

contd.

### Appendix-I

(Refer paragraph 1.5 at page 6)

**List of offices covered under Performance Audit for RLTA in KBK districts**

| Sl. No | Departments/<br>Fieldunits   | Number of<br>departments/<br>field units | Name of departments/<br>field units   |
|--------|--|--|---|
| 1.     | <b>Departments</b>   | 9  | Planning & Coordination, Agriculture, Health & Family welfare, Forest & environment, Rural Development, Works, Women & Child Development, Water Resources and Panchayati Raj.   |
| 2.     | <b>Heads of<br/>Departments</b>  | 10                                       | Directorate of Agriculture, Health & family welfare, Soil conservation, Lift Irrigation, Engineer-in-chief, Works; Chief Engineers, Minor Irrigation, Rural Works-1 & II, Principal Chief Conservator of Forest and Orissa Agro-Industry Corporation. |
| 3.     | <b>DRDAs</b>   | 8  | Kalahandi, Nuapara, Balangir, Sonapur, Koraput, Rayagada, Nowrangpur and Malkangiri.  |
| 4.     | <b>Project Directors,<br/>Watersheds</b>                                 | 8  | Project Directors of all 8 KBK districts.   |
| 5.     | <b>Chief District<br/>Medical Officers<br/>(CDMOs)</b>                   | 8  | CDMOs of all 8 KBK districts.   |
| 6.     | <b>Dist. Social Welfare<br/>Officers (DSWOs)</b>                         | 8  | DSWOs of all 8 KBK districts.   |
| 7.     | <b>EEs, Rural Works<br/>Divisions</b>                                    | 8  | Kalahandi, Nuapara, Balangir, Sonapur, Koraput, Rayagada, Nowrangpur and Malkangiri.  |
| 8.     | <b>EEs, RWSS Divisions</b>   | 5  | Kalahandi, Balangir, Koraput, Rayagada, Nowrangpur.   |
| 9.     | <b>EEs, R&amp;B divisions</b>  | 9  | Kalahandi, Nuapara, Balangir, Sonapur, Koraput, Rayagada, Nowrangpur, Malkangiri and NH Division, Kantabanjhi.  |
| 10.    | <b>Divisional Forest<br/>officers</b>                                    | 13                                       | Kalahandi (South & North), Nuapara, Balangir (East & West), Sonapur, Koraput, Jeypore, Rayagada, Nowrangpur, Malkangiri, Sambalpur and Rairakhol.   |
| 11.    | <b>Executive Engineers,<br/>Lift Irrigation<br/>Divisions</b>            | 4  | Kalahandi, Balangir, Koraput and Rayagada.  |
| 12.    | <b>District Managers,<br/>Orissa Agro<br/>Industries<br/>Corporation</b> | 8  | All 8 KBK districts.  |
| 13.    | <b>EEs, MI Divisions</b>   | 3  | Jeypore, Rayagada and Balangir.   |
| 14.    | <b>Blocks</b>  | 20                                       | Kalahandi, Dharmgarh, Jaypatna, Nuapara, Khariar, Balangir, Agalpur, Belpara, Muribahal, Sonapur, Birmaharajpur, Koraput, Kotpad.   |

concl.

| <b>Sl. No</b> | <b>Departments/<br/>Fieldunits</b>        | <b>Number of<br/>departments/<br/>field units</b> | <b>Name of departments/ field units</b>                                 |
|---------------|---|---|---|
|               |   |   | Kundra, Nowrangpur, umorkote, Malkangir, Khairput, Rayagada and Gudari. |
| 15.           | <b>Watershed Committees</b>               | 80  | 4 watershed committees in each block.                                   |
| 16.           | <b>Pani Panchayats (PPs):</b>             | 80  | 4 PPs in each block.  |
| 17.           | <b>Vana Sangrakhan Sammittees (VSSs):</b> | 80  | 4 VSSs in each block.   |
| 18.           | <b>Villages</b>                           | 80  | 10 beneficiaries in each of 4 Villages in each block.                   |
|               | <b>Total</b>                              | <b>441</b>  |   |

**Appendix-II**

(Refer paragraph 3.2.2 at page 11)

**Statement showing curtailment of central assistance in respect of centrally sponsored schemes under watershed programmes**

*(Rupees in lakh)*

| Scheme               | Project period | Central share due | Central share received by the State Government | Central share not received | State share due with respect to central share received | State share released | Short release of state share |
|----------------------|----------------|-------------------|--|----------------------------|--|----------------------|------------------------------|
| DPAP 6 <sup>th</sup> | 2001-06        | 1509.75           | 754.93   | 754.82                     | 251.64   | 253.13               | (-)1.49                      |
| DPAP 7 <sup>th</sup> | 2002-07        | 2259.40           | 1003.02  | 1256.38                    | 334.34   | 336.37               | (-)2.03                      |
| IWDP                 | 2001-06        | 1188.72           | 827.85   | 360.87                     | 75.26  | 41.28                | 33.98                        |
| EAS                  | 1999-2002      | 8107.75           | 6168.36  | 1939.39                    | 2056.12  | 1971.11              | 85.01                        |
| <b>Total</b>         |                | <b>13065.62</b>   | <b>8754.16</b>                                 | <b>4311.46</b>             | <b>2717.36</b>   | <b>2601.89</b>       | <b>115.47</b>                |

contd.

