

CHAPTER – IX

Monitoring Mechanism and Impact Evaluation

9.1 *Monitoring by District Administration*

Timely and proper monitoring of all developmental works executed by the various departments in the district was the overall responsibility of DC. However, the DC intimated (November 2011) that mechanism for monitoring the execution of schemes/ programmes through obtaining regular feedback from head of the offices of the departments, field visits by the SDMs and DC himself did not exist. Though various meetings were convened by the DC, these meetings were mostly relating to celebration of festive programmes, disaster management, etc. It was also noticed that inspection schedule for field visit to monitor the progress of schemes/ programmes was neither drawn up by the departments concerned nor by the DC office. Details indicating outcome of field visits were never recorded and passed on to the department concerned for initiating corrective action. Evaluation of the scheme/ programme at district and State level was not attempted as yet. Besides, following were also noticed:

9.1.1 *Suitable Mechanism not Developed for Monitoring*

According to State Government notification (January 2007), suitable mechanism for reporting of the progress of the various schemes undertaken at the Block level to the concerned line department through the designated Nodal officers along with a copy to head of departments is required to be developed.

It was, however, noticed that these prescriptions were not adhered as no documentation indicated physical verification was ever recorded. In the absence of documentation, the field visits by the authorities could not be vouched for in audit and corrective action, if any, could not be initiated by the implementing departments.

9.1.2 *Schedule of Inspection for Field Visits not Drawn*

Reports related to all ongoing schemes within the block shall be forwarded to the concerned line department on a monthly basis and field visits should be conducted by DDO on quarterly basis and DC on half yearly basis. The district authorities have not drawn up such schedule for inspections and indicated their findings, if any, for initiating corrective actions by implementing agency/departments.

Even in case of SGRY and NREGA schemes, where the scheme required preparation of

schedule of inspection for State/district level officers for monitoring the execution of projects and overall implementation of scheme through visit to work site and submitting returns to GOI in prescribed format; schedule of inspection and visit reports to worksite by district level officers could not be made available to Audit. Thus, effective monitoring of the scheme in terms of actual execution of work was severely lacking in the existing system.

In reply, the DC stated (February 2012) that periodical meetings were held with the Heads of Office of each Department in the district where developmental works were being analysed and the DC coordinates for overall monitoring in the district. Whenever meetings were called for any particular purpose, it did not mean that the progress of development was not discussed. A system of recording field visits in the DC's Office was going on and a suitable mechanism was getting developed in the DC's Office for timely and proper monitoring of all the developmental works.

9.2 Grievance Redressal

The State Government had not instituted any mechanism at the district level to address the grievances of the public relating to the services/ utilities provided by various departments and agencies of the State. No Grievance Cell had been set up in the district. The DC, South stated (November 2011 and February 2012) that the grievances received were attended instantly depending upon their nature and the public grievances received in the office of the DC, South on daily basis relating to other departments were forwarded to the concerned departments for redressal at their end. However, no records were maintained for such grievances. Since no records were maintained, details relating to grievances received, disposed of and pending were not available with any authority.

In further reply, the DC stated (February 2012) that the Grievance Redressal mechanism was well established at Single Window System with a complaint register/box, kept over there. There was no record of pending grievances. There was also a provision to make online complaint on official website of South District – www.southsikkim.nic.in and through the official mail at dmnamchi@gmail.com. Records were also maintained at Under Secretary level and PA to DC level for better disposal of works. The District Collectorate was trying its best to give justice to the public at large. The reply is not acceptable as no such records were maintained either at Private Secretary level or at Under Secretary level.

9.3 Conclusion

Monitoring and supervision of the progress of implementation of various schemes at all tiers of local administration in the district was perfunctory which impacted the progress of developmental works/projects undertaken by various departments/implementing agencies. Consequently, there were number of works in the social and economic sectors which were plagued by time overruns thereby depriving the public of the benefits of these developmental schemes.

9.4 Recommendation

- *Monitoring, inspection and supervision needs to be strengthened at all the tiers of local administration to ensure that the programmes are executed on time and within cost and timely corrective action is taken in cases of slippage.*