

Chapter V

Monitoring of the Scheme

Chapter V

Monitoring of the Scheme

This chapter discusses about the functioning of monitoring mechanism in implementation of PMAY-G scheme.

Audit Objective: The monitoring and evaluation of the Scheme were in compliance with the Scheme guidelines.

Brief snapshot of the chapter

- Out of 75 districts in the State, Programme Management Unit was sanctioned for constitution in only five districts. Thus, implementation and monitoring of PMAY-G scheme was not being carried out as per the scheme guidelines.
- In the absence of minutes of the meetings, the constitution and functioning of State and District level committees for implementation of scheme could not be assured.
- Most of the issues (53 *per cent*) reported in Social Audit of PMAY-G during 2017-23 were unresolved even after lapse of more than one to six years of reporting.

5.1 Programme Management Unit

Although the construction of house was to be undertaken by the beneficiary, it was the responsibility of the State Government to ensure that beneficiary is provided requisite guidance in the process and also closely monitored to ensure that the construction of houses is completed. Para 7.3 of FFI of PMAY-G envisages setting up of a dedicated State Programme Management Unit (PMU) to undertake the tasks of implementation, monitoring and supervision of quality construction.

5.1.1 Constitution of Programme Management Unit

Para 7.3 of FFI of PMAY-G envisages that the State PMU is to be headed by the State Nodal Officer and supported by personnel on deputation and hired contract personnel. Similar arrangements are to be followed for the District and Block level PMUs. The composition and responsibilities of State, District and Block level PMUs are given in *Appendix 5.1*.

Audit observed that State Government approved (September 2017) constitution of PMUs and creation of posts for PMUs at State, District and Block levels. However, constitution of the three-tier PMU was abolished (April 2018) by the State Government citing that it would not serve any significant purpose. Subsequently, State Government approved (October 2018) constitution of

PMUs at State level and at the district as well as block levels in five districts⁵⁴. However, in both the approvals (September 2017 and October 2018), GoUP did not sanction the post of ‘Technical professional in the field of construction’ for District level PMU even though prescribed in the FFI.

Further, out of 19 test checked districts, permission for constitution of PMU was granted in three districts⁵⁵. However, the PMU was constituted in only one test checked district, Ambedkar Nagar. However, the post of ‘Technical professional (IT)’ and ‘Accountant Assistant’ as sanctioned by the GoUP was vacant in the PMU, Ambedkar Nagar. Thus, the PMU in the district Ambedkar Nagar functioned without desired level of staff.

Audit further noticed that AAP of 2019-20 to 2022-23 submitted to GoI mentioned that PMU of PMAY-G was constituted in 64 to 65 districts⁵⁶ and in 730 to 765 blocks⁵⁷, which was contradictory to the GoUP order (April 2018) for abolition of the three tier PMU in the State. Moreover, non-constitution of PMU at district and block levels adversely affected the implementation of the scheme in terms of facilitating allotment of land to landless beneficiaries, preparation of Annual Select List from the PWL, plan and organise mason training programme, tag a trained mason to each beneficiary, monitor reporting on AwaasSoft⁵⁸ and release of timely instalments as discussed in previous Chapters.

The State Government replied (September 2024) that permission was granted to five districts to engage employees for PMU on outsourcing/contractual basis after considering the proposals. It was further stated that proposals for PMU of other districts was sent by CRD to the State Government, however, the permission was not granted. With reference to information submitted in AAP, State Government stated that the information on PMUs included in AAP was of Government officials and contractual workers engaged for other schemes, who were also engaged at district and block levels against the posts/responsibilities of PMU. During the exit conference (October 2024) audit observation was accepted and factual position was explained.

The reply may be viewed in the light of the fact that the State Government did not constitute the three tier PMUs as envisaged in the FFI of PMAY-G, though roles and responsibilities of each tier were fixed under the FFI for smooth implementation and monitoring of the scheme. Further, the post of ‘Technical professional in the field of construction’ was not sanctioned at the district level despite being stipulated in the FFI.

⁵⁴ Lucknow, Ambedkar Nagar, Budaun, Gorakhpur and Moradabad

⁵⁵ Ambedkar Nagar, Budaun and Moradabad

⁵⁶ In the year 2019-20, 2020-21 & 2022-23 - 64 districts and in 2021-22- 65 districts. Detail of PMU constitution in AAP of 2018-19 was not mentioned.

⁵⁷ In the year 2019-20, 2020-21 & 2022-23 -730 blocks and in 2021-22- 765 blocks.

⁵⁸ AwaasSoft is a web based transactional electronic service delivery platform to facilitate e-G-governance in PMAY-G.

5.1.2 Inspection of houses by District and Block level officers

As per para 9.3.2 of FFI of PMAY-G, the PMU shall also monitor the scheme implementation and quality supervision at different levels. It was suggested that (a) officers at the block level should inspect as far as possible 10 *per cent* of the houses during construction and (b) district level officers should inspect two *per cent* of the houses during construction.

