

Chapter 6: Convergence with other Schemes

6.1 Introduction

As per para 5.11 of the Indira Awaas Yojana (IAY) guidelines, the District Rural Development Agencies (DRDAs) were to make concerted efforts to identify the programmes/schemes being implemented by various Ministries/Departments of the Central Government which could be dovetailed with the IAY so that IAY beneficiaries could also derive the benefits of these schemes intended for rural BPL households. It was envisaged that there should be convergence of the IAY with activities and funds provided under the Total Sanitation Campaign for construction of sanitary latrines in the IAY houses; Rajiv Gandhi Grameen Vidhyutikaran Yojana for providing electricity; National Rural Water Supply Programme for providing drinking water; Differential Rate of Interest scheme for availing loan facility; Insurance Policies for rural BPL families and rural landless families; and job cards under Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme so that the possible benefits under these schemes could be extended to the IAY beneficiaries.

6.2 Absence of Convergence Activities

6.2.1 Construction of sanitary latrines under Total Sanitation Campaign (TSC)

We noted that sanitary latrines were constructed only in 25.48 lakh (23.68 *per cent*) out of 107.58 lakh houses for the entire country during the period 2009-10 to 2012-13. Thus, 76.32 *per cent* houses were deprived of the benefits of TSC as sanitary latrines were not constructed in these houses.

Further, in the selected districts of 16 states/UTs *viz.* **Arunachal Pradesh, Bihar, Goa, Gujarat, Haryana** (in five districts), **Jammu & Kashmir, Jharkhand, Karnataka, Kerala, Mizoram, Nagaland, Odisha, Punjab, Tripura, Uttarakhand** and **Andaman & Nicobar Islands**, convergence activities with TSC were not undertaken.

In **Chhattisgarh**, in five selected districts and 13 blocks, there was lack of awareness regarding convergence between IAY and TSC. There were no concerted efforts on the part of the implementing agencies to ensure assistance under TSC to IAY beneficiaries. In place of providing additional assistance for the construction of sanitary latrine, the agencies in their sanctions for release of assistance under the IAY stipulated that a portion of the IAY assistance was to be used for the construction of sanitary latrine. Thus, instead of obtaining additional assistance under TSC, the beneficiaries had to construct the sanitary latrines within the IAY assistance. In **Uttarakhand**, sanitary latrines were to be constructed with the IAY houses under TSC but were actually funded under the IAY. In **Uttar Pradesh**, 15 selected districts did not ensure sanction of sanitary latrines while sanctioning a house under the IAY. District Panchayat Raj Officers (DPROs), under whom TSC was being implemented, were working independently and not in coordination with DRDAs. The DRDAs invariably did not send the list of houses sanctioned under the IAY to DPROs and also did not ensure construction of a sanitary latrine. There was no system to ensure sanctioning and construction of a sanitary latrine along with the construction of house. We noted that out of 15 selected districts, in nine districts¹ only 55,635 sanitary latrines (12.60 *per cent*) were constructed against 4,41,409 sanctioned houses during 2008-13.

In **Andhra Pradesh**, the Andhra Pradesh State Housing Corporation Limited (APSHCL) did not furnish any information about convergence of IAY with other GOI programmes/schemes. However, audit noted that in two selected districts Karimnagar and Khammam, out of 2, 04,569 sanctioned houses², only 34,487 houses³ (16.86 *per cent*) were sanctioned along with sanitary latrines.

In **Maharashtra**, out of eight selected districts, in three districts (Ahmednagar, Ratnagiri, Thane) convergence was done with the IAY. In four selected districts (Bhandara, Solapur, Beed, Gondia) and two blocks (Ardhapur, Kinwat) of district Nanded, no convergence was done with the IAY. Further, beneficiaries were forced to construct the sanitary latrine from the assistance of the IAY as State Government instructed the DRDAs not to release final instalment of the IAY unless sanitary latrines were constructed by the beneficiaries. This instruction was against the provisions of the guidelines and deprived of the benefits of TSC to the IAY beneficiaries.