**Appendix-III**  
(Paragraph 5.3.2 at page 30)

**Statement showing the details of irregular execution of works of major district roads  
(MDR) / State Highway (SH) roads under RLTA during 2002-07**

(Rupees in lakh)

| Sl. No | Division       | Name of the Road                     | MDR/SH  | Year  | Expenditure                               |
|--------|----------------|--------------------------------------|---------|---|---|
| 1      | NH Kantabanji  | Patnagarh-Khaprakhol-Harisankar road | MDR-37  | 2003-04<br>2004-05<br>2005-06                       | 18.82<br>9.57<br>15.00                    |
| 2      | -do-           | Patnagarh-Padmapur road              | MDR     | 2003-04<br>2004-05                                  | 18.99<br>7.09                             |
| 3      | R&B Balangir   | Sonepur-Binka-Rampur-Dunguripali     | MDR-39  | 2002-03<br>2003-04<br>2004-05<br>2005-06<br>2006-07 | 10.00<br>25.00<br>40.00<br>25.00<br>20.00 |
| 4      | -do-           | Arigaon-Bisalpali                    | MDR     | 2003-04<br>2004-05                                  | 8.00<br>12.00                             |
| 5      | R&B Malkangiri | Jeypore-Kota-Malkangiri Motu road    | SH-25   | 2002-03<br>2003-04                                  | 168.00<br>77.00                           |
| 6      | -do-           | Gobindapali-Balimela-Chitakonda road | SH-47   | 2002-03<br>2003-04<br>2006-07                       | 100.00<br>40.00<br>44.12                  |
| 7      | -do-           | Chittrakonda-Janvai-Papermetla road  | MDR-105 | 2002-03<br>2004-05<br>2006-07                       | 35.68<br>33.11<br>3.67                    |
| 8      | R&B Kalahandi  | Bhawanipatna-Kharia road             | SH-16   | 2002-03<br>2003-04<br>2004-05                       | 20.00<br>50.00<br>50.00                   |
| 9      | -do-           | Bh.patna-Rayagada                    | SH-6    | 2002-03<br>2003-04<br>2004-05<br>2006-07            | 20.00<br>67.00<br>50.00<br>65.00          |
| 10     | -do-           | Bh.patna-Gunpur road                 | SH-44   | 2002-03<br>2003-04                                  | 34.00<br>25.00                            |
| 11     | -do-           | Baldiamal-Dharamgarh                 | SH-52   | 2003-04<br>2006-07                                  | 70.00<br>22.10                            |
| 12     | -do-           | Moter-Jeypatna road                  | MDR-99  | 2003-04<br>2006-07                                  | 40.00<br>20.00                            |
| 13     | -do-           | Dharamgarh-Golamunda road            | MDR-111 | 2004-05<br>2006-07                                  | 30.00<br>30.00                            |
| 14     | R&B Koraput    | Koraput-Raniguda-Boriguma road       | MDR     | 2002-03<br>2003-04                                  | 22.48<br>27.52                            |
| 15     | -do-           | JKMM road                            | SH-25   | 2002-03   | 30.00                                     |
| 16     | -do-           | Baipariguda-Kundra                   | MDR     | 2003-04<br>2004-05                                  | 21.16<br>8.50                             |

concl.

| Sl. No | Division     | Name of the Road                       | MDR/SH  | Year                                     | Expenditure                       |
|--------|--------------|--|---------|--|-----------------------------------|
| 17     | -do-         | Vaizag-Jeypore road                    | SH      | 2002-03                                  | 20.00                             |
| 18     | -do-         | Koraput-Laxmipur-Rayagada road         | MDR     | 2005-06<br>2006-07                       | 40.00<br>30.00                    |
| 19     | R&B Jeypore  | Papadahandi-Umarekote-yerla road       | SH-39   | 2002-03<br>2006-07                       | 57.09<br>38.72                    |
| 20     | -do-         | JKMM road                              | SH-25   | 2005-06<br>2006-07                       | 16.61<br>30.00                    |
| 21     | -do-         | Umerekote-Raighar road                 | MDR     | 2005-06                                  | 33.50                             |
| 22     | R&B Khariar  | Khariar-Boden-Sinapali                 | MDR-121 | 2002-03<br>2004-05<br>2005-06<br>2006-07 | 50.00<br>5.52<br>20.00<br>1.21    |
| 23     | -do-         | Sohela-Nuapara road                    | SH-3    | 2002-03<br>2003-04                       | 100.00<br>20.00                   |
| 24     | -do-         | Bh.patna-Khariar road                  | SH-16   | 2002-03                                  | 40.00                             |
| 25     | R&B Rayagada | Gunupur-Kasipur rod                    | SH      | 2001-02<br>2006-07                       | 16.25<br>41.14                    |
| 26     | -do-         | Koraput-Laxmipur-Rayagada Gunupur road | SH-4    | 2002-03<br>2003-04<br>2004-05            | 9.74<br>42.23<br>25.00            |
| 27     | -do-         | Ramanguda-B. cuttack road              | SH-46   | 2002-03<br>2003-04<br>2004-05            | 9.06<br>15.00<br>6.76             |
| 28     | -do-         | Rayagda-Kerada road                    | MDR-48B | 2002-03<br>2003-04<br>2004-05<br>2005-06 | 100.00<br>30.00<br>50.00<br>16.61 |
| 29     | -do-         | Komtalpeta-Muniguda-Tumudibandh road   | SH-5    | 2002-03<br>2003-04<br>2004-05            | 9.02<br>10.00<br>12.03            |
|        | <b>TOTAL</b> |  |         |  | <b>2309.30</b>                    |

**Appendix –IV**  
**(Refer paragraph 5.3.5 at page 32)**  
**Statement showing the details of less consumption of cement in seventeen bridge works**  
**as of March 2007**

