the Ministry for better implementation of IRDP. The Committee also note that the Ministry keep a vigilant watch upon the States through the CLCC and the Area Officers to ensure that the State Governments are adhering to the advice/instructions given to them under the new initiatives. The Committee desire the Ministry to keep up the monitoring system in future also. They also recommend the Ministry to persuade those States who have not passed on the necessary instructions to the DRDA, to do the needful immediately.

### C. Concurrent Evaluation Studies

2.28 The Committee have been informed that since October, 1985 the process of Concurrent Evaluation Studies of the IRDP was initiated through 27 Institutions on a regular basis to streamline and improve the pace of implementation of the Programme. So far four rounds of such evaluation studies have been completed. The first round was carried out during October, 1985—September, 1986; the second during January-December, 1987, the third during January-December, 1989 and the fourth during Sept., 1992 to August, 1993. The main findings, both positive and negative, of the third round of Concurrent Evaluation Studies (January-December, 1989) were stated to be as follows.

#### *Positive Points*

- (i) About 29% of the sample beneficiaries belonged to Scheduled Castes, 16% to Scheduled Tribes and 20% women. Coverage of SC/ST was significantly higher than the stipulated target of 30% at

the national level. The beneficiaries included 5% families of freed bonded labourers, 0.4% handicapped and 1% assignees of surplus land.

- (ii) Primary and Tertiary Sectors were the main thrust areas covering 44% and 45% families respectively.
- (iii) At the national level, 65% beneficiaries were selected at the meetings of Gram Sabhas.
- (iv) In the opinion of the beneficiaries, the assets provided to them were of good quality in 80% cases.
- (v) About 83% beneficiaries had found the assistance (subsidy + credit) sufficient for acquiring the assets.
- (vi) The assets had generated additional income (net of cost of maintenance and repayment of loan) of more than Rs. 2000 in 42% cases, between Rs. 1001 and Rs. 2000 in 18% cases and between Rs. 501 and Rs. 1000 in 9% cases.
- (vii) The old beneficiaries had crossed the poverty line of Rs. 6400/- in 28% cases at the national level.
- (viii) The families belonging to the destitute and very very poor groups (whose assessed annual income was below Rs. 3500) had crossed the poverty line of Rs. 6400/- in 16% cases at the national level.

#### *Negative Points*

- (i) Ineligible families were assisted in 16% at the national level.
- (ii) Working capital was not provided to beneficiaries in 20% cases out of 62% cases where working capital was required.
- (iii) After care and Government support was not made available to the beneficiaries in 53% cases out of 71% cases requiring support.
- (iv) Adequate infrastructure facility was not available to the beneficiaries in most of the cases.
- (v) The beneficiaries were not aware of the Group Life Insurance Scheme in 76% cases at national level.
- (vi) The assets of the beneficiaries were not insured in 25% cases out of the 71% cases requiring insurance.
- (vii) In 27% cases, the beneficiaries required replacement of the perished assets, but they were not aware/prompted in 13% cases. In the remaining 14% cases, they applied for claims but their cases could not be settled in 6% cases.
- (viii) In 78% cases, TRYSEM beneficiaries were provided IRDP assistance for activities other than the activities for which they were trained under TRYSEM.

- (ix) Vikas Patrika was provided to beneficiaries in 39% cases but was updated only in 24% cases.
- (x) In 26% cases the assets of the old beneficiaries did not generate any incremental income.

2.29 After going through the above mentioned negative points when the Committee desired to know what steps had been taken by the Ministry to ensure that no ineligible family was assisted under the IRDP it was replied that the Ministry had taken several steps to minimise the total number of ineligible families assisted in the States. A house to house survey was initiated in November, 1991 to identify families below the poverty line.

2.30 The Expert Committee on IRDP set up by the RBI has also recommended that all those States which have not completed the BPL survey should not be given assistance for IRDP. The Gram Panchayats should be made more effective by the presence of bank officials, school teachers, village post masters, representatives of grass root NGOs etc. The lists approved by the Panchayats should be displayed at prominent public places such as Panchayat Office, Post Office, Village Chaupals, bank branches etc. Finally the Gram Sabha with quorum should approve the list. The above recommendations of the Committee have been accepted by the Ministry of Rural Development for implementation. The detailed guidelines were formulated by the Ministry and the same had been reiterated from time to time to the State Governments emphasizing the following:—

- (i) selection of beneficiaries should be done by Gram Panchayats to impart transparency and objectivity to the selection procedure;
- (ii) the list of beneficiaries identified and selected is to be displayed publicly so that objection to inclusion or exclusion of names can be filled by individuals.
- (iii) the list of Below Poverty Line (BPL) families and those selected for assistance has to have the final approval of the Gram Sabha.

2.31 When the Committee desired to know whether the purpose for which the Concurrent Evaluation Study was initiated had been achieved more or less, it was replied that the purpose of the Concurrent Evaluation Studies had been achieved as on the basis of the studies most of the shortcomings in the implementation of IRDP had been done away with and guidelines of the programme had been modified from time to time.