¹ Amroha, Deoria (only of block Bhatani), Gonda, Kushinagar, Lucknow, Manपुरi, Mathura Rampur and Varanasi

² (Karimnagar-51,107 and Khammam-1,53,462)

³ (Karimnagar-13,914 and Khammam-20,573)

Case Study

Uttar Pradesh

District Panchayat Raj Officer (DPRO), Varanasi released ₹ 1.35 crore to DRDA Varanasi for crediting the same in bank accounts of the IAY beneficiaries for construction of sanitary latrine during 2009-11, out of which the DRDA released only ₹ 36 lakh to the IAY beneficiaries. Audit noted that ₹ 5.50 lakh was diverted for the payment of salary to DRDA staff and ₹ 0.34 lakh for first instalment of an IAY beneficiary. The amount of ₹ 1.04 crore (including interest) remained unutilized (February 2013).

Audit further noted that after receipt of funds under convergence from DPRO, DRDA Varanasi released first instalment of ₹ 1,500 each for the construction of sanitary latrine to 739 beneficiaries in 2010-11. However, second instalment to these beneficiaries was not released (May 2013). As a result neither the sanitary latrines were constructed nor the amount so disbursed (₹ 11.09 lakh) was put to use.

6.2.2 Convergence with Rajiv Gandhi Grameen Vidhyutikaran Yojana (RGGVY)

In selected districts of 21 states *viz.* **Andhra Pradesh, Arunachal Pradesh, Assam, Bihar, Goa, Gujarat, Haryana, Himachal Pradesh (one district), Jammu & Kashmir, Jharkhand, Karnataka, Kerala, Madhya Pradesh, Meghalaya, Manipur, Mizoram, Nagaland, Odisha, Punjab, Uttarakhand, and Uttar Pradesh**, the IAY was not converged with RGGVY for providing free electricity connections.

6.2.3 Convergence with National Rural Water Supply Programme (NRWSP)

We noted that in selected districts of 24 states/UTs *viz.* **Andhra Pradesh, Arunachal Pradesh, Assam, Bihar, Chhattisgarh, Goa, Gujarat, Haryana, Himachal Pradesh(one district), Jammu & Kashmir, Jharkhand, Karnataka, Kerala, Meghalaya, Manipur, Mizoram, Nagaland, Odisha, Punjab, Tripura, Uttar Pradesh, Uttarakhand, West Bengal and Andaman & Nicobar Islands**, IAY beneficiaries were deprived of the benefits of convergence with NRWSP.

In **Madhya Pradesh**, out of 13 selected districts, nine districts⁴ reported that convergence with NRWSP was not ensured. Two districts (Mandla, Khandwa) reported convergence with NRWSP, however, records were not produced to audit for verification and remaining two districts (Dindori, Ujjain) stated that no information was available with them.

6.2.4 Convergence with Differential Rate of Interest (DRI) Scheme

According to para 3.1 and 3.3 of the IAY guidelines, in addition to the assistance provided under the IAY, an IAY beneficiary can avail himself of a loan of up to ₹ 20,000 per housing unit under the DRI scheme from any nationalized bank at the interest rate of four *per cent* per annum to top up the unit assistance under the IAY. It will be the responsibility of the state government/DRDA concerned to co-ordinate with the financial institutions to make available the credit facility to those beneficiaries who are interested.

We noted that loan facility under DRI scheme was not availed due to absence of efforts by states/DRDAs in co-ordination with the financial institutions to make available the credit facility and awareness of the DRI scheme among beneficiaries during 2008-13 in selected districts of 13 states *viz.* **Arunachal Pradesh, Assam, Bihar, Goa, Jammu & Kashmir, Karnataka, Maharashtra, Manipur, Meghalaya, Nagaland, Rajasthan, Uttar Pradesh and West Bengal.**

In **Andhra Pradesh**, no efforts were made by APSHCL to avail the loans under the DRI scheme for beneficiaries. However, every SC/ST beneficiary was eligible for a loan of ₹ 20,000 under state housing programme (INDIRAMMA).