| Sl. No. | Name of the Division | Name of the bridge                     | Grade of cement concrete. | Quantity executed in cum. | Consumption of cement as per estimate qt/ Cum | Actual consumption as per mix design test qt/ cum | Differential quantity of cement Col-6-col-7 Qtl/cum | Less consumption of cement (qtl.) Col-5Xcol-8 | Cost of less consumption in Rupees |
|---------|----------------------|--|---------------------------|---------------------------|---|---|---|---|------------------------------------|
| 1       | 2                    | 3                                      | 4                         | 5                         | 6   | 7   | 8   | 9   | 10                                 |
| 1       | RW, Koraput          | Bridge over Palliguda                  | M15                       | 806                       | 3.21  | 3.13  | 0.08  | 64  | 20000                              |
|         |                      | Kolab 9 <sup>th</sup> . KM JBB road    | M25                       | 761                       | 5.71  | 4.42  | 1.29  | 982   | 353520                             |
|         |                      | Kolab 24 <sup>th</sup> . KM NKK road   | M25                       | 96                        | 5.71  | 4.42  | 1.29  | 124   | 42160                              |
|         |                      | Do-                                    | M30                       | 356                       | 6.46  | 5.17  | 1.29  | 459   | 156060                             |
|         |                      | Satiguda 7 <sup>th</sup> . KM JBB road | M25                       | 1674                      | 5.71  | 4.92  | 0.79  | 1322  | 462700                             |
| 2.      | R&B, Balangir        | Magarkund.                             | M15                       | 2097                      | 3.21  | 2.92  | 0.29  | 608   | 214624                             |
|         |                      | Do-                                    | M20                       | 13                        | 4.11  | 3.75  | 0.36  | 5   | 1765                               |
|         |                      | Do-                                    | M25                       | 305                       | 5.71  | 3.77  | 1.94  | 592   | 208976                             |
|         |                      | D0-                                    | M30                       | 24                        | 6.46  | 4.60  | 1.86  | 45  | 15885                              |
|         |                      | Tureikela                              | M20                       | 248                       | 4.11  | 3.78  | 0.33  | 82  | 27486                              |
|         |                      | Do-                                    | M30                       | 18                        | 6.46  | 4.84  | 1.62  | 29  | 9720                               |
|         |                      | Choukinalla                            | M20                       | 16                        | 4.11  | 3.86  | 0.25  | 4   | 1260                               |
|         |                      | Do-                                    | M25                       | 392                       | 5.71  | 4.14  | 1.57  | 615   | 193725                             |
|         |                      | Do-                                    | M30                       | 30                        | 6.46  | 4.38  | 2.08  | 62  | 19530                              |
|         |                      | Sonagarh                               | M30                       | 2292                      | 6.46  | 5.00  | 1.46  | 3346  | 1166628                            |
| 3       | RW, Nawrangpur       | Bhaskel                                | M25                       | 1440                      | 5.71  | 4.47  | 1.24  | 1786  | 498554                             |
|         |                      | Do-                                    | M30                       | 133                       | 6.46  | 4.79  | 1.67  | 222   | 73722                              |
| 4.      | RW, Malkangiri       | Pangam                                 | M20                       | 471                       | 4.11  | 4.09  | 0.02  | 9   | 3105                               |
|         |                      | Do-                                    | M25                       | 481                       | 5.71  | 4.38  | 1.33  | 640   | 220800                             |
|         |                      | Do-                                    | M30                       | 235                       | 6.46  | 5.19  | 1.27  | 298   | 102810                             |
| 5.      | R&B, Malkangiri      | Saptadhara                             | M20                       | 289                       | 4.11  | 4.04  | 0.07  | 20  | 6920                               |
|         |                      | Do-                                    | M30                       | 488                       | 6.46  | 5.71  | 0.75  | 366   | 126636                             |
| 6.      | R&B, Raygada         | Sankeshnala-I                          | M25                       | 502                       | 5.71  | 4.32  | 1.39  | 698   | 228944                             |
|         |                      | Do-                                    | M30                       | 45                        | 6.46  | 4.49  | 1.97  | 89  | 29192                              |
|         |                      | Sankeshnal-II                          | M25                       | 444                       | 5.71  | 4.02  | 1.69  | 750   | 193500                             |
|         |                      |  | M30                       | 41                        | 6.46  | 4.40  | 2.06  | 84  | 21672                              |
|         |                      | Japakhal nalla                         | M25                       | 350                       | 5.71  | 4.32  | 1.39  | 487   | 125646                             |
|         |                      |  | M30                       | 30                        | 6.46  | 4.49  | 1.97  | 59  | 15222                              |
| 7.      | R&B, Koraput         | Jhanjabati                             | M15                       | 937                       | 3.21  | 3.19  | 0.02  | 19  | 5787                               |
|         |                      |  | M25                       | 477                       | 5.71  | 4.36  | 1.35  | 644   | 196098                             |
|         |                      | Champabati                             | M15                       | 1287                      | 3.21  | 3.18  | 0.03  | 39  | 11875                              |
|         |                      |  | M25                       | 365                       | 5.71  | 4.35  | 1.36  | 496   | 151032                             |
|         |                      | Kasiguda                               | M15                       | 1005                      | 3.21  | 3.18  | 0.03  | 30  | 10293                              |
|         |                      |  | M25                       | 231                       | 5.71  | 4.36  | 1.35  | 312   | 107047                             |
|         | <b>Total</b>         |  |                           | <b>18379</b>              |   |   |   | <b>15387</b>                                  | <b>5022894</b>                     |

## Appendix-V

(Refer paragraph 1.6 at page 7)

### Extracts of "Evaluation Report on impact of implementation of Revised Long Term Action Plan (RLTA) in KBK districts, Orissa" by the Xavier Institute of Management, Bhubaneswar.

#### Objective:

The key objectives of the study have been to assess the perception of the beneficiaries in the KBK region on the impact of the 8 RLTA schemes. Impact has been seen from two levels viz., Outputs from each scheme and overall Outcomes from all the schemes taken together.

#### Methodology:

The study constituted both the *Survey Methodology* and *Case Methodology*. The *perception* of the program beneficiaries on the impact of the selected program was based on the survey of over **4400 beneficiaries** from the eight districts on all eight schemes was covered under the study. A total of about **60 blocks** out of a total of 80 blocks from eight districts were covered in the study. Four village clusters from each block were covered under the survey.

The survey of beneficiaries was complemented with **detailed case studies** to get deeper insights into the implementation process, implementation process, segments that benefited from the schemes, and impact of the schemes on the targeted beneficiaries. The study also explored the specific lacunae if any in each of the programs so that the method of implementation could be improvised in the future.

