

## CHAPTER – III

### Planning

GOI envisaged an inclusive and participative planning process for the development of districts. The 74<sup>th</sup> Amendment (1992) to the Constitution mandated the establishment of a District Planning Committee (DPC) for consolidating the plans prepared by the Panchayats in the district into an integrated District Plan. Accordingly, Gram Panchayats (GP) and the ZP were required to prepare annual action plan and submit it to District Planning Officer (DPO) through BDOs and DDO respectively. The efficacy of the planning process in the district was analysed in audit and results are enumerated below:

#### 3.1 *Perspective and Annual Plans*

Scrutiny of the records of the DDO, ZP and selected BDOs revealed that neither Perspective Plan was prepared nor any Consolidated Annual Plan was formulated for the district for the period 2006-07 to 2010-11, except preparing a statement of targeted number of works and outlay at the level of the GPs / villages, the Blocks and the District. No shelf of projects was prepared at any level on annual basis.

#### 3.2 *District Plan*

A consolidated plan for the district as a whole was never prepared by the district authorities. The perspective plan and the annual action plans for the district as a whole were also never attempted during the financial years 2006-07 to 2010-11. Line departments were implementing various schemes / projects according to the resource allocation made to them by their respective head office located at Gangtok based on the annual plans of their departments.

Even after constituting the DPC for South district as late as July 2008 with the Adhyaksha, ZP (South) as the Chairman, DPO as Member Secretary and the Member of Parliaments (MPs), Member of Legislative Assemblies (MLAs), and others as members to consolidate the plans prepared by the ZP and GPs in the draft development plan for the district as a whole for approval by the State Government, perspective plan for the district and consolidated annual action plans for the district were not prepared. Neither the DPC sought inputs from GPs for preparation of the district plans nor the GPs proposed any such plans for their portion for inclusion in the district plan. As a result, the planning process for development of district duly reflecting the aspirations of the people at the grassroots levels and lower formations as envisaged in the 74<sup>th</sup> amendment was missing.

It was also noticed that the mandate of the DPC did not specify the number of meetings to be

convened in a year. However, no record was produced to show that the DPC had ever met.

### **3.3 District Technical Support Committee**

The district was supposed to constitute a District Technical Support Committee (DTSC) with the DC as chairperson and all district level heads of office of line departments as ex-officio members for (i) preparation of sector-specific district perspective plan for the GPs and ZP, (ii) supporting and coordinate with the Gram Planning Forum for preparation of GP plan, (iii) assisting in formulation of ZP plan and district plan.

Audit noticed that no such Committee was constituted during the period under Audit and accordingly no such district perspective plan was prepared and technical inputs to the GP and ZP for formulation of plans were not provided.

### **3.4 Gram Panchayat Plan**

The State Government notified (August 2006) formation of Gram Planning Forum (GPF) at the GP unit for:

- (i) preparation of prospective planning duly laying down development goals for the GPU and identifying the ways and means to achieve it,
- (ii) preparation of periodical and annual plan for the GP,
- (iii) monitoring the implementation of works,
- (iv) maintaining year wise records of the schemes, and
- (v) presenting all the executed / completed schemes in the gram sabha.

The GPF would consist of President of the GPU as chairperson, all elected members of the GP and concerned elected members of the ZP as members. Besides, the Forum would also consist of one senior most official from each of the department working under the GPU and BDO as ex-officio members and five expert members from different fields as advisory members.

Audit noticed (November 2011) that the GPs had neither constituted GPF nor framed annual plans as envisaged. Further, no working group was formed in any of the 14 selected GPs to facilitate sector wise preparation of plan for the GP. However, GPs prepared list of works to be executed in the GPUs in their gram sabhas. Thus, planning process at the GP level was almost non-existent.

### **3.5 Conclusion**

Perspective plan and consolidated annual action plans for the district as a whole were not prepared during the years 2006-11 despite formation of various Committees for preparation of these plans. No record was produced to show that the DPC had ever met for formulating a plan for the district as a whole. Planning process at the GP level was almost non-existent as the GPs had not framed annual plans and working group to facilitate sector wise preparation of plan

were not formed in any of the 14 GPs visited by audit.

### **3.6 Recommendation**

- *Perspective plan and consolidated annual action plans for the district should be prepared on priority basis to avail the benefit of planned development.*
- *Immediate steps may be initiated to revive the DPC to ensure peoples participation in the planning process for robust and efficient plan formulation. Further, steps may also be taken to constitute District Technical Support Committee and the Gram Planning Forum.*