In **Chhattisgarh**, in five selected districts, out of 55,468 cases, only 1,639 cases (three *per cent*) were forwarded to banks for loan under DRI scheme during 2011-13. Out of these, loans were sanctioned in 552 cases only (one *per cent*). Overall percentage of the cases forwarded by JPs to banks for availing loan under DRI and beneficiaries availing the DRI loans was not up to the appreciable level. It was also observed during the joint physical verification that beneficiaries were not aware of the scheme which indicates that widespread awareness about the scheme was not created by the implementing agencies.

In **Gujarat**, in 13 selected blocks (Anand, Tarapur, Palanpur, Deesa, Chotila, Sayla, Zalod, Limkheda, Bhesan, Junagadh, Keshod, Kamrej and Mandvi) out of 65,447 houses sanctioned, only 25,447 applications of IAY beneficiaries for loan

⁴ Balaghat, Barwani, Dhar, Jabalpur, Katni, Narsinghpur, Raisen, Rajgarh, and Shajapur

were submitted to banks and 866 applications (one *per cent*) were approved under DRI scheme.

In **Haryana**, awareness about DRI scheme was not created amongst the IAY beneficiaries with the result that only one beneficiary could avail of the benefit of DRI scheme in district Mahendergarh during 2008-13.

In **Jharkhand**, out of six selected districts, only in one district (East Singhbhum) 456 beneficiaries were provided loan under DRI scheme amounting to ₹ 56.46 lakh as of October 2010. However, no documents were produced to audit to ascertain the factual position in respect of details of beneficiaries, disbursement, etc.

In **Kerala**, though 2.54 lakh beneficiaries availed assistance under the IAY, out of that only 2,346 beneficiaries had availed loan under DRI scheme during 2008-13. In two selected districts (Thiruvananthapuram, Wayanad) none of the beneficiaries availed loan under DRI scheme. In district Malappuram, out of 45 applications submitted, loan was sanctioned to only 15 applicants and the remaining 30 applications were rejected by banks during 2008-13. In district Alappuzha, out of 3,345 applications received, loan was sanctioned to only 934 applicants and applications of 2,411 were rejected by the banks.

In **Madhya Pradesh**, out of 13 selected districts, in 10 districts (Balaghat, Barwani, Dhar, Jabalpur, Katni, Narsinghpur, Raisen, Rajgarh, Shajapur and Ujjain), no initiatives were taken at district level to facilitate loan under DRI scheme to the IAY beneficiary. Two districts (Khandwa, Mandla) stated that DRI scheme was being advertised through JP/GPs and the district Dindori stated that initiatives were taken at district level, but no records were produced to audit for verification. All the selected districts stated that no beneficiary had applied for loan during the audit period.

In **Odisha**, in eight selected districts of 123 GPs, 1,293 beneficiaries were interviewed in 239 villages who expressed unawareness regarding existence of loan under DRI scheme. Despite low level of awareness regarding the scheme, it was observed that 66 beneficiaries in two blocks (Bolagarh, Jatni) of district Khurda availed loan under DRI scheme. Except district Khurda, in other seven selected districts no beneficiary had availed loan under DRI scheme.

In **Tripura**, out of six blocks in two selected districts, only 119 beneficiaries in Dasda block availed the loan under DRI scheme out of the 6,414 houses sanctioned during 2008-09 to 2012-13.

In **Andaman & Nicobar Islands**, no Public Sector Bank (PSB) was available in GP Neil Kendra. As the loan under DRI scheme can be availed only through PSBs, the beneficiaries of the said GP could not avail the benefits of DRI scheme. Block Mayabunder stated that exclusion of co-operative banks from the ambit of loan under DRI scheme was a hindrance in availing such facility. The DRDA, South Andaman took up the matter (December 2010) with the Ministry as well as with the Co-operative banks without any suitable modification in the guidelines of the DRI scheme.

The Ministry stated (June 2014) that DRI loans were availed in very limited numbers due to lack of clarity with regard to eligibility.