The overall **Outcomes** from the various RLTA schemes have been analyzed from three key perspectives, viz.,

1. Whether the poor in the region have been alleviated from **Poverty**?
2. Whether the region has been **Drought** proofed?
3. Whether the people in the region have improved in their **Quality of Life**?

#### Executive Summary

##### Objective of the study:

The key objectives of the study have been to assess the perception of the beneficiaries in the KBK region on the impact of the eight schemes of Revised Long Term Action Plan (RLTA). Impact in this study has been seen at two levels viz., Outputs (economic, social, and participation-action) from each scheme and overall Outcomes (poverty alleviation, drought proofing, and quality of life) taking all the schemes into account.

##### Major Findings on Outputs:

**Rural Employment:** The performance of Rural Employment schemes in terms of employment opportunities created for poor people, its impact on reducing migration and the role of palli sabhas in the implementation of these schemes is at a satisfactory level. However, the impact in terms of reducing number of poor families in the region seems to be only at a fair level of output.

**Rural Connectivity:** While the gross economic indicator appears to be satisfactory, the gross social indicator and the gross participation-action indicator stand at fair level of output.

**Watershed Development:** While the performance of gross economic indicator has attained a fair level of output, gross social indicator has been at lower side of satisfactory level. Gross participation-action has also been at lower side of fair level of output.

**Afforestation:** Economic indicators such as increase in collection of forest produce, increase in income from forest produce, and increase in number of people collecting forest produce, survival of plants and survival of grass and vegetation are at a fair level of output. However, employment opportunities through daily wage labor touch satisfactory level of output.

**BKVY:** All the economic, social and participation-action indicators are either at fair or poor level of output. Gross economic indicator and social indicator are at fair level, whereas gross participation-action indicator is at poor level.

**Emergency Feeding:** Outputs of both gross economic indicator and the gross social indicator are at lower side of satisfactory level. However, the output of gross participation-action indicator is at poor level of output.

**Drinking Water:** Key economic output indicators such as whether water from tube wells / piped water has been alright for drinking and cooking, that women did not have to travel long distances to collect water, and that water has been available through out the year, etc all stand at a good level of output. Output on whether tube wells have been in good working condition stands at satisfactory level. The gross economic indicator of the scheme also emerges to be in good level of output.

Key social output indicators such as whether tube wells and piped water systems are kept neat and clean by the users is at the lower side of satisfactory level of output. Gross social indicator stands only at fair level of output. Participation-action indicators like whether villagers take responsibility to maintain and repair tube wells/piped water system and that village leaders tell people to keep the tube well clean are at higher end of fair level of output. In all, the output scores of different indicators of this scheme have been observed to be better than all other schemes under RLTAAP.

**MHU:** Key economic indicators like on regularity of immunization camps, decrease in child mortality rate, and whether people get free medicine through MHU, the outputs stands at good level. All other economic indicators are at satisfactory or fair level. On social indicators like whether people's reliance on village shamans has reduced during the past 7-8 years, the output shows satisfactory level. On participation-action indicator, output on whether people gather, organize and listen to MHU doctors is at fair level and output on whether people speak out when they do not get medical service at poor level.

**Major Findings on Outcomes:**

On an average, **Poverty Alleviation** is at a fair level of outcome. Gross economic output, gross social output and gross participation-action output that make the poverty alleviation outcome are at the level of satisfactory, satisfactory, and fair respectively. While 25 *per cent* of the beneficiaries have had little impact on alleviation of their poverty, another 25 *per cent* of beneficiaries have had a fair level of impact on poverty alleviation. The balance 50 *per cent* of beneficiaries had either satisfactory level of impact or better than satisfactory level of impact.

Performance of RLTAAP schemes to **drought proof** the region appears to be at fair level of outcome. 40 *per cent* of the beneficiaries felt that drought-proofing measures have achieved poor level of outcome. 20 *per cent* of the beneficiaries rate the drought proofing measures to have achieved a fair level of outcome. The balance 40 *per cent* of the beneficiaries felt that drought-proofing measures have achieved satisfactory or



better than satisfactory level of outcome. On the whole, the score on this outcome is lower than the other two outcomes.

With regard to average Quality of Life (QL), performance is at fair level of outcome. Gross economic outcome, gross social outcome and gross participation-action outcome that construct the Quality of Life index are at the level of satisfactory, fair, and fair respectively. 25 per cent of the beneficiaries felt that the RLTAAP schemes have had little impact on their quality of life and 35 per cent beneficiaries felt that the RLTAAP scheme have had a fair level of impact in improving the quality of life. The balance 40 per cent have expressed that RLTAAP schemes had a satisfactory level or better than satisfactory level of impact on improving their quality of life.

### **Key Observations & Suggestions**

(a) Targeted beneficiaries have benefited in different measures from the various schemes of the RLTAAP in KBK districts. The overall economic, social and participation-action levels have improved as compared to the situation prior to the implementation of RLTAAP in 1998-99.

(b) The results of economic outputs for different schemes are better than the results of social outputs and participation-action outputs. Systematic analyses of the reasons that has led to differences in outputs of these broad indicators should be undertaken and corrective measures need to be taken so that the long term objectives of RLTAAP can be achieved in due course of time.

(c ) Different levels of outcomes have been achieved with regard to Poverty Alleviation, Drought Proofing and Quality of Life in the region. Poverty alleviation and Quality of Life outcomes have been slightly better than Drought Proofing outcome.

(d) It has been found that the participation-action indicator is low in all the programs as compared to the economic indicator. This implies that the beneficiaries are not fully aware about their rights and entitlements from the various schemes. Further, the increasing heterogeneity of people in the KBK communities by the entry of settlers from outside the region has reduced the cohesiveness of villages. These aspects appear to have affected the absorption capacity of the beneficiaries to demand, absorb, and utilize the benefits of the various schemes of RLTAAP. With the above social contexts, the systemic losses are likely to be higher and the delivered benefits lower.

(e) Systemic losses of resources have been observed owing to practices of officials & intermediaries. This observation has been a common knowledge among the public and has been quite perceptible even during the course of this study.