2.32 The Committee were also informed that as a result of the aforesaid efforts the percentage of ineligible families had come down to 4 per cent according to the fourth round of Concurrent Evaluation Studies.

2.33 The Committee note that so far three rounds of concurrent Evaluation Studies have been undertaken by several Institutions at the behest of the Ministry to streamline and improve the pace of implementation of the programme. They also note that the latest round of Study (January-December, 1989) has pointed out elaborately both positive and negative aspects of the implementation of the Integrated Rural Development

Programme. One such negative point that has come to the notice of the Committee is the assistance of ineligible families upto the tune of 16%. The Committee, however, note that the Ministry have formulated detailed guidelines on the basis of recommendations of the Expert Committee of the Reserve Bank of India to see that no ineligible family is assisted under the Programme. These guidelines have been communicated to the States from time to time as a result of which, the percentage of ineligible families has come down to 4 only. The Committee feel that assistance to ineligible families under the Integrated Rural Development Programme can very well defeat the purpose for which the programme was initiated *i.e.*, poverty alleviation of the rural poor including SCs and STs. They, therefore, recommend that the Central Government should relentlessly persuade the State Governments to take necessary steps *viz.* selection of beneficiaries by Gram Panchayats, public display of the list of beneficiaries etc. so that the remaining ineligible families are completely debarred from being assisted under the programme.

2.34 The Committee also recommend that those States who are not conducting the Below Poverty Line (BPL) survey or not adhering to the suggestions/instructions of the Central Government to ensure non-inclusion of ineligible families under IRDP, should not be given any assistance under the programme.

#### D. Recommendations of the Working Group on Development of Scheduled Tribes

2.35 The Committee have been informed that the Working Group on Development of Scheduled Tribes had made several recommendations during the VII Five Year Plan in regard to the anti-poverty programmes which can broadly be summarised as follows:—

- (i) Distinction between those aimed at enabling beneficiary families to cross the poverty line and those merely enabling the beneficiary families to generate additional income.
- (ii) Earmarking 15% of the number of beneficiaries, subsidy and credit for ST beneficiaries.
- (iii) Increase in per capita assistance under all economic assistance programme including IRDP
- (iv) Increase in the number of ST beneficiaries under IRDP out of the total assisted under IRDP.
- (v) Introduction of family cards to monitor assistance given and results thereof.
- (vi) Avoidance of mere arithmetical approach in assisting ST families.
- (vii) Involvement of the ITDP project administration in the implementation of IRDP.

2.36 To a specific query of the Committee it was replied that the Working Group made several recommendations during VIII plan also. Some of the important recommendations were as follows:—

- (i) That under all family-oriented, income-generating schemes common to SCs/STs and other beneficiaries, monitoring should be done separately for the STs.
- (ii) That the percentage of ST beneficiaries, credit to STs and subsidy to STs out of the total under IRDP should be proportional to the percentage of ST families below poverty line among total families below poverty line, subject to a minimum of 15% at national level. Suitable guidelines may be issued to district and block level authorities coverage of financial flows to ST beneficiaries under IRDP so as to achieve this objective.
- (iii) That to the extent possible, programmes for creation of income generating assets with a combination of loan and subsidy should be funded under IRDP and only the balance funded from SCA.
- (iv) That the family cards already introduced under the name "Vikas Patrika" should be compulsorily issued and maintained in respect of ST beneficiaries.
- (v) That under IRDP and all other family oriented income generating schemes, the desirable per capita investment should be fixed at Rs. 8000/- at 1988-89 prices.
- (vi) That organisations of ST beneficiaries should be established and involved in the implementation of IRDP and other family-oriented, income-generating schemes.
- (vii) That under all schemes other than the traditional occupations of the ST beneficiary families, training in maintenance and handling of assets created should be imparted under TRYSEM.
- (viii) The ST women beneficiaries be considered for assistance under IRDP and other family-oriented, income-generating programmes in much larger numbers than they have been so far. Also that the number and per capita assistance to female ST beneficiaries be monitored.
- (ix) That ITDP districts should be given priority in selection under the scheme "Development of Women and Children in Rural Areas (DWCRA)."
- (x) That schemes, which inherently lead to suboptimal levels of investment, should be discontinued.
- (xi) That in regard to beneficiaries belonging to Primitive Tribal Groups, Ministry of Welfare may evolve suitable guidelines on the extent of capital subsidy to be allowed from SCA on unit cost under family oriented income generating schemes (certain States are allowing even 100% subsidy out of SCA currently).

- (xii) For PTGs and similar disadvantaged groups for whom credit may not be available from banks and cooperatives, the credit component may be provided by the Project Administration by taking a block loan from a financial institution.
- (xiii) That adequate backward and forward linkages like veterinary services, fodder, marketing of produce etc. be provided under all family-oriented, income-generating schemes.
- (xiv) That marketing follow-up and generation of awareness among the ST beneficiaries be paid greater attention, use of SCA is permitted for these activities.
- (xv) Instructions have already been issued that Project Directors of District Rural Development Agencies (PD, DRDA) should be members of IRDPs and *vice versa*. For better coordination of anti-poverty programmes for STs in ITDP areas, a sub-committee chaired by either PD, DRDA or Project Officer, ITDP and having both of them, as well as other officers as members, may be set up.