6.2.5 Convergence with Life Insurance Corporation (LIC)

According to para 5.11 (vi) of the IAY guidelines, Life Insurance Corporation (LIC) of India has insurance schemes called *Janshree Bima* for rural BPL families and *Aam Aadmi Bima* for the benefit of rural landless families. The DRDA is to furnish the particulars of all the willing IAY beneficiaries every month to the respective nodal agency which is implementing the two insurance schemes in the district so that all willing IAY beneficiaries derive the benefits available under these insurance policies.

We noted that the benefit of *Janshree* and *Aam Admi Bima Yojana* were provided only to 0.97 lakh (0.90 per cent) and 2.95 lakh (2.74 per cent) beneficiaries respectively for the entire country during the period 2009-10 to 2012-13.

Further, in selected districts of 21 states/UT viz. **Andhra Pradesh, Assam, Arunachal Pradesh, Bihar, Goa, Gujarat, Haryana, Jammu & Kashmir, Jharkhand, Karnataka, Madhya Pradesh (in ten districts), Manipur, Meghalaya, Mizoram, Nagaland, Odisha, Punjab, Rajasthan, Uttar Pradesh, West Bengal and Andaman & Nicobar Islands** both insurance schemes were not availed by beneficiaries.

6.2.6 Convergence with Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme (MGNREGS)⁵ and Swarnjayanti Gram Swarozgar Yojana (SGSY)⁶.

We noted that in selected districts of 13 states viz. **Andhra Pradesh, Arunachal Pradesh, Bihar, Goa, Gujarat, Jammu & Kashmir, Jharkhand, Meghalaya, Nagaland, Odisha (except Khurda), Punjab, Tamil Nadu** and **Uttar Pradesh** the benefits of both the schemes were not ensured to the IAY beneficiaries.

The Ministry stated (June/July 2014) that the instructions regarding convergence of IAY with other schemes viz. TSC, RGGVY, NRWSP, Insurance schemes and MGNREGS issued under IAY guidelines are more of an advisory nature as these are dependent on the guidelines of the concerned scheme of other Ministries. It further stated that it would take up the convergence issue on a continuous basis to ensure better outcomes and as per revised guidelines construction of a toilet with a IAY house is mandatory under TSC (Nirmal Bharat Abhiyan).

Reply of the Ministry is not satisfactory. The IAY guidelines on convergence with other schemes are not of advisory nature as these categorically state that the DRDAs will spare no effort in liaising with all the nodal agencies implementing the schemes in the district in order to bring about the actual convergence of these programmes at field level. Besides, convergence with these schemes will ensure that the beneficiaries will get the benefit at one go instead of duplication of efforts through a plethora of disjointed schemes.

6.3 Monitoring of Convergence through Monthly Progress Report (MPR)

Para 5.11 (viii) of the IAY guidelines states that for effective monitoring of the convergence of the schemes discussed above, a monthly progress report-3 (MPR-3) has been devised to capture data about convergence activities at the field level and which was to be furnished online every month to the Ministry in the prescribed format. The MPR-3 has been devised for keeping watch on financial assistance, physical performance and convergence progress reported by districts to the Ministry.

⁵ The Ministry of Rural Development implemented MGNREGS in February 2006 with an objective to enhance livelihood security in rural areas at least 100 days of guaranteed employment in a financial year.

⁶ Ministry of Rural Development launched the scheme in April 1999 with an objective to bring the assisted poor families above the poverty line by ensuring the appreciable sustained level of income over a period of time.

Analysis of records at the Ministry revealed that the online monitoring of MPR-3 was made in May 2006 although the system of sending hard copies of MPR-3 by post was continued till the online system was fully operational. From April 2007 onwards, the online monitoring mechanism was made operational to enable districts to upload their monthly progress reports on the website of the Ministry.