### **Suggestions:**

Indeed, the social context of the region is quite diverse and the dimensions that shape the outputs and outcomes of various programs are many. Hence it is rather difficult to make any concrete workable suggestions for improvements in program delivery and to improve the absorption capacity of the beneficiaries.

However, three issues may be looked into as an attempt to make RLTAAP and other such development projects in KBK region more effective. (a) **Restructure** the existing development wing in the district by pooling in manpower resources from various departments such that the new wing will *focus only on the development projects* in the district.

(b) **Disseminate information** about the various schemes to respective beneficiary groups so that the people know the details of the schemes and their rights and entitlements from the schemes.

(c) **Build capacity and expertise** among the beneficiary groups so that the beneficiary groups can make productive use of various schemes. Developing training modules, conducting workshops, and in-house training of village youth, men and women selected through systematic sampling of the population may go a long way in better absorption and utilization of the schemes.

**On the whole**, RLTAAP schemes should be carried out with greater vigour by deploying honest, fearless and effective key officials in the districts to curb inefficiencies and to reduce systemic losses in the current system so that the RLTAAP schemes achieve the long term objectives of improving the quality of life of people in KBK region.

### Scheme Output Analyses

The scores obtained on the various scheme outputs and program (RLTAAP) outcomes were divided on a seven grades ranging from excellent to failure based on the ratings obtained from a total score of 5.0. The performance criterion used for evaluation in terms of outputs and outcomes levels and the associated range of scores are given in table below.

Table : Performance Criterion

| Output / Outcome Level | Range of Score |
|------------------------|----------------|
| Excellent              | 4.6 – 5.0      |
| Very Good              | 4.1 – 4.5      |
| Good                   | 3.6 – 4.0      |
| Satisfactory           | 3.1 – 3.5      |
| Fair                   | 2.6 – 3.0      |
| Poor                   | 2.1 – 2.5      |
| Failure                | < 2.1          |

### 1. Rural Employment

The scheme of Rural Employment consisted of three sub-schemes viz., Indira Awas Yojana (IAY), Swarnajayanti Gram Sworozgar Yojana (SGSY), and Sampoorna Gramin Rojgar Yojan (SGRY).

This scheme has been aimed at alleviation of poverty by catering to the immediate economic needs of the poor people and in due course would also help improving their living conditions. The performance of these schemes in terms of employment opportunities created for poor people and its impact on reducing migration from the villages surveyed appears to be at a satisfactory level. The role of palli sabhas in the implementation of these schemes also seems to be a satisfactory level. However, the impact on reduction in number of poor families seems to be only at a fair level.

#### 1.1 IAY:

The performance of IAY scheme with regard to gross economic indicator has been good with an overall score of 3.6 but the gross social indicator appears to be fair with an overall score of 3.2. Many of the poor and landless beneficiaries built their own IAY houses. The score of AIS9 indicator shows that whenever, local contractors was engaged to built such houses, the concerned beneficiaries of the houses were largely not consulted.

On a comparative analysis of the eight districts, gross economic indicator mean scores of Kalahandi and Rayagada touch a score of 4.0, whereas, Malkangiri's score is 3.0 and scores of all the other districts are in between. The situation on gross social indicator across the districts is lower than the gross economic indicator. While Malkangiri has higher gross social indicator, Bolangir and Sonepur touch scores of poor levels. The differences in these economic and social indicators suggest that the impact of this scheme on the overall objective of improving quality of life has not been strong.

### **1.2 SGSY:**

The gross economic and gross social indicators of SGSY scheme show satisfactory level of performance. Interestingly, here the score of gross social indicator is more than the gross economic indicator. This suggests that beneficiaries tend to participate better in this type of scheme than in other type of schemes. However, the swarojogaris under the scheme seem to be far from the target of earning Rs. 2000 per month.

With regard to performance across the eight districts, gross economic indicator for all the districts except Malkangiri and Bolangir is either satisfactory or better. However, the indicator is poor for Malkangiri and it is fair for Bolnagir. On gross social indicator, all the districts are either fair or better.

### **1.3 SGRY:**

While the gross economic indicator touches satisfactory level, gross social indicator is at fair level a little below satisfactory level. Although, the scheme is aimed to engage beneficiaries in the implementation of projects under this scheme, the score on indicator relating to people's participation and action is at a poor level. This should ring an alarm bell to the SGRY implementing agencies as it appears from the above scores that the beneficiaries only get some employment from the scheme but are not the decision makers in project implementation and neither have the beneficiaries developed a sense of ownership on the community assets that have been created from this scheme. It also implies that even if the work order of a project were issued on a targeted beneficiary, the local intermediaries such local contractors, agents, etc possibly, on their own terms, implement the work order of different projects under the scheme.

When the eight districts are compared on the output indicators, except for Nawarangpur with satisfactory level, all the districts are at a fair level on gross economic indicator. On gross social indicator, except for Nawarnagpur and Rayagada with satisfactory level all other districts at best show only fair level. On gross participation-action indicator, all the districts except Nawarangpur with satisfactory level, exhibit either fair or poor level of output.

## **2. Rural Connectivity**

The objective of this scheme has been to improve the existing road connectivity from remote villages to the block headquarters, schools, primary health centres (PHC) and market places by way of providing funds for construction and repair of roads and bridges. In addition to improving rural connectivity, the scheme has been a major source of daily wage employment to rural poor in KBK region.

The gross economic indicator of this scheme appears to be satisfactory with a score of 3.3. The gross social indicator stands at only fair level with a score 2.9 and the gross participation-action indicator stands at again at fair level with still lower score of 2.8. Gross indicator is composite index of benefits like improved accessibility to block office, schools, marketplaces, PHCs, etc. Gross social indicator is a composite index of whether proper wages were paid on time and whether the wage rates and work

times were discussed in palli sabhas. Gross participation-action indicator is a composite index of whether the poor wage labor trusts the local contractor and whether the poor are able to raise voice against any violation of norms of work and payments.