2.37. As regards the follow up action taken by the Ministry it was stated that several steps as described below had been taken to comply with the recommendations made by the Working Group.

- (i) To give due coverage to SC/ST beneficiaries the target to assist the category was increased from 30% to 50% in the year 1990-91.
- (ii) The percentage of ST families in the total IRDP families has increased from 14.62% in 1990-91 to 17.06% in 1993-94.
- (iii) The per capita investment for ST families has gone up from Rs. 3650/- in the year 1987-88 to Rs. 6551/- in the year 1993-94 and efforts are further being made to increase the level of per capita investment of ST families.
- (iv) It has also been ensured that there should not be target oriented approach on numerical terms while assisting IRDP beneficiaries, but more stress is laid on the qualitative aspect of the programme so as to achieve higher per capita investment.
- (v) To give proper representation to the ST community a person belonging to the category is a regular member of the governing body of District Rural Development Agency (DRDA).

2.38. The Committee have been informed that the Ministry of Rural Development monitors the aforesaid aspects through the monthly Progress Reports received from the State Governments based on the district Reports as well as by periodic visits of the senior officers of the Ministry under the Area Officers scheme. It has also been stated that the ultimate

responsibility for the proper implementation of the programme however, lies with the State Governments.

2.39. The Committee note that the Working Group on the Development of Scheduled Tribes has made several good recommendations during the VII and VIII plans for the economic upliftment of Tribal people under IRDP. They also note that although the Ministry are taking steps to comply with the recommendations made by the Working Group, they are yet to fully implement the same. For example the desirable per capita investment as per the recommendations of the Working Group should be fixed at Rs. 8000/- at 1988-89 prices whereas the per capita investment for ST families is only Rs. 6551/- during 1993-94 as per the information furnished by the Ministry. The Committee, therefore, recommend the Ministry to make vigorous efforts to meet the desirable per capita investment as recommended by the Working Group at the earliest.

2.40. The Committee also recommend that the Government should take immediate steps to implement the other recommendations of the Working Group for the economic betterment of Scheduled Tribes. Special attention in this regard ought to be paid for separate monitoring of the programme for ST beneficiaries, compulsory issuance and maintenance of 'Vikas Patrika' in respect of ST families establishment and involvement of the organisations of the ST beneficiaries, assistance to the primitive tribal groups and coverage of ST women in much larger numbers under the programme.



## CHAPTER III

### PERFORMANCE

#### A. Physical Performance

As regards the physical performance under the Integrated Rural Development Programme during the year 1993-94 and the number and percentage of SC/ST families therein the following statement was furnished to the Committee.

State	Total Families Assisted		Families Assisted		% of achievement	
	Target	Achievement	SCs	STs	SCs	STs
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Andhra Pradesh	204024	259697	107040	528229	41.22	20.34
Arunachal Pradesh	16630	15207	—	15207	0.00	100.00
Assam	67158	63381	8797	16164	13.88	25.50
Bihar	387248	335908	108105	70168	32.18	20.89
Goa	3446	736	12	—	1.63	0.00
Gujarat	74909	79725	13236	27983	16.60	35.10
Haryana	17989	34026	16490	—	48.46	0.00
Himachal Pradesh	5863	9128	3856	834	42.24	9.14
Jammu & Kashmir	11193	7408	1189	2231	16.05	30.12
Karnataka	136981	132861	41168	8936	30.99	6.73
Kerala	49836	53698	24939	1969	46.44	3.67
Madhya Pradesh	258521	242673	67002	92068	27.61	37.94
Maharashtra	222394	217671	55345	36378	-25.43	16.71
Manipur	4848	6333	75	4126	1.18	65.15
Meghalaya	4655	2635	18	2617	0.68	99.32
Mizoram	6971	4684	—	4684	0.00	100.00
Nagaland	7273	4368	—	5489	0.00	125.66
Orissa	165479	160000	43543	50246	27.21	31.40
Punjab	12792	33736	17837	—	52.87	0.00
Rajasthan	107400	116567	41521	22315	35.62	19.14
Sikkim	1352	1218	64	469	5.25	38.51
Tamil Nadu	184436	214888	99358	5306	46.24	2.47
Tripura	15000	16297	2712	5234	16.64	32.12
Uttar Pradesh	416354	445403	234092	2486	52.56	0.56
West Bengal	182836	73818	25959	4210	35.17	5.70
Andaman & Nicobar Islands	1726	492	—	51	0.00	10.37
Chandigarh	0	0	—	—	—	—
D & N Haveli	372	372	19	341	5.11	91.67
Delhi	0	0	—	—	—	—
Daman & Diu	690	507	33	133	6.51	26.23
Lakshadweep	159	81	—	81	0.00	100.00

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Pondicherry	1407	1407	508	—	36.11	0.00
All India	2569942	2534925	912918	432555	36.01	17.06

Note:— For SCs and STs only percentage target has been fixed under IRDP.