Audit observed that out of test checked 19 districts and 56 blocks, PMU was not constituted in 18 districts and 54 blocks. Further, as discussed in Para 5.1.1, the post of ‘technical professional in the field of construction’ was not created in one test checked district⁵⁹ where PMU was constituted, though this professional was essential for supervision of construction quality of PMAY-G houses. The test checked 56 blocks informed that inspection of houses during construction was carried out, but information regarding number of houses inspected was not maintained and copy of inspection report was not provided for verification. Thus, the assurance regarding the desired level of inspection during construction of houses could not be derived.

Audit noticed from the data available on website of Area Officer App of GoI that worksite visited by District Officials under PMAY-G during 2017-23 in test checked 19 districts ranged from zero to 0.12 *per cent* which was less than the desired two *per cent* as envisaged in FFI. Furthermore, cases of construction of PMAY-G houses without plastered walls, without dedicated space for cooking and bath, without toilets, without proper drainage system and houses constructed with roof as tin/asbestos sheets found during Joint Physical Verification and discussed in previous Chapter IV indicated towards lack of inspection by the officials as envisaged in the FFI.

The State Government replied (September 2024) that as per directions of GoI in the guidelines, instructions have been issued for 10 *per cent* inspection at Block level and two *per cent* inspection at District level. In addition to this, at present, inspection was being done through Area Officer App. During exit conference (October 2024) audit observation was accepted and factual position was explained.

The reply was not acceptable, as the desired level of inspection at District and Block levels as envisaged in the FFI was not ensured.

5.2 Constitution of Committees at State and District levels

As per Para 7.4 of FFI of PMAY-G, to ensure implementation of PMAY-G as per the Annual Action Plan (AAP), a committee chaired by Chief Secretary was to be constituted at the State level. The State level Committee should meet at least twice a year. Similarly, the District level Committees should be chaired by the respective District Collectors which should meet every quarter in a year.

⁵⁹ Ambedkar Nagar.

The composition of the Committees at the State and District levels may be decided by the State Government.

Audit observed that GoUP issued (June 2017) orders for constitution of committees both at State⁶⁰ and District level. However, on further enquiring the functionality of these committees during 2017-23, the CRD office informed that committees had been constituted and provided minutes of the review meetings of Chief Secretary of Government of Uttar Pradesh, held for review of various schemes, including PMAY-G, being implemented in the State. The minutes of meetings of committee constituted for PMAY-G as per GoUP order (July 2017) were, however, not provided. Thus, the function of State level committee for PMAY-G could not be ascertained in Audit. Further, at the district level, in 11 out of 19 test checked districts, the committee was not formed. In eight district⁶¹, where DRDA affirmed its constitution, no records regarding its constitution and holding of meetings were provided to audit for verification.

The State Government replied (September 2024) that State and District level committees had been constituted and regular review of the PMAY-G scheme was taken up by the Chief Secretary at the State level and District Magistrate at the District level. It was further stated that meeting of State Level Committee in Chairmanship of the Chief Secretary was scheduled to be held in September 2024. During exit conference (October 2024) audit observation was accepted and factual position was explained.

The reply may be viewed in the light of the fact that DRDAs of the test checked districts could not provide records related to holding meetings of district level committees. Thus, the constitution and functioning of these committees could not be assured. Moreover, after the matter was pointed out in audit, the meeting of State Level Committee was held in October 2024.

5.3 Conduct of Social Audit

Para 9.6.1 of FFI of PMAY-G provides that Social Audit is to be conducted in every Gram Panchayat at least once in a year, involving a mandatory review of all aspects. The basic objective of social audit is to ensure achievement of public accountability in PMAY-G implementation.

The status of conduct of Social Audit of PMAY-G in the State during 2017-23 was as detailed in **Table 5.1**.

⁶⁰ Chairman: Chief Secretary U.P., Vice Chairman: Additional Chief Secretary/Principal Secretary Rural Development Department, Secretary: Commissioner Rural Development U.P., Members: Principal Secretary Planning Department, Principal Secretary Finance Department, Commissioner Rural Housing, UP Rural Housing Board, Director Panchayati Raj, Regional Manager HUDCO, Additional Commissioner (PMAY-G) Rural Development U.P. and Additional Commissioner (Accounts) Rural Development U.P.

⁶¹ Azamgarh, Barabanki, Budaun, Jaunpur, Jhansi, Mahoba, Moradabad and Shahjahanpur.

Table 5.1: Conduct of Social Audit of PMAY-G in the State

Year	Number of GPs	Number of GPs where social audit conducted	Shortfall (in per cent)	Total number of issues reported	Total number of issues closed as of October 2024	Percentage issues	
						Closed	Pending
2017-18	59073	1967	97	13506	4007	30	70
2018-19	59073	15931	73	89746	54276	60	40
2019-20	59073	31445	47	143106	63538	44	56
2020-21	58189	0 ⁶²	0	0	0	0	0
2021-22	58189	30927	47	169033	91118	54	46
2022-23	57702	42436	26	177480	66114	37	63
Total				592871	279053	47	53

(Source: Social Audit Directorate U.P. and Uttar Pradesh At A Glance published by Planning Department, U.P.)