With the improvements on rural roads and bridges people are able to reach faster to the nearby market, bus stands, and block offices. The score for indicator on whether daily wages of Rs. 55 per day was paid by contractors is only 3.3. Although the score looks satisfactory, there is little reason why this score should not be closer to 5.0 as wages at the above mentioned rate are paid by the Government to the contractors. Inquiry with the beneficiaries in different villages revealed that men in general get a daily wage of Rs 45 and women get a daily wage of Rs. 35 in villages that are away from main settlement. Wages are also not paid on time on most occasions. It is also observed that the beneficiaries often do not have a voice against violation of norms and rules of the scheme.

Comparison of performance across the eight districts provides some more understanding to the phenomena. On gross economic indicator, while Malkangiri and Rayagada are at good outcome level, Kalahandi is near the poor outcome level. Other districts are either at fair or satisfactory outcome level. On gross social indicator, while Nawarangpur is at good outcome level, Sonepur is at poor outcome level. Other districts are largely at fair output level. On gross participation-action indicator, only Bolangir and Nawarangpur manage to touch satisfactory output level. All the other districts are below the satisfactory level. Indeed, *Malkangiri and Sonepur with scores below 2.0 show signs of failure* with regard to participation-action indicator.

The above scores of various indicators lead to suggest that while the economic outputs seems to be at satisfactory output levels and the social indicators are at a fair level of output, the participation-action has been the bottleneck. It may therefore be inferred that the even the present ratings on economic indicators and social indicators could be on the higher side given that the beneficiaries are at poor to fair level with regard to their participation and action on the above scheme.

### **3. Watershed Development**

Watershed scheme is a holistic development scheme that has the potential to meet all the three key outcomes viz., poverty alleviation, drought proofing, and quality of life. The budgetary support, however, has been much lower than it demands for.

While the performance of gross economic indicator has attained a fair level of output, gross social indicator has been at lower side of satisfactory level. Gross participation-action has also been at lower side of fair level of output.

With regard to specific economic indicators, the scheme has achieved satisfactory level of output on employment through labour-days generation in watershed areas but stands only at fair level on increase in level of water in tanks and ponds, cultivation in summer months, and increase in moisture level and vegetation in watershed areas.

Most of the individual social indicators are at satisfactory level implying that the scheme has been able to mobilize people better than other schemes. Involvement of poor people to form SHGs appears to be satisfactory with a score of 3.54. Involvement of all categories of people in the decision of watershed work is also at satisfactory level with a score of 3.24.

However, the participation-action of beneficiary on this scheme has been at lower side of fair level of output. Indicator on whether beneficiaries speak out against violation of norms is at a dismal poor level of output. From the above indicators, it can be inferred that the long-term objectives and issues of sustainability have not been achieved from the implementation of this scheme.

Comparison of performance of different districts show that most of the district show a fair level of output on gross economic indicator. While Nawarangpur shows good level of output, Kalahandi and Sonepur shows only fair level of output. On gross social indicator, all the districts except Malkangiri are at satisfactory level or at good level of output. On gross participation-action output, it is alarming to note that Malkangiri and Sonepur seem to have failed on this indicator. The other districts also stand only at fair level or on lower side of satisfactory level of output.

Given the myriads of problems that people in the hilly tracts face, basic infrastructures like roads and bridges have been given priority by people and the district officials. However, as the basic infrastructures are put in place, if proper implementation of this scheme were emphasized upon, it can significantly contribute towards all the key outcomes of RLTA. Although, this scheme seems to have achieved only partial success, it could be improvised with better design of the scheme in terms of greater focus capacity building of the beneficiaries through improved guidance, supervision and SHG activities.

#### **4. Afforestation**

This scheme has been largely aimed at drought proofing. It has also been designed to create labor-days through plantation activities and in the long run it aims to provide sustainable economic benefits through increased forest produce.

Economic indicators such as increase in collection of forest produce, increase in income from forest produce, and increase in number of people collecting forest produce are at fair level of output. Survival of plants and survival of grass and vegetation are also at a fair level. However, employment opportunities through daily wage labor and increase in forest cover touch the satisfactory level of output. All individual social indicators are at fair level or poor level of output. Regular meetings of VSS and involvement of people in making important decisions is at poor level of output. So is the case in participation-action indicator, the individual indicators are either at fair level or at poor level of output.

On gross economic indicator, all the districts except Rayagada are either at fair or poor level. On gross social indicator, only Rayagada is at satisfactory level most other districts are at fair level. Koraput stands to be at poor level and Sonepur stands at failure level of output. On gross participation-action indicator, Bolangir, Nawarangpur and Rayagada are at fair level and the five districts are either at poor level or failure level of output.

The performance of this scheme on all fronts is of concern. The gross economic and gross social indicators have been observed to at fair level of outputs and the gross participation-action indicator is at poor level of output. It is necessary to review the nature of plantation work undertaken, the gestation period for resource recovery of these plantation and the norms and regulation on use and ownership of the assets created so that appropriate corrections can be made and long-term objectives of the scheme can be achieved in future years. The case analysis of this scheme provides some of understanding on the issues concerning this scheme.

#### **5. Biju Krushak Vikas Yojana**

This scheme has been largely aimed at increase the income levels of people and alleviate the poverty situation of targeted beneficiaries. In the long run this scheme should also add towards improving the quality of life of the beneficiaries.

All the economic, social and participation-action indicators of this scheme are either at fair or poor level of output. Gross economic indicator and social indicator are at fair level, whereas gross participation-action indicator is at poor level.

Some important individual indicators like increase in land use for rabi crops is fair, farmers' ability to cultivate second crop is also fair and inclusion of members from different social class is also fair. People's ability to speak out when rules and norms are violated is poor.

On gross economic indicator, only Rayagada is at good level and Koraput is at satisfactory level. Sonapur is at poor level and the rest are at fair level. On gross social indicator, Sonapur is at poor level and the other districts are at fair level of output. And, on gross participation-action indicator, except for Kalahandi district, outputs of all the districts are either at fair level or below. Indeed, Malkangiri and Sonapur are at failure level of output.