In **Bihar**, MPR-3 of the 10 selected districts for the period 2008-13 revealed that the availability of smokeless *chulhas*, sanitary latrine and electric connections in the constructed IAY houses were only five, seven and two *per cent* respectively whereas at block level and joint physical verification revealed that the convergence with other schemes were not carried out in any district. The DRDAs were not in possession of even the basic data regarding the number of cases sent to implementing agencies for convergence activities.

In **Jharkhand**, convergence activities during 2008-09 to 2012-13 with the IAY in the state was as detailed below in **Table-11**.

Table-11 : Details showing provision of facilities under convergence

Period	State	No. of complete IAY houses	Convergence in comparison with complete IAY houses with percentage					
			Sanitary Latrines constructed	Smokeless <i>Chulha</i> provided	Free power connection under RGGVY	Aam Aadmi Bima	Self help group membership under SGSY	Job Card issued under MGNREGS
2009-13	Jharkhand	3,37,154	33,035	27,758	4,710	2,757	6,622	59,251
Percentage convergence			9.80	8.23	1.39	0.81	1.96	17.57

Source: State MPR

Thus, the percentage of the provisions of facilities under convergence in the state ranged between 17 to less than one *per cent*. State government directed (August/September 2011) all the Divisional Commissioners/Dy. Commissioners/Dy. Development Commissioners to ensure provision of 100 *per cent* facilities in constructed houses. However, situation under convergence remained the same.

Further, audit noted that six selected districts neither had any co-ordination with other implementing agencies for convergence with the IAY nor did they have any information on facilities provided under TSC, RGGVY, etc. during 2008-13.

In **Madhya Pradesh**, out of 13 selected districts, 10 districts⁷ reported that MPR-3 for convergence had not been sent and three districts⁸ reported that MPR-3 was being sent to Ministry of Rural Development.

In **Manipur**, MPR-3 of all nine districts (district Ukhrul and Tamenglong furnished only part data) revealed that during 2008-13, 28,612 beneficiaries did not get the benefits of DRI and RGGVY schemes nor availed of the *Janshree Bima* and *Aam Aadmi Bima* insurance schemes. Three selected districts (Imphal East, Thoubal, Senapati) did not produce data related to convergence.

In **Punjab**, in six selected districts, MPR-3 was not maintained.

In **Uttarakhand**, all five selected districts did not have any co-ordination with implementing agencies for convergence with the IAY and they did not have any document for the same. Despite this, the status of convergence during 2008-13 had been regularly reported by the department to the Ministry through its MPRs as depicted below in the **Table-12**.

Table-12 : Convergence with schemes reported to the Ministry

Number of houses completed during 2008-13	Sanitary latrine constructed	Smokeless <i>chulhas</i>	Benefit availed under RGGVY	Enrolled under <i>Janshree/Aam Aadmi Beema yojana</i>	Enrolled under health insurance scheme	Membership under Self help group (SHG)	Job card issued under MNRGS
At State level							
76,781	61,632	48,163	4,460	28,034	9,765	12,060	32,167
Percentage	80.27	62.73	5.81	36.51	12.72	15.71	41.89
In five selected districts							
55,521	44,465	35,954	3,659	22,676	9,490	10,721	22,954
Percentage	80.09	64.76	6.59	40.84	17.09	19.31	41.34

(Source: MPRs of state level and five selected districts)

Further, in district Tehri Garhwal, against 874 sanctioned houses, 448 smokeless *chulhas* were procured at DRDA level and distributed (May 2012) to nine blocks, out of which, 45 and 62 *chulhas* were provided to Jaunpur and Devprayag blocks respectively. BDOs of both the blocks admitted that the *chulhas* received by

⁷ Balaghat, Barwani, Dhar, Jabalpur, Katni, Narsinghpur, Raisen, Khandwa, Shajapur and Ujjain

⁸ Dindori, Mandla and Rajgarh

them were not distributed to intended beneficiaries. Further, BDOs of selected blocks admitted that during the last five years no efforts were made to dovetail the IAY with other schemes. They also stated that neither smokeless *chulhas* had been procured nor distributed to the IAY beneficiaries although the MPRs showed a convergence of 64 *per cent* against the actual position.