3.2 After going through the above statement the Committee pointed out that although the percentage of achievement towards SC/ST beneficiaries was upto the target on all India basis, there were some shortfalls in individual States. The Committee therefore, desired to know the reasons for which some of the States had not come up to the mark and what steps were taken by the Ministry to increase the number of SC/ST families to be assisted under the programme in individual States. In reply it was stated that certain States like Assam, Goa, Karnataka, Maharashtra, Sikkim and West Bengal showed under achievement of physical targets for SCs and STs mainly due to lower population of SCs and STs in the aforesaid States. It was further stated that the Ministry was considering to allocate financial targets during 1995-96. This was envisaged to further improve flow of assistance under IRDP to SC/ST beneficiaries.

## B. Financial Performance

3.3. As regards the financial performance (State-wise) under Integrated Rural Development Programme and the amount provided to SCs and STs therein during the year 1993-94, the following information was furnished to the Committee:—

(Rs. in lakh)

State/UT	Central Allocation		Total Allocation		Percentage Achievement (Subsidy)		
	Target	Utilised (Release)	Target	Utilised	General	SC	ST
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Andhra Pradesh	4208.00	4824.31	8416.00	8813.75	46.66	41.87	11.46
Arunachal Pradesh	343.00	178.24	686.00	523.65	0.00	0.00	100.00
Assam	1385.00	1152.11	2770.00	2532.34	52.66	16.72	30.62
Bihar	7987.00	6198.84	15974.00	10073.59	43.95	35.16	28.89
Goa	71.00	73.42	142.00	24.51	97.44	2.56	0.00
Gujarat	1545.00	1510.23	3090.00	3354.85	39.96	18.04	42.00
Haryana	371.00	646.98	742.00	1318.31	44.36	55.64	0.00
Himachal Pradesh	121.00	178.62	242.00	378.02	46.14	44.65	9.21
J&K	231.00	312.70	462.00	426.67	57.82	18.91	23.27
Karnataka	2825.00	2466.33	5650.00	4026.36	57.04	34.53	8.44
Kerala	1028.00	1024.57	2056.00	1973.75	45.96	50.17	3.87
Madhya Pradesh	5332.00	5159.04	10664.00	10040.21	32.84	25.36	41.88
Maharashtra	4587.00	4433.70	9174.00	7329.26	49.28	30.46	20.26
Manipur	100.00	98.66	200.00	175.91	29.30	1.26	69.44
Meghalaya	96.00	96.76	192.00	158.33	0.03	0.65	99.32
Mizoram	144.00	138.75	288.00	282.09	0.00	0.00	100.00
Nagaland	150.00	134.64	300.00	310.79	0.00	0.00	100.00
Orissa	3413.00	3208.01	6826.00	6263.38	36.39	32.17	31.44

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Punjab	264.00	627.48	528.00	1471.24	39.35	60.65	0.00
Rajasthan	2215.00	2328.17	4430.00	4213.30	39.55	39.19	21.26
Sikkim	28.00	26.54	56.00	40.96	46.38	6.18	47.45
Tamilnadu	3884.00	3755.60	7608.00	7269.39	45.20	51.98	2.82
Tripura	309.00	309.00	618.00	540.29	43.50	18.36	38.14
Uttar Pradesh	10254.00	11045.66	20505.00	20197.02	39.54	59.76	0.70
West Bengal	3771.00	3698.07	7542.00	2959.40	52.52	40.91	6.67
A&N Islands	71.00	49.51	71.00	17.51	75.02	0.00	24.98
D.N. Haveli	15.00	15.00	15.00	14.89	2.37	4.03	93.68
Daman and Diu	28.00	14.00	28.00	18.74	69.55	7.44	24.01
Lakshadweep	7.00	7.00	7.00	6.99	0.00	0.00	100.00
Pondicherry	58.00	58.00	58.00	36.29			
	54761.00	53770.00	109343.00	9591.39	42.25	40.68	17.07

3.4. After a perusal of the above statement the Committee pointed out that the financial utilisation under the programme was less than the target during the aforesaid year on all India basis. It was simultaneously pointed out that some States fell short in utilising the financial assistance to cover the desired target. The Committee desired to know the reasons for which the financial utilisation during the year 1993-94 fell short of the desired target. In reply it was stated that the overall utilisation of IRDP funds during the year was 87% and the under-utilisation of funds should be seen in the light of 65% hike in allocations over the previous year. It was further stated that though several States geared up their implementation to absorb the higher allocation, some States such as those in the North-East, Bihar, Karnataka, Maharashtra and West Bengal were not able to utilise fully the funds allocated to them.

3.5. When the Committee wanted to know the reason for which the aforesaid States could not be able to utilise fully the funds allocated to them it was replied that short releases of funds by the State Governments of Bihar, West Bengal etc. and lack of proper infrastructural facilities in the North-Eastern States were the main reasons for which the funds could not be fully utilised.

3.6. It was elaborated that the reasons for under utilisation of funds were discussed in the six-monthly meetings with the State Governments to review their performance.