There seems to be a number of problems in this scheme on several fronts. Issues like whether a farmers' group with 50 acres of land or a group with lesser than 50 acres of land area should make a unit, whether electricity driven pumps or diesel driven pumps be used by farmers, etc need to be analyzed for improving the output levels of this scheme. The detail case analysis provides some clue to the existing problem.

## **6. Emergency Feeding**

This scheme has been largely aimed to arrest death of people due to starvation. This scheme has been primarily to provide succor to old, infirm, poor and helpless people in the region. In the long-term this scheme can also help in improving the overall quality of life of population in KBK region.

Outputs of both gross economic indicator and the gross social indicator are at the lower side of satisfactory level. However, the output of gross participation-action indicator is at poor level. The key indicator of this scheme has been to arrest the starvation deaths. The score of this indicator is at a good output level of 3.8 suggesting that the scheme has been largely effective on this issue. Individual economic indicators like quality of food and quantity of food given appear to be at satisfactory level of output. A score of 3.2 on the indicator to assess whether food is being given every day appears to be satisfactory. However, this score must be seen from the light of what it signifies to a old, infirm, and helpless person not getting his/her one meal a day. In addition to this, the poor output level of participation-action indicator implies that when the beneficiaries do not get their daily meal or any of the norms of the scheme is violated, they have little voice to report the same to the relevant authorities. Their problems can only be resolved through an effective monitoring mechanism of the government.

On gross economic indicator, six of the eight districts are at satisfactory level. While the output in Malkangiri is at very good level, Sonapur is at fair level of output. On gross social indicator too, six out of the eight districts are at satisfactory output level. While Nawarangpur district at good output level, Sonapur is at failure output level. When we look at the gross participation-action level, only Nawarangpur district has satisfactory output level. Bolangir and Nuapada districts are at fair output level. Kalahandi, Koraput, and Rayagada districts are at poor output level. Malkangiri and Sonapur districts are at failure output level.

With the beneficiaries of this scheme being largely voiceless against violation of norms of the scheme as indicated by the score on gross participation-action variable, the local intermediaries like the Anganwadi workers and a few village leaders who are usually from Bengal, Andhra Pradesh and Coastal Orissa are likely to misuse the provisions under emergency feeding scheme in the absence of proper supervision from the government department.

## **7. Rural Drinking Water**

This scheme has been largely aimed to make available safe drinking water to people in KBK region. The burden of walking long distance by rural women to fetch water for drinking and cooking was to be reduced through this scheme. Reduction in the number of diseases related to unsafe drinking water was yet another objective of this scheme.

The key economic output indicators such as whether drinking water has been alright for drinking and cooking, that women did not have to travel long distances to collect water, and that water has been available through out the year, etc all stand at a good level of output. Output on whether tube wells have been in good working condition stands at satisfactory level. The gross economic indicator of the scheme also emerges to be in good level of output.

The key social output indicators such as whether tube wells and piped water systems are kept neat and clean by the users is at the lower side of satisfactory level of output. Gross social indicator output stands only at fair level of output. Participation-action indicators like villagers take responsibility to maintain and repair tube wells/piped water system and village leaders tell people to keep the tube well clean are at the higher end of the fair level of output. In all, the output scores of different indicators of this scheme have been observed to be better than all other schemes under RLTA.

On gross economic indicator, performance of all the eight KBK districts are at satisfactory to good output levels. Indeed, on this indicator Malkangiri district has the distinction of being the only district with very good level of output. This is like a fresh air for Makangiri district especially because in most of the other schemes, it has been on lower level of output as compared to other outputs of other districts in KBK. One may wonder why such a difference in output levels in Malkangiri district. The initial conditions of drinking water supply in Malkangiri district may have a clue to the paradox we see in the output level of drinking water scheme vis-à-vis other schemes in Malkangiri district.

On gross social indicator, outputs of all the districts except Sonepur have been largely at fair or satisfactory level. However, output level of this indicator in Sonepur is at failure level. On gross participation-action indicator, all the districts except Sonepur are either at fair or satisfactory level and Sonepur again is at failure level. With scores on gross social and participation-action indicator, Sonepur once again slips down as compared to the other districts.

It is however, interesting to find that when the gross economic indicator of drinking water is good for all the districts, the output levels in Sonepur district is also at satisfactory level that is on par to performance of other districts in KBK region. This suggests that the low scores of Sonepur may not be because of statistical error but because of some genuine social or systemic problem. This raises the question of why Sonepur is one of the few districts with low output scores on most of the schemes. Is the answer to this question in the size and the nature of district administration has to be explored.

## **8. Mobile Health Unit**

This scheme has been aimed to provide medical service to people who have poor or no access to primary health centres at block headquarters. These people are usually in villages in remote location that do not have proper transport service for people to be able to reach primary health centres. The scheme has been essentially aimed to improve the health conditions of people and in the long run improve the overall quality of life. This scheme was also aimed to bring awareness about and acceptance of the popular and well-developed allopathic system of medicine among people of

scheduled tribes and castes who have been averse to such medicine and who relied only on village shamans (disharis) for all health related problems.

On some key economic indicators like on regularity of immunization camps, decrease in child mortality rate, and whether people get free medicine through MHU, the outputs stand at good level. All other economic indicators are at satisfactory or fair level. The gross economic indicator stands at satisfactory level. On social indicators like whether people's reliance on village shamans has reduced during the past five years, the output shows satisfactory level. However, output on whether people have formed village health committees to solve their health problems is at failure level. Therefore, output of gross social indicator of this scheme stands at a poor level. On participation-action indicator, output on whether people gather, organize and listen to MHU doctors is at fair level and output on whether people speak out when they do not get medical service is poor. Hence, the gross participation-action is at fair level of output.