In **West Bengal**, MPR of district Malda for the year 2012-13 revealed that out of 8,274 houses constructed, the benefits of convergence was noted in DRI (4.64 *per cent*), TSC (27.62 *per cent*), RGGVY (33.90 *per cent*). During 2012-13, 1,955 beneficiaries under LIC and 1,805 beneficiaries under *Arogyaraksha Bima Yojana* were enrolled. However, during joint physical verification of 120 IAY beneficiaries in 10 GPs, they denied such convergence.

Similarly, district Birbhum in its MPR depicted convergence of 11 schemes with the IAY. During 2008-09 to 2012-13, out of 41,898 houses constructed, DRI (1.11 *per cent*) TSC (55.97 *per cent*), smokeless *chulla* (22.80 *per cent*), RGGVY (4.77 *per cent*), *Aam Admi Bima* (2.03 *per cent*), MGNREGS (42.39 *per cent*) converged with the IAY as given in **Annex-6.1**. However, during joint physical verification of 108 beneficiaries audit noted that they were not provided the benefits of convergence. The district stated that no convergence with any other schemes was taken up and RGGVY was implemented separately. Thus, the MPR maintained by the district did not match with the joint physical verification.

6.4 Lack of awareness for Convergence

We observed that in selected districts of nine states *viz.* **Arunachal Pradesh, Bihar, Goa, Jharkhand, Karnataka, Manipur, Nagaland, Uttar Pradesh** and **Uttarakhand**, due to lack of Information, Education and Communication (IEC) activities and co-ordination between districts and implementing agencies of other schemes, the IAY beneficiaries could not avail the benefits of convergence.

6.5 Conclusion

Thus, there were no concerted efforts by the selected districts to identify the programmes/schemes being implemented by various Ministries/departments of the GoI which could be dovetailed with the IAY so that the IAY beneficiaries could also derive the benefits of these schemes intended for rural BPL households. The picture that emerges is as under:

Sl. No.	State/UT	TSC	RGVY	NRWSP	DRI	Insurance	MGNREGS/ SGSY
1	Andhra Pradesh	Yes (one district)	No	No	No	No	No
2	Arunachal Pradesh	No	No	No	No	No	No
3	Assam	--	No	No	No	No	---
4	Bihar	No	No	No	No	No	No
5	Chhattisgarh	No	---	No	Yes	----	---
6	Goa	No	No	No	No	No	No
7	Gujarat	No	No	No	Yes	No	No
8	Haryana	No	No	No	No	---	---
9	Himachal Pradesh (Data pertains to only one DRDA)	--	No	No	---	---	---
10	Jammu & Kashmir	No	No	No	No	No	No
11	Jharkhand	No	No	No	No	No	No
12	Karnataka	No	No	No	No (Except one district)	No	---
13	Kerala	No	No	No	--	--	---
14	Madhya Pradesh	TSC in only one district	No	No	No	In four districts	---
15	Maharashtra	TSC in three districts	---	---	No	---	---
16	Manipur	TSC in three districts	No	No	No	No	---
17	Meghalaya	Yes	No	No	No	No	No
18	Mizoram	No	No	No	--	No	---
19	Nagaland	No	No	No	No	No	No
20	Odisha	No	No	No	No	No	No (Except Khurda)
21	Punjab	No	No	No	--	No	---
22	Rajasthan	---	---	---	No	No	---
23	Tripura	No	----	No		No	No
24	Uttar Pradesh	No	No	No	No	No	No
25	Uttarakhand	No	No	No		---	----
26	West Bengal	--	--	No	No	No	--
27	Andaman & Nicobar Islands	No	No	No	No	No	---

Recommendation:

- The District Rural Development Agencies (DRDAs)/District Panchayati Raj Officers (DPROs) should spread awareness of the convergence activities among the beneficiaries at the time of sanction of houses and also work in coordination with other concerned authorities at the district level to ensure the provision for potable water, sanitation, electricity etc. in the IAY houses. Renewable sources of energy could be considered as an option for electricity based on its availability and requirement.