3.7. During the course of evidence the Committee wanted to hear the views of the Secretary, Ministry of Rural Development on the present system of providing financial assistance to SCs and STs and whether any improvement had been observed in their economic condition as a result of such assistance. In reply the Secretary of the Ministry stated that poverty could not be dealt with by the implementation of only one programme, rather convergence of a variety of things was required to tackle poverty effectively. He apprised that the difficulties the Ministry were facing in bringing the SCs and STs above the poverty line were on account of a very weak social, economic and political bargaining position and strength. -

3.8. When asked to elaborate, the representative of the Ministry stated that the SCs and STs, in addition to being poor, suffered from special disabilities, disadvantages and difficulties. Non-implementation of protective legislation in favour of SCs and STs regarding transfer of land, minimum agricultural wages, money lending social oppression and exploitation, and non-access to educational, health, market and other institutions constitute these special disabilities. He further stated:—

“When this protective legislation is not implemented effectively, when they (SCs and STs) suffer from these disabilities, then even if I provide them assistance under IRDP, the money gets leaked away. For example, in Bastar District (M.P.) if I give money to a Scheduled Tribe in the form of subsidy, I am awaiting a death sentence on him because immediately the exploiters and the middlemen go to him and exploit him more. This is happening with increased allocation of funds.”

3.9. Another aspect which the Secretary of the Ministry brought to the notice of the Committee was that the funds released from the Ministry of Welfare under the Special Component Plan and Tribal Sub-plan were not actually reaching the Districts. Moreover, in the absence of inadequate administrative arrangements to supervise, review and ensure that these funds were reaching the Districts, the Ministry were not getting the force and momentum to make a total impact upon the SCs and STs and the rural poor.

3.10. the witness further apprised the Committee:—

“All the families whom I have brought above the poverty line last year are now below the poverty line again because of inflation. Once a person is brought above the poverty line it is not automatic that he goes on becoming richer and richer. Secondly, once we assist a poor man we do not go to him time and again and harass him whether he is doing well or not.”

3.11. When the Committee desired to know what steps were taken by the Ministry to do away with the shortcomings cited above the Secretary, Ministry of Rural Development stated that their Ministry had taken up the matter with the Ministry of Welfare and the Planning Commission. In the preparation of the Annual Plan of the Ministry of Rural Development as well as those of the States, the Ministry of Welfare and Planning Commission were always associated. The witness further apprised that in the last two years some improvement had been made. With the formation of the District Planning Committees under the Panchayati Raj system, the implementation of IRDP would be more effective and dynamic.

3.12 From the Physical Performance statement for the year 1993-94 under IRDP furnished the Committee observe that out of 2534925 families assisted

during the aforesaid year in various States 912918 families belong to SC category and 432555 to those of STs. It amount to 36.01% achievement in case of SCs and 17.06% in case of STs thereby meeting the 50% target. But the Committee are unhappy to note that some of the States *Viz.*, Assam, Goa, Sikkim, Karnataka, Maharashtra and West Bengal have shown inadequate achievement of physical targets for SCs and STs during 1993-94. The Committee are convinced with the reason put forward by the Ministry *i.e.* Lower population of SCs and STs in the aforesaid States for such under achievement. The Committee, however, desire the Ministry to constantly persuade these States to improve their performance in the coming years.

3.13 The Committee note that the North-Eastern States have not been able to utilise fully the funds allocated to them during 1993-94 due to poor infrastructural facilities. Similarly due to short release of funds by some other State Governments like Bihar, West Bengal etc. these States have also not been able to fully utilise the funds. The Committee, therefore, urge upon the Ministry of Rural Development to coordinate with all concerned Central Ministries as well as with the North-Eastern State Governments for providing adequate infrastructural facilities to these States so that funds provided under the programme are properly utilised for the economic betterment of STs. The Committee also desire the Ministry to refrain the State Governments fo Bihar, West Bengal etc. from resorting to the practice of short release of funds.

3.14 The Committee note from the statement made by the Secretary, Ministry of Rural Development that the Integrated Rural Development Programme sponsored by the Ministry is not getting the force and momentum due to non-implementation of the protective legislation in favour of SCs and STs against so many socio-economic disabilities. The Committee are also constrained to note that funds released under Special Component Plan and Tribal Sub-plan are not reaching the Districts due to lack of proper administrative arrangements and supervision. The Committee take a serious view of these lapses on the part of both Central and State Governments. They opine that any Central or Centrally sponsored scheme aimed at the benefit of SCs and STs would prove useless unless and until protective legislation is adequately implemented in favour of these people and proper administrative arrangements are made to supervise and review the implementation of various programmes. The Committee, therefore, strongly recommend that the Ministry of Rural Development in consultation with the Ministry of Welfare and other concerned Ministries should gear up all the machineries at their command for ensuring expeditious removal of these shortcomings for the benefit of needy SCs and STs.

3.15 The Committee agree with the views expressed by the Secretary, Ministry of Rural Development that "Once a person is brought above the poverty line it is not automatic that he goes on becoming richer and richer" due to inflation. But the Committee do not agree with the statement made by the Secretary that once a person is assisted they do not go to him time

and again to harass him whether he is doing well or not. In the opinion of the Committee any assistance to SCs, STs and other rural poor is meaningless without proper follow-up action. The Committee, therefore, recommend that the persons, especially SCs and STs, assisted under IRDP should be continuously/periodically attended to, to ensure that he is atleast doing well with the funds provided to him if not becoming richer and richer.

