

EVALUATION REPORT

**ECONOMIC AND STATISTICAL ORGANISATION
PUNJAB (INDIA)**

**MEMBER OF PARLIAMENT LOCAL AREA
DEVELOPMENT SCHEME**

ECONOMIC ADVISER TO GOVERNMENT PUNJAB, CHANDIGARH.

CONTENTS

Sr.No.	Particulars	Pages
1.	Summary of Findings	2-11
2.	Summary of Recommendations	12-15
3. Chapter-I	Introduction and Plan of Enquiry	16-21
	Introduction, Objectives, Reference Period, Scope and Coverage, Sampling Design, Instruments of Investigation and Plan of Report	
4. Chapter-II	Organisational and Administrative Set-up	22-38
	Broad Guidelines, Implementation of the scheme in the State, Implementation of the scheme in the Selected Districts.	
5. Chapter-III	Progress and Utility of the Scheme.	39-83
	Review of the Scheme in the Selected districts, Review of Selected Works, Details of Selected Works in district Ferozepur, Details of Selected Works in district Faridkot, Details of Selected Works in district Jalandhar, Details of Selected Works in district Patiala.	
6. Appendix-I	Member of Parliament Local Area Development Scheme, Guidelines of Scheme, Concepts, Implementation and Monitoring of the Scheme.	84-91
7. Appendix-II	Illustrative List of Works that can be taken up under MPLADS.	92-93
8. Appendix-III	List of Works not permissible under MPLADS.	94
9. Appendix-IV	Format for the purpose of Release of Funds under MPLADS for Lok Sabha MPs.	95-96
10. Appendix-V	Format for the purpose of Release of Funds under MPLADS for Rajya Sabha MPs.	97-98
11. Annexure-I	Summary Statement for Entitlement Release/ Expenditure for Members of Parliament Local Area Development Scheme for State of Punjab as on 31.3.2001.	99
12. Annexure-II	Summary Statement for Entitlement/ Release/ Expenditure for MPLADS for the State of Punjab as on 31.3.2003.	100
13. Annexure-III	MPwise Details of Funds received and spent under MPLADS . District Ferozepur.	101
14. Annexure-IV	MPwise Details of Funds received and spent under MPLADS District Faridkot.	102

15.	Annexure-V	MPwise Details of Funds received and spent under MPLADS. District Jalandhar.	103
16	Annexure-VI	MPwise Details of Funds received and spent under MPLAD Scheme District Patiala.	104
17.	Annexure-VII	Name of the Executive Agencies of Selected Works.	105
18.	Annexure-VIII	Monitoring of the Selected Works in District Ferozepur.	106
19.	Annexure-IX	Monitoring of the Selected Works in District Faridkot.	107
20	Annexure-X	Monitoring of the Selected Works in District Jalandhar.	108
21.	Annexure-XI	Monitoring of the Selected Works in District Patiala.	109
22.	Annexure-XII	Names of the Officers and Officials Associated with the study.	110

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

AND

RECOMMENDATIONS

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

A-1 Members of Parliament Local Area Development Scheme (MPLADS) was introduced by Govt. of India in the country w.e.f. 23rd December, 1993 after its formal announcement in the Parliament by Honourable Prime Minister of India. At the outset each M.P. could suggest work to the tune of Rs. 1 crore per year in the constituency to the District Collector later on after realising the usefulness of this scheme this amount was raised to Rs. 2 crores from the financial year 1998-1999. Elected members of Rajya Sabha representing the whole of the State has the choice to suggest works for implementation in one or more districts as they may deem fit. Nominated members of Lok Sabha and Rajya Sabha may also select works for implementation in one or more district(s) but within one State of their choice.

Under the scheme, each Member of Parliament will give a choice of developmental works to the concerned Deputy Commissioner of the district who in turn will get these works executed by following the established procedure laid down by the State Government in accordance with the guidelines issued for implementation of this scheme. The works in urban areas can be executed through Commissioners /Chief Executive Officers of Corporations and Municipalities. Implementing agencies can be either government or Panchayati Raj institutions or any other reputed non-governmental organisation, which may be considered by the District Head as capable of implementing the works satisfactorily. The Head of the District shall identify the agency through which a particular work recommended by the Members of Parliament should be executed.