As evident from **Table 5.1**, social audit was not conducted as per periodicity envisaged in the FFI. Further, out of 5.93 lakh issues reported during 2017-23, only 2.79 lakh issues (47 per cent) were closed and 3.14 lakh issues (53 per cent) were pending as of October 2024. The pending issues ranged from 40 to 70 per cent of the issues reported during 2017-23. In 19 test checked districts, although DRDAs informed that Social Audit was conducted, but copies of findings of Social Audit and follow-up action thereon were not provided to audit for verification.

The State Government replied (September 2024) that issues reported in Social Audit once received from Social Audit Directorate, are made available to districts for disposing them after taking action.

Audit noticed that majority of issues reported in Social Audit were unresolved even after lapse of period up to six years of reporting.

5.4 Monitoring of progress of construction of houses through AwaasSoft

Para 5.7.2 of FFI of PMAY-G stipulates that State must mandatorily pay the first instalment at the time of sanction. Other than the first instalment, the States should have to map the remaining instalments, to house construction stages/levels of their choice from among six⁶³ levels in AwaasSoft. The Government of Uttar Pradesh issued orders (November 2017) for release of second instalment with construction up to plinth level and third instalment after completion of house, i.e., after roof cast and plaster.

Audit noticed in Joint Physical verification (JPV) that, in 42 cases out of 2,178 beneficiaries selected for verification, the pictures of completed houses uploaded on the AwaasSoft did not match with the pictures taken during JPV. The instalments were released on the basis of picture uploaded on AwaasSoft. The pictures uploaded on AwaasSoft and that of taken during JPV in respect of two such cases are given in **Picture 5.1**.

⁶² During financial year 2020-21, due to Covid-19 pandemic regular social audit was not conducted.

⁶³ Foundation, Plinth, Windowsill, Lintel, Roof cast Completed.

Picture 5.1: Mis-match pictures of AwaasSoft and that taken during JPV

Beneficiary ID – UP119685401, GP-Gauri Saloneypur, Block Nawabganj, Dist.- Unnao	
	
Picture uploaded on AwaasSoft (inspection dated 06.07.2021)	Picture taken in JPV(dated 11.01.2024)
Beneficiary ID – 141721446, GP- Purey Basti Gaderiya, Block Mahasi, District Bahraich	
	
As per AwaasSoft (inspection dated 25.09.2023)	As taken in JPV (dated 09.10.2023) – only foundation work on one side noticed during JPV

Thus, it was evident from above photographs that there was laxity in monitoring of release of instalments linked with the stages of construction as stipulated in the guidelines of the PMAY-G.

The State Government replied (September 2024) that as per guidelines of PMAY-G, there was provision to upload photo after geo tagging after release of each instalment and completion of house up to set standard. Actual photo of constructed or under construction house was to be uploaded. Taking cognizance of these cases, instructions had been issued (August 2024) for taking corrective measures and non-repetition of mismatch in actual pictures and pictures uploaded in AwaasSoft in future. During exit conference (October 2024) it was further informed that rigorous monitoring of construction of houses would be ensured through AwaasSoft.

To sum up, the monitoring of the scheme was not ensured as per Framework for Implementation (FFI) of PMAY-G. Programme Management Unit was not constituted in majority of the districts and blocks during 2017-23 which impacted the implementation, monitoring and supervision of quality construction of PMAY-G houses. The functionality of State and District level committees could also not be assured in absence of requisite evidence. District and block level officers did not undertake inspection of PMAY-G houses during construction as per prescribed frequency. Social Audit was not conducted as per periodicity envisaged in the FFI and majority of issues raised during Social Audit were pending to be resolved. Further, monitoring of construction of houses through AwaasSoft was found to be deficient.

Recommendations:

In view of the audit observations, the State Government may ensure:

- (12) *promptly setting up of dedicated Programme Management Units (PMUs) at district and block levels for implementation and monitoring of the scheme.*
- (13) *inspection of PMAY-G houses during construction by district and block level officers, as per prescribed percentage, to improve implementation, monitoring and quality supervision under the scheme.*
- (14) *Social Audit is conducted as per periodicity prescribed in the guidelines and the issues raised in the Social Audit are duly attended and timely resolved.*



(RAJ KUMAR)

Principal Accountant General (Audit-I)
Uttar Pradesh

PRAYAGRAJ
THE **19 NOV 2025**

COUNTERSIGNED



(K. SANJAY MURTHY)

Comptroller and Auditor General of India

NEW DELHI
THE **24 NOV 2025**