NEW DELHI;  
20 April, 1995

---

30 Chaitra, 1917 (S)

PARAS RAM BHARDWAJ,  
*Chairman,*  
*Committee on the Welfare of*  
*Scheduled Castes and*  
*Scheduled Tribes.*

## APPENDIX

(Vide para 4 of introduction)

### *Summary of Conclusions/Recommendations contained in the Report*

Sl. No.	Para No.	Conclusions/Recommendations
1	2	3
1.	1.9	The Committee note that there is an exclusive Department <i>i.e.</i> Department of Rural Development headed by the Secretary and assisted by one Additional Secretary, one Joint Secretary, four Officers of Deputy Commissioner/Deputy Secretary level, two Under Secretaries and seven sections. In the opinion of the Committee it is a well defined system to deal with a programme of IRDP's magnitude. The Committee, desire that out of the seven sections dealing with the programme at least one section should be entrusted to deal with the SC/ST beneficiaries exclusively under the Programme to facilitate smooth and expeditious disposal of their grievances besides maintaining a meticulous record of all the aspects of such beneficiaries.
2.	1.10	The Committee are happy to note that a Central Level Coordination Committee (CLCC) with well defined functions has been constituted to review the implementation of IRDP and other allied programmes. The Committee also note that as a result of CLCC's efforts the State Governments in some cases have arrested, suspended or terminated the services of the corrupt officials. The Committee would like the Ministry to maintain that spirit in future also so that needy rural poors, especially SCs and STs, do not suffer on account of corrupt officials.
3.	1.11	The Committee note that those States who take inordinately long time in releasing Central share of funds have been warned against such practices. The Committee feel that the Ministry have also taken steps to motivate the States for releasing Central share of funds. The Committee recommend that after exhausting all the means at their disposal in persuading the States to release without delay Central share of funds, the Ministry may take other suitable measures against the habitual defaulting States and devise method to ensure that the Central assistance is released without fail.

- 
- | 1 | 2 | 3 |
|---|---|---|
|---|---|---|
- 
4. 1.18 The Committee note that a State Level Coordination Committee has been constituted in each and every State to ensure smooth implementation of Integrated Rural Development Programme as per the guidelines issued by the Centre. They also note that the frequency of the periodic meetings of the SLCC varies from State to State. The Committee desire the Ministry to instruct all the State Governments to conduct periodic meetings of the SLCC at least once in a month so that shortcomings in the implementation of the programme are wiped out in time for the benefit of the rural poor including SCs and STs.
  5. 1.19 The Committee are not satisfied with the reply of the Ministry that Members of the SLCC are required to conduct regular and surprise visits to Districts/Blocks for overseeing the implementation of the programme. The Committee recommend the Ministry to ensure that the SLCC actually conduct periodical and surprise visits to the Districts and Blocks to oversee the implementation of the programme at the grass root level. In the opinion of the Committee it will help in providing not only proper leadership and timely guidance to Districts/Blocks but also a forum for a meaningful dialogue between the policy makers at the State level and the implementors at the field level:
  6. 1.20 The Committee note that the State Government are authorised to include any official or non-official as a Member in the State Level Coordination Committee. They recommend the Central Government to instruct the State Governments to include at least one knowledgeable person belonging to the SC/ST community as official or non-official member in the SLCC so that his views are taken care of while framing policies for the betterment of SCs and STs.
  7. 1.31 The Committee note that the District Rural Development Agencies are the overall incharge of planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the Integrated Rural Development Programme in the District. They also note that the DRDAs have been provided a basic staffing
-



---

pattern to discharge their day-to-day work. The Committee, however, desire that a SC/ST cell with adequate staff should be set up and attached to each DRDA to deal with matters pertaining to SC/ST beneficiaries exclusively. Taking into consideration the ignorance and illiteracy of SC/ST people residing in backward Districts, the Committee opine that these exclusive cells can provide them proper guidance and protect them from unscrupulous exploitation.

8. 1.32 The Committee note that the Governing Body of the DRDA includes members of the Weaker Sections to assist the DRDA in discharging its duties. The Committee consider it an healthy trend and would like to recommend that the Executive Committee also whenever constituted, should include members belonging to the Weaker Sections so that they can be able to participate in the planning and implementation of the programme at the grass root level.
9. 1.33 The Committee are dissatisfied to note that the Project Officer/Director of the DRDA has no disciplinary authority over the Block Staff. When the sole responsibility of implementing the programme at the grass root level lies with the PO/PD, the Committee fail to understand the constraint in empowering him with disciplinary powers over the Block Staff. Taking into consideration many preoccupations of the District Collector and notwithstanding the fact that the PO/PD is drawn on deputation, the Committee would like the Ministry to instruct the State Governments to empower the PO/PD of DRDA with adequate disciplinary authority over the Block Staff so that corruption can be nipped in the bud.
10. 1.34 The Committee are pained to note that although the Central Government issued instructions to the State Governments in 1983 for setting up of Grievance Cells to avoid corruption at grass root level, the Ministry do not have information about the composition of these cells. The Committee apprehend whether these cells have been established at all. They, therefore, recommend the Ministry to collect detailed data about the establishment and composition of the Grievance Cells and apprise the
-

---

1	2	3
---	---	---

---

Committee accordingly. The Committee also desire that after scrutinizing the data collected from various States, the Government should take suitable action against the State Governments wherever any deviation to their instruction is noticed.