The works under the scheme should be developmental in nature based on locally felt needs with due emphasis on the creation of durable assets. Funds provided under the scheme should not be used for incurring revenue expenditure. Service support facilities can be provided with these funds barring recurring expenditure viz. on staff and maintenance of such facilities. Funds provided under the scheme can be used for partially meeting the cost of a larger work only in case it would result in completion of work. Execution of work depending on the nature of work may span into more than one year. The site selected for the execution of the work shall not be changed except with the concurrence of the M.P. An illustrative list of works that may be taken up under the scheme is given at Appendix-II and that of not to be allowed is given at Appendix-III of the guidelines given at Appendix-I.

A-2 ORGANISATIONAL SET UP

The implementation of the scheme involves three-pronged strategy. The funds under the scheme are provided by the Department of Statistics, Ministry of Planning and Programme Implementation Govt. of India directly to Deputy Commissioner(s) of the district concerning constituency of the M.P. The Deputy Commissioner acts as D.D.O. of the scheme and gets it implemented through any of agencies working under his control. In case of Punjab State, the scheme is being implemented by a number of agencies at district level viz. The office of Deputy Economic & Statistical Adviser, Additional Deputy Commissioner, Secretary Zila Parishad etc. The implementing

agency in the district receives the proposals recommended by the MP and analyse it according to the guidelines. Funds are released to the executing agencies.

The Economic and Statistical Organisation, Punjab Department of Planning has been entrusted the job of Nodal Agency for physical monitoring and coordination with the Department of Statistics and Programme Implementation, Ministry of Planning and Programme Implementation, Govt. of India. Nodal Department at the State level is required to convene annually a meeting of district heads and MP's to review the progress under the scheme.

The evaluation team has observed certain basic flaws in the guidelines /implementation of the scheme:

- i) No doubt the Economic and Statistical Organisation, Department of Planning has been entrusted the job of Nodal Agency at the State Level but funds under the scheme are being sent directly by the department of Statistical and Programme Implementation, Govt. of India to the respective Deputy Commissioner in the state. Thus resulting in loose control of the Economic and Statistical Organisation, Department of Planning and inefficient co-ordination between the State level nodal agency with that of district level agencies. Sufficient powers needs to be vested with State Nodal agency for efficient supervision.
- ii) State Level nodal agency has failed to stick to schedule of holding one meeting per year of district heads and MPs to review the progress of the scheme.
- iii) Staff posted in the offices of the implementing agencies i.e.ADC (Development) Secretary,Zila Parishad and Deputy Economic and Statistical Advisor is of general nature without much technical knowledge and familiarity with accounts matter and thus sometimes the works are being executed without proper application of guidelines. Feasibility and desirability of the works recommended by MP is not being assessed at all. Monitoring of the scheme is not being done regularly. Up to date record of works done under the scheme was not found properly maintained.
- iv) It has been observed by the evaluation team that the scheme is being implemented through various agencies at the district level. No uniform pattern was found in the four selected districts during the study. In Ferozepur district the implementing agency is Additional Deputy Commissioner (D), in Faridkot district, the implementing agency is the Secretary, Zila Parishad and in Jalandhar & Patiala districts both the implementing agency is Deputy Economic and Statistical Adviser.

A-3 PROGRESS OF THE SCHEME

A sum of Rs. 8925.00 lacs have been released by Govt. of India to various Lok Sabha and Rajya Sabha MPs till the end of March, 2003 in the districts under study (i.e. Ferozepur, Faridkot, Jalandhar and Patiala). Out of the total amount of Rs. 9117.49 lakhs including interest accrued an amount of Rs. 6972.79 (76.48 percent) lakhs was found spent in these selected districts.

Analysis of funds spent in the selected districts revealed that in Ferozepur district expenditure incurred was Rs. 1201.00 lakhs (63.83 percent) out of Rs. 1881.52 lakhs available, in Faridkot

expenditure incurred amounts to Rs. 810.19 lakhs (55.76 percent) of available amount of Rs 1452.93 lakhs. Similarly in Jalandhar and Patiala districts expenditure incurred was Rs. 3172.00 lakhs (92.97 percent) and Rs. 1789.40 lakhs (75.47 percent) out of Rs. 3412.18 lakhs and Rs. 2370.86 lakhs respectively available for expenditure in these districts. It showed that under this scheme around ¼ th (23.52 percent) of the available funds found unutilised in the selected districts.

