

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This Report contains results of performance audit of (i) Medical Council of India (ii) “Functioning of Council for Advancement of People’s Action and Rural Technology” (iii) “Catalytic Development Programme” of Central Silk Board (iv) Role of National Centre for Jute Diversification in Promotion of Jute Diversified Products and (v) Functioning of Brahmaputra Board.

## MINISTRY OF HEALTH AND FAMILY WELFARE

### Medical Council of India

The Medical Council of India (Council) was established in February 1934 under an Act of Parliament - the Indian Medical Council Act 1933 repealed in 1956 by the Indian Medical Council Act, 1956 (*Act*). It aims to establish uniform standards of medical education and recognition of medical qualifications granted by universities/medical institutions in India and abroad. Performance audit of the Council revealed instances of Ministry having granted permissions for establishment of new medical colleges, increase of seats, renewal of permission for admissions and starting of post graduate courses against the recommendations of the Council and norms prescribed in the *Act*. There were also instances of variations in Inspection Reports of the Council and the Ministry. During the period 2007-08 to 2008-09, 59 medical colleges countrywide admitted 326 students in post graduate courses in excess of their intake capacity in violation of provisions of Indian Medical Council Act. The Ministry did not take any action for de-recognition in the case of nine medical colleges whose withdrawal of recognition was recommended by the Council due to persistent irregularities noticed by the Council in many inspections. The Council had not drawn up any schedule for periodical inspection of each medical college though its norms provided for such inspection once in every five years. Of the total colleges inspected by the Council during 2004-05 to 2008-09, 73 *per cent* were inspected after the prescribed period of five years. During the periodical inspections of 62 medical colleges, the Council noticed that there was a shortage of faculty beyond the permissible limits in 29 government and 19 private medical colleges and shortage of residents in 21 government and 18 private medical colleges. The Council did not have a mechanism to check whether doctors whose names were struck off the Indian Medical Register continued the practice nor did it publicize the names of doctors found guilty of professional misconduct in local press etc. as required under its regulations.

(Paragraph 1)

**MINISTRY OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT**

**Functioning of Council for Advancement of People's Action and Rural Technology**

The Council for Advancement of People's Action and Rural Technology (CAPART) was set up in 1986, with a mandate to encourage, promote, and assist rural action and propagate appropriate rural technologies for the benefit of the rural poor. This was to be achieved mainly by promoting voluntary action through funding support for innovative, need-based projects, encouraging collaboration amongst voluntary organisation, and selecting, encouraging and disseminating innovative technologies.

A performance audit of CAPART, covering the period 2003-09 and involving scrutiny of records at the Headquarters and three regional offices (Ahmadabad, Bhubaneswar and Jaipur) and field visits to selected project sites, was conducted in spells between April 2009 and July 2010.

The performance audit revealed that CAPART was not achieving its objective of promoting voluntary action through funding support as execution of projects had been poor, with most projects either ongoing with huge time overruns or were terminated. The process for approval, management, and monitoring of projects was flawed, as the majority of the projects falling within the audit sample were improperly appraised and approved, funded and monitored. Field visits to the sites of the selected projects also revealed irregularities in delivery of the intended project benefits.

In the context of overlap of CAPART's activities with other flagship programmes of the Government of India, the Ministry may consider its restructuring.

*(Paragraph2)*

**MINISTRY OF TEXTILES**

**Central Silk Board**

**Catalytic Development Programme**

Sericulture, a technique of silk production is an agro industry, playing an eminent role in the rural economy in India. The major activities of sericulture comprise food plant cultivation to feed silkworms which spin silk cocoons and reeling the cocoons for unwinding the silk filament for processing and weaving. The Central Silk Board(CSB) implements various schemes for development of sericulture and silk industry with the involvement of State Governments. These schemes are collectively described as Catalytic Development Programme (CDP) which is a Centrally Sponsored Scheme. The

CSB is responsible for formulating the schemes and getting them approved by the Government of India. It releases central share of funds in the prescribed ratio to the State covered by CDP and monitors implementation

The performance audit of implementation of CDP during the period 2004-05 to 2008-09 revealed significant deficiencies in planning, utilisation of funds and implementation. Audit also noticed extension of assistance in contravention of scheme guidelines. In Karnataka, which is one of the major silk producing states, majority of beneficiaries after availing subsidy for construction of rearing houses for production of Bivoltine cocoons for producing higher quality raw silk, discontinued rearing in contravention of the terms and conditions signifying monitoring deficiencies.

*(Paragraph3)*

### **National Centre for Jute Diversification**

#### **Role of National Centre for Jute Diversification in Promotion of Jute Diversified Products**

The National Centre for Jute Diversification (NCJD) was established in 1994 as an autonomous body under the Ministry of Textiles to give focused attention to the diversification efforts in jute sector. The major objectives of NCJD included consolidation of R&D results of various institutes in jute and textiles and transfer to the entrepreneurs for commercial production, to provide training and technical guidance to entrepreneurs/artisans/craftsmen, to plan and execute market promotion strategies and media campaigns and to provide financial assistance by way of subsidy or seed capital. NCJD implemented the schemes without proper planning and monitoring. NCJD focused its efforts mainly in organising awareness workshops/training programmes, providing subsidised jute raw material and participating in fairs. NCJD did not maintain any database on trainees of different training programmes. In the absence of required database, the impact assessment of schemes implemented by NCJD was not feasible. There were deficiencies in selection of Cluster Development Agencies. NCJD could not develop a single jute park as envisaged under Jute Technology Mission. NCJD has been merged in the National Jute Board, which commenced its operation from 1 April 2010. The National Jute Board was required to strengthen its control and monitoring mechanism to ensure proper survey, availability of database in respect of all activities under schemes implemented and outcome thereof.

*(Paragraph4)*

## **MINISTRY OF WATER RESOURCES**

### **Functioning of Brahmaputra Board**

The Brahmaputra Board was established in 1980 under an Act of Parliament as an autonomous body under the aegis of the erstwhile Ministry of Irrigation (now Ministry of Water Resources), Government of India for planning and integrated implementation of measures for control of floods and bank erosion in Brahmaputra Valley and Barak Valley. The Board was required to prepare Master Plan for the control of floods and bank erosion and improvement of drainage and implement the projects as per approved Master Plans. The Board did not prescribe any time frame for preparation of the Master Plans resulting in non-completion of this main activity till date. There was also lack of coordination between the Board and the States in preparation of Master Plans. The Board could complete preparation of Detailed Project Reports (DPRs) for 34 projects against 64 projects. Approval of Central Water Commission could be obtained for 12 DPRs only against 29 DPRs submitted up to January 2010. The Board took up 20 projects under different schemes for execution, but it could complete only seven projects. There were deficiencies in financial management. Delay in completion of projects had resulted in loss of Rs.243.72 crore in the form of non-achievement of perceived cost benefits under the schemes. Project monitoring mechanism was not effective. The fact that the Board could complete only seven projects during its existence for 27 years proved that it failed to achieve its objectives.

*(Paragraph 5)*