11. 2.11 The Committee note that the Ministry of Rural Development has been issuing guidelines from time to time to the States/UTs for proper implementation of the working of IRDP at various levels. The Committee also note that the performance report with regard to the key indicators are to be sent by the States/UTs for all the District Rural Development Agencies to the Centre in monthly, quarterly and yearly proformas which have been made precise and need oriented during the VIIth Plan. The Committee desire the Ministry to ensure that all the States/UTs are sending the performance report of the DRDAs in the monthly, quarterly and yearly proformas to the Central Government. They also recommend that any deviation made by any State/UT in this regard should be set right without loss of time.
12. 2.12 The Committee note that a definite number of inspections to be carried out at different levels by State Officials has been prescribed by the introduction of a qualitative monitoring system since March, 1988. But they are unhappy to note the casual reply given by the representative of the Ministry that the aforesaid inspections are supposed to be held properly. In their opinion mere issuance of guidelines to the States for conducting a minimum number of inspections on monthly basis would serve little purpose unless and until there is constant persuasion by the Central Government in this regard. The Committee, therefore, desire the Ministry to motivate the State Governments for carrying out inspections meticulously in commensurate with the prescribed norms. They also recommend the Ministry to persuade the State Governments to take action against the officials who fail to comply with the orders/guidelines in this regard.
13. 2.13 The Committee simultaneously recommend that the State Officials who conduct monthly inspections of the working
-

---

1	2	3
		<b>of RDP at the grass root level should be given independent power and authority to carry out such inspections and to arrest any incidence of non implementation of the programme, misappropriation of fund etc.</b>
14.	2.14	<b>The Committee are glad to note that the Ministry of Rural Development have devised many appreciable methods e.g. appointment of Area Officers, conducting Project Directors Workshop, Secretaries Conference etc. to monitor the working of IRDP in various States/UTs. They are also happy to note that the Ministry have issued instructions to the State Governments/UT Administrations to do away with the shortcomings which came to notice as a result of the inspections conducted by the Area Officers of the Ministry. The Committee feel that it is a step in the right direction and would like to encourage the Ministry to keep up their efforts in future also.</b>
15.	2.24	<b>The Committee note that the evaluation study of IRDP conducted by the Reserve Bank of India, National Bank for Agriculture and Rural Development, Institute for Financial Management and Research, World Bank etc. has hailed the programme as a sound and ambitious effort towards poverty alleviation of the rural poor. The Committee would, however, like the Ministry to encourage more such evaluation studies in future for the economic betterment of the rural poor including SCs &amp; STs.</b>
16.	2.25	<b>The Committee note that the Ministry have taken several steps to do away with the shortcomings pointed out by the aforesaid evaluation studies. They are, however, unhappy to note that the number and percentage of SC/ST families given supplementary assistance is not available with the Ministry. The Committee, therefore, recommend that henceforth whenever supplementary assistance is given to the beneficiaries, a detailed record of such assistance given to the SC/ST beneficiaries should be maintained meticulously by the Ministry.</b>
17.	2.26	<b>The Committee note that the Ministry do not encourage the practice of giving supplementary assistance on a</b>

---

- 
- | 1 | 2 | 3 |
|---|---|---|
|---|---|---|
- 
- continuous basis and the same is extended only after a case by case scrutiny of the borrowers performance. The Committee agree with the method adopted by the Ministry for extending supplementary assistance to the beneficiaries. They, however, suggest that while scrutinizing the performance of the borrowers, special attention be paid towards the SC/ST beneficiaries as they are unable to cross the poverty line due to the prevailing social stigma and other vulnerable factors.
18. 2.27 The Committee note that the feedback received in the Ministry has shown most of the States have passed on necessary instructions to their respective District rural Development Agencies to revise guidelines as desired by the Ministry for better implementation of IRDP. The Committee also note that the Ministry keep a vigilant watch upon the States through the CLCC and the Area Officers to ensure that the State Governments are adhering to the advice/instructions given to them under the new initiatives. The Committee desire the Ministry to keep up the monitoring system in future also. They also recommend the Ministry to persuade those States who have not passed on the necessary instructions to the DRDA, to do the needful immediately.
19. 2.33 The Committee note that so far three rounds of concurrent Evaluation Studies have been undertaken by several Institutions at the behest of the Ministry to streamline and improve the pace of implementation of the programme. They also note that the latest round of Study (January-December, 1989) has pointed out elaborately both positive and negative aspects of the implementation of the Integrated Rural Development Programme. One such negative point that has come to the notice of the Committee is the assistance of ineligible families upto the tune of 16%. The Committee, however note that the Ministry have formulated detailed guidelines on the basis of recommendations of the Expert Committee of the Reserve Bank of India to see that no ineligible family is assisted under the Programme. These guidelines have been communicated to the States from time to time as a result of which, the percentage of ineligible families has come down to 4 only. The Committee feel that assistance to ineligible families under the Integrated Rural Development Programme can
-

