

Executive Summary

Indira Awaas Yojana (IAY), a flagship programme of Ministry of Rural Development Department (MoRD), Government of India (GoI) aims at helping rural people Below Poverty-Line (BPL) belonging to SCs/STs, freed bonded labourers and non-SC/ST categories in construction of dwelling units and upgradation of existing unserviceable kutcha houses by providing assistance in the form of full grant. The programme was being implemented in the State with effect from 1 January 1996. Besides, a scheme for providing homestead sites to those rural BPL households who neither have agricultural land nor a house site was launched as part of IAY with effect from 24 August 2009. The scheme was being implemented through the Zilla Parishads/DRDAs.

The performance audit of IAY in Assam was aimed at reviewing the efforts of the State Government for implementation of the Scheme and highlighting the areas and issues of concern which need to be addressed for the successful achievement of the objectives of the scheme. Against the total funds of ₹3,973.54 crore available in the State under the scheme during the period of 2008-13, ₹3,836.12 crore (96.54 *per cent*) was reported to have been spent for providing houses (New Construction) to the beneficiaries. Out of the total 8.95 lakh houses sanctioned during 2008-13, 7.34 lakh houses (82 *per cent*) were completed during the period.

The performance audit brought out some positive achievements of the State Government relating to implementation of the scheme *viz.*, creation of a cluster of 177 houses during 2012-13 in Nagaon district. It was also noticed during joint survey that the responses of the beneficiaries was favourable indicating that most of the beneficiaries did not face any problem in getting allotment of houses under the scheme.

There were however, certain areas of concern and issues which requires action on the part of the State Government on priority basis. These are summarised as under:

Planning

Indira Awaas Yojana was an ongoing process for meeting the housing needs of the rural poor. MoRD, GoI decided (January 2011) that every state should prepare Annual Plan from 2012-13 *inter-alia* highlighting issues like budget, eradication of shelterlessness in a time-bound manner, access to appropriate technological solutions and skills, convergence, monitoring of houses constructed by the beneficiaries and complaints redressal etc. The State Government, however, did not prepare the Annual Plan for 2012-13 for reasons not on record.

(Paragraph 2.1)

Physical and financial management

Of the total 8.95 lakh houses sanctioned during 2008-13, 7.34 lakh houses were completed during the period. There were instances of short release of both Central as well as State share and issues relating to imposition of cuts, delays in release of funds, irregular utilisation of fund, loss of interest, reporting of inflated expenditure, non-utilisation of interest funds at block level etc., besides other gross financial irregularities like misappropriation of funds and doubtful expenditures.

(Paragraphs 3.1, 3.3.2, 3.3.4, 3.3.5, 3.3.7, 3.3.9 and 3.3.11)

Identification and selection of beneficiaries

There were deficiencies in assessment of housing shortage and preparation of Permanent Wait list (PWL). There were also cases of irregular selection of beneficiaries whose names did not appear in the BPL lists, PWL and approved list of Gram Sabha. Cases of double allotment of houses to a single beneficiary during the same or subsequent years also came to notice.

(Paragraphs 4.1.1, 4.1.2 and 4.1.4)

Construction and quality of houses

There were shortfalls in allotment and construction of houses during 2008-13 with respect to the funds available with the State. Instances of construction of houses by the blocks (instead of releasing funds to the accounts of the beneficiaries), excess allotment of houses and release of funds from block level at reduced rate were also noticed. Cases of non-completion of the houses, non-adoption of disaster resistant technology in the constructions and poor construction also came to notice. Additional amenities like sanitary latrine, electricity and drinking water facilities were also not provided with the houses of the beneficiaries.

(Paragraphs 4.2.1, 4.2.4, 4.2.5, 4.2.6, 4.2.8 and 4.3)

Monitoring and Evaluation

The State Government had not prescribed any norms for inspections to be carried out at different levels. There was deficiency in conducting inspections and maintenance of related inspection records/reports. There were shortfalls in holding of Vigilance and Monitoring Committee meetings at all levels. Besides, deficiency in conducting Social Audit, grievance redressal etc., reflected poor monitoring and evaluation of the programmes at state, district and block levels.

(Paragraphs 5.1.1, 5.2.1, 5.2.3, 5.3.1 and 5.4)