Comparative district analysis reveals that output of gross economic indicator of the districts except Sonepur is either satisfactory or good. Indeed, Malkangiri district and Nuapada district lead on this indicator with outputs at level good. Output level of Sonepur district, however, is at poor level. Output on social indicator for all the districts except Sonepur district is poor and output of Sonepur (Subarnapur) on this front is at failure level. Output on gross participation-action of all districts either satisfactory or below that level and there is a greater variation in the outputs among the districts. While Nawarangpur and Rayagada are at a satisfactory level of output, Bolangir, Kalahandi and Rayagada are at fair level of output, Koraput and Malkangiri are at poor level of output and Sonepur is again at failure level on this output.

Although, social dimensions and people's participation-action on the scheme has not been vibrant, the delivery of immediate benefits seems to have achieved a satisfactory level of output.

In summary, the outputs from the different schemes were assessed using 114 variables on performance ratings of excellent, very good, good, satisfactory, fair, poor and failure. On mean score of these variables, 10.5 *per cent* of the variables were rated as good, 36 *per cent* variables were satisfactory, 43.9 *per cent* were fair, and 9.6 *per cent* were poor.



## GLOSSARY OF ABBREVIATIONS

### A

|       |   |
|-------|---|
| AAPs  | Annual Action Plans                     |
| ACA   | Additional Central Assistance           |
| AOFFP | Area Oriented Fuel and Fodder Programme |
| APL   | Above Poverty Line                      |
| AWC   | Angawadi Centres                        |

### B

|      |                           |
|------|---------------------------|
| BDO  | Block Development Officer |
| BKVY | Biju Krushak Vikas Yojna  |
| BPL  | Below Poverty Line        |

### C

|      |                                   |
|------|-----------------------------------|
| CA   | Chef Administrator                |
| CDMO | Chief District Medical Officer    |
| CDPO | Child Development Project Officer |
| CE   | Cheif Engineer                    |
| CGWB | Central Ground Water Board        |
| CP   | Central Plan                      |
| CSP  | Centrally Sponsored Plan          |

### D

|      |                                   |
|------|-----------------------------------|
| DCA  | Deputy Chief Administrator        |
| DPAP | Drought Prone Area Programme      |
| DRDA | District Rural Development Agency |
| DSWO | District Social Welfare Officer   |
| DWM  | District Watershed Mission        |

### E

|     |                             |
|-----|-----------------------------|
| EAS | Employment Assurance Scheme |
| EE  | Executive Engineer          |
| EFP | Emergency Feeding Programme |

### F

|     |               |
|-----|---------------|
| FFW | Food For Work |
|-----|---------------|

### G

|     |                     |
|-----|---------------------|
| GOI | Government of India |
| GP  | Gram Panchayat      |

### I

|      |  |
|------|--|
| IAEP | Integrated Afforestation and Eco Development Project |
| IAY  | Indira Awas Yojana                                   |

|           |  |
|-----------|--|
| IWDP      | Integrated Watershed Development Programme               |
| <b>J</b>  |  |
| JFM       | Joint Forest Management                                  |
| <b>K</b>  |  |
| KBK       | Koraput, Bolangir and Kalahandi                          |
| Km.       | Kilometre  |
| <b>L</b>  |  |
| LI        | Lift Irrigation  |
| <b>M</b>  |  |
| MDR       | Major District Road                                      |
| MHU       | Mobile Health Unit                                       |
| MLA       | Member of Legislative Assembly                           |
| MP        | Madhya Pradesh   |
| MT        | Metric Tonne   |
| <b>N</b>  |  |
| NGO       | Non Government Organisation                              |
| NREGS     | National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme               |
| NTFP      | Non Timber Forest Produce                                |
| NWDPR     | National Watershed Development Project in Rain-fed Areas |
| <b>O</b>  |  |
| OAIC      | Orissa Agro Industries Corporation                       |
| OLIC      | Orissa Lift Irrigation Corporation                       |
| OPWD      | Orissa Public Works Department                           |
| ORSAC     | Orissa Remote Sensing and Application Centre             |
| <b>P</b>  |  |
| PCCF      | Principal Chief Conservator of Forests                   |
| PCD / P&C | Planning and Coordination Department                     |
| PIA       | Project Implementing Agency                              |
| PMGSY     | Prime Ministers Gram Sadak Yojana                        |
| PP        | Pani Panchayat   |
| <b>R</b>  |  |
| R&B       | Roads and Buildings                                      |
| RDWS      | Rural Drinking Water Supply                              |
| RLTAP     | Revised Long Term Action Plan                            |
| Rs        | Rupees   |
| RW        | Rural Works  |

|          |  |
|----------|--|
| RWSS     | Rural Water Supply and Sanitation              |
| <b>S</b> |  |
| SADP     | Special Area Development Project               |
| SARCA    | Special Area Rural Connectivity Authority      |
| SC / ST  | Scheduled Caste / Scheduled Tribe              |
| SCA      | Special Central Assistance                     |
| SDMU     | State Drug Management Unit                     |
| SGRY     | Sampoorna Grameena Rozgar Yojana               |
| SGSY     | Swarnajayanti Gram Swarajgar Yojana            |
| SH       | State Highway                                  |
| SHG      | Self Help Group                                |
| SRC      | Special Relief Commissioner                    |
| SRSWR    | Stratified Random Sampling without Replacement |
| SW       | Sanitary Well                                  |
| <b>T</b> |  |
| TW       | Tube Well                                      |
| <b>U</b> |  |
| UG       | User Group                                     |
| <b>V</b> |  |
| VLL      | Village Labour Leader                          |
| VSS      | Vana Samrakshana Samities                      |
| <b>W</b> |  |
| WA       | Watershed Association                          |
| WC       | Watershed Committee                            |
| WDF      | Watershed Development Fund                     |
| WDT      | Watershed Development Team                     |
| WRD      | Water Resources Department                     |
| <b>X</b> |  |
| XIMB     | Xavier Institute of Management,<br>Bhubaneswar |
| <b>Z</b> |  |
| ZP       | Zilla Parishad                                 |
| ZSS      | Zilla Swasthya Samiti                          |