- 
- | 1 | 2 | 3 |
|---|---|---|
|---|---|---|
- 
- very well defeat the purpose for which the programme was initiated i.e., poverty alleviation of the rural poor including SCs and STs. They, therefore, recommend that the Central Govt. should relentlessly persuade the State Governments to take necessary steps viz. selection of beneficiaries by Gram Panchayats, public display of the list of beneficiaries etc. so that the remaining ineligible families are completely debarred from being assisted under the programme.
20. 2.34 The Committee also recommend that those States who are not conducting the Below Poverty Line (BPL) survey or not adhering to the suggestions/instructions of the Central Government to ensure non-inclusion of ineligible families under IRDP, should not be given any assistance under the programme.
21. 2.39 The Committee note that the working Group on the Development of Scheduled Tribes has made several good recommendations during the VII and VIII plans for the economic upliftment of Tribal people under IRDP. They also note that although the Ministry are taking steps to comply with the recommendations made by the Working Group, they are yet to fully implement the same. For example the desirable per capita investment as per the recommendations of the Working Group should be fixed at Rs. 8000/- at 1988-89 prices whereas the per capita investment for ST families is only Rs. 6551/- during 1993-94 as per the information furnished by the Ministry. The Committee, therefore, recommend the Ministry to make vigorous efforts to meet the desirable per capita investment as recommended by the Working Group at the earliest.
22. 2.40 The Committee also recommend that the Government should take immediate steps to implement the other recommendations of the Working Group for the economic betterment of Scheduled Tribes. Special attention in this regard ought to be paid for separate monitoring of the programme for ST beneficiaries, compulsory issuance and maintenance of 'Vikas Patrika' in respect of ST families, establishment and involvement of the organisations of the ST beneficiaries, assistance to the primitive tribal groups and coverage of ST women in much larger numbers under the programme.
-

1	2	3
23.	3.12	<p>From the Physical performance statement for the year 1993-94 under IRDP furnished, the Committee observe that out of 2534925 families assisted during the aforesaid year in various States 912918 families belong to SC category and 432555 to those of STs. It amount to 36.01% achievement in case of SCs and 17.06% in case of STs thereby meeting the 50% target. But the Committee are unhappy to note that some of the States viz., Assam, Goa, Sikkim, Karnataka, Maharashtra and West Bengal have shown inadequate achievement of physical targets for SCs and STs during 1993-94. The Committee are convinced with the reason put forward by the Ministry i.e. lower population of SCs and STs in the aforesaid States for such under achievement. The Committee, however, desire the Ministry to constantly persuade these States to improve their performance in the coming years.</p>
24.	3.13	<p>The Committee note that the North Eastern States have not been able to utilise fully the funds allocated to them during 1993-94 due to poor infrastructural facilities. Similarly due to short release of funds by some other State Governments like Bihar, West Bengal etc. these States have also not been able to fully utilise the funds. The Committee, therefore, urge upon the Ministry of Rural Development to coordinate with all concerned Central Ministries as well as with the North Eastern State Governments for providing adequate infrastructural facilities to these States so that funds provided under the programme are properly utilised for the economic betterment of STs. The Committee also desire the Ministry to refrain the State Governments of Bihar, West Bengal etc. from resorting to the practice of short release of funds.</p>
25.	3.14	<p>The Committee note from the statement made by the Secretary, Ministry of Rural Development that the Integrated Rural Development Programme sponsored by the Ministry is not getting the force and momentum due to non-implementation of the protective legislation in favour of SCs and STs against so many socio-economic disabilities. The Committee are also constrained to note that funds released under Special Component Plan and Tribal Sub-Plan are not reaching the District due to lack of proper Administrative arrangements and supervision. The Committee take a serious view of these lapses on the part</p>

1 2

3

---

of both Central and State Governments. They opine that any Central or Centrally Sponsored scheme aimed at the benefit of SCs and STs would prove useless unless and until protective legislation is adequately implemented in favour of these people and proper administrative arrangements are made to supervise and review the implementation of various programmes. The Committee, therefore, strongly recommend that the Ministry of Rural Development in consultation with the Ministry of Welfare and other concerned Ministries should gear up all the machineries at their command for ensuring expeditious removal of these shortcomings for the benefit of needy SCs and STs.

26. 3.15

The Committee agree with the views expressed by the Secretary, Ministry of Rural Development that "Once a person is brought above the poverty line it is not automatic that he goes on becoming richer and richer" due to inflation. But the Committee do not agree with the statement made by the Secretary that once a person is assisted they do not go to him time and again to harass him whether he is doing well or not. In the opinion of the Committee any assistance to SCs, STs and other rural poor is meaningless without proper follow up action. The Committee, therefore, recommend that the persons, especially SCs and STs, assisted under IRDP should be continuously/periodically attended to, to ensure that he is at least doing well with the funds provided to him if not becoming richer and richer.

---