A-4. EXECUTION OF SELECTED WORKS

I. SELECTION OF WORKS

As per pre-drawn survey strategy in all 40 works in the 4 selected districts i.e. Ferozepur, Faridkot, Jalandhar and Patiala were selected for study. Out of this 14 works were selected from allocation range upto Rs. 0.50 lac, 11 works were from Rs. 0.50 to Rs. 2.50 lac, 7 works were from Rs. 2.50 lakhs to Rs. 5.00 lac and 8 works were where more than Rs. 5.00 lacs were allocated.

II. ALLOCATION OF SELECTED WORKS

On the recommendations of the respective MP, Deputy Commissioner of a district has been empowered to allocate a particular work to any of the executing agencies operating in the district. Out of the 40 selected works, 19 were assigned to Block Development and Panchayat Officer through the Gram Panchayat, 5 to Principal/Parents Teachers Association, 6 to Municipal Committees, 3 to Punjab Water Supply and Sewerage Board, 3 to Thapur Institute of Engineering and Technology (TIET) 1 each to Construction Division of the Guru Nanak Dev University, Amritsar, Village Sports Youth Club, XEN Panchayati Raj and Tehsil Welfare Officer.

III STATUS OF SELECTED WORKS

As per instructions regarding construction in force, work sanctioned under the scheme is required to be completed within a working session. Out of the 40 selected works, 36 works were found complete on the day of survey, 25(69.44 percent) works got completed within the stipulated period while 11(30.56 percent) works took time more than required. The following remaining four works were yet to be taken up on the day of survey for want of selection of site or some other administrative reasons.

Construction of Public Rest House/Community Centre Pattran,
(Sanctioned amount Rs. 10.00 lakhs)

Construction of Public Rest House Samana)
(Sanctioned Amount Rs. 10.00 lakhs)

Construction of Community Centre Samana
(Sanctioned amount Rs. 10.00 lakhs)

Construction of Community Hall in Village Paddy
Jagir Block Phillaur (sanctioned amount Rs. 4.84 lakhs)

IV. ROUGH COST ESTIMATES

During the field inquiry it has been observed that normally rough cost estimates of works are not obtained before the release of funds. Funds for all the 40 selected works have been released without obtaining the rough cost estimates.

V. UNSPENT FUNDS

To a great surprise of the evaluation team that out of the sanctioned amount of Rs.139.00 lakhs for the 40 selected works an amount of Rs.34.84 lakhs (25.06 percent) pertaining to following 4 incomplete works was found unspent in the respective accounts of executing/implementing agencies for the period ranging from 24 to 51 months.

i) CONSTRUCTION OF PUBLIC REST HOUSE/COMMUNITY CENTRE PATTRAN.

Funds amounting to Rs. 10.00 lakhs were sanctioned on 30.4.1998 for the construction of Public Rest House/Community Centre Pattran. This amount remained unspent in the account of M.C. Pattran upto August, 2002. On an inquiry by the evaluation team, the President of M.C. Pattran attributed dispute over site, for non- initiation of the construction activity. It exhibits slackness on the part of executing agency as well as implementing agency of the scheme for not taking appropriate action for the utilisation of funds.

ii) CONSTRUCTION OF PUBLIC REST HOUSE SAMANA

Funds amounting to Rs. 10.00 lakhs were sanctioned for the construction of Public Rest House at Samana on 30.4.1998. The funds remained unspent till 24.9.2001 in the accounts of executing agency i.e. Thapur Institute of Engineering & Technology Patiala. Thereafter the funds were returned to the implementing agency i.e. Deputy Commissioner Patiala without any interest, after retaining the funds for more than 40 months. As above, this again shows laxity by both the agencies in the proper utilisation of funds. Returned funds were lying in the accounts of the implementing agency even in August, 2002 on the day of survey. These funds should have been sent back to the MP concerned or a fresh recommendation should have been called from the MP by the implementing authority.

iii) CONSTRUCTION OF COMMUNITY CENTRE SAMANA

Funds amounting to Rs. 10.00 lakhs were sanctioned for the construction of Community Centre at Samana on 30.4.98. In this case too the funds remained unspent till 24.9.2001 in the accounts of executing agency i.e. Thapur Institute of Engineering & Technology Patiala. The executive agency returned the sanctioned amount without interest to the implementing agency after retaining for 40 months. Thereafter the funds remained unspent in the accounts of the implementing agency till the survey i.e. August 2002. Funds found unutilised for 51 months from the date of sanction. The reasons put forward to evaluation team for non-utilisation of funds were non-starting of project due to non-availability of site.

iv) CONSTRUCTION OF COMMUNITY HALL IN VILLAGE PADDI JAGIR, BLOCK PHILLAUR

Funds amounting to Rs. 4.84 lakhs were sanctioned to the Gram Panchayat on 25.5.1998 for the construction of community hall in the village. On the day of survey in the

month of July,2002 the evaluation team found that the funds were returned to the implementing agency after retaining 24 months. The reason for non-utilisation of funds was cited non-availability of site for the construction of community hall.

v) NON-COMPLIANCE OF GUIDELINES

Seventeen (17 percent) works were found sanctioned by the implementing agencies in contravention of the guidelines issued under the scheme. The extent of violation was observed on higher side in District Faridkot. In this district 5 (50 percent) out of 10 selected works were sanctioned by ignoring the guidelines. For 2 works viz-i) For purchase of sports Material to Youth Club Pehlowal (Faridkot) ii) Purchase of Sports Material by Gram Panchayat Bander Jatana (Faridkot) funds were provided for the purchase of Sports Material, which is an inventory item prohibited under the scheme. Apart from this no material was available to the evaluation team at both the sites. Funds released to Youth Club, Pehlowal (Faridkot block) were reported used by knowledgeable persons for making arrangements of tournaments held in the village. Funds were also released for the repair and beautification of 2 Dharmshalas in district Faridkot by ignoring the guidelines. For the construction of sports stadium in village Baja Khana (Faridkot) funds were released twice in a financial year.

In district Jalandhar while issuing funds for 2 (20 percent) works for the repair of Harizan Dharmshala guidelines of scheme were not kept in view. This type of violation occurs mainly when MP recommends works not permissible under the guidelines to please the public to attain their political mileage despite the fact that every copy of guidelines issued by Govt. of India is supplied to M.P.s all over the country. The implementing agencies are then convinced /pressurized to release the funds. Such practice need to be checked by educating/advising MPs in this regard and issuing strict instruction to district collector not to accommodate such violation.

VI RECOMMENDATION OF PROJECTS BY MP

MP is required to recommend work/funds for such works where it will lead to their completion and not for partially meeting out of the cost of the project. In this context the evaluation team has observed that in respect of 14(35%) out of 40 selected works, part of project were still found incomplete. In diistrict Faridkot construction work regarding 3 sites viz. Stadium, Dharmshala and Streets and Drainage. In diistrict Jalandhar work regarding 4 Dharmshalas, a Road and Pavements of Streets were found incomplete. Similarly in districts Firozpur and Patiala work regarding Pavement of Streets and Drainage at one site and four sites respectively were found incomplete. Knowledgeable persons convassed at these places revealed that inadequacy of funds sanctioned leads to incompleteness of work and demanded more funds for the completion of remaining infrastructure other wise partially constructed work will be of no use or it will delipidate overtime.

Similarly in case of 4 out of 40 selected works funds were allocated for unidentifiable parts of major projects ignoring the guidelines. Though instructions in this regard are already in vago, but still there is need of their maticulous compliance at the MP as well as Admn.level.

VII SELECTION OF EXECUTING AGENCIES

1. PTA/SCHOOL AUTHORITIES AS EXECUTING AGENCIES

Knowledgeable persons, in respect of 4-5 school sites visited by Evaluation Team showed their entire satisfaction with work executed by PTAs/School authorities. Toilet and drinking water facilities were found lacking in schools. In view of above it requires to be made mandatory that for creating infrastructure in educational institutions, funds should be given to PTA/School Authorities instead of Panchayat or any agency. Suitable provision should be made in State Plan for providing Toilet and Drinking Water facilities in school alongwith creation of other infrastructure.

2. Thapur College of Engineering Technology Patiala was made executing agency in respect of 4 out of 10 selected works, which has failed to execute 3 works and an amount of Rs. 30 lac reverted back to implementing agencies after a long time span. Agencies, which are not directly under Govt. control as well as answerable to district administration needs to be discouraged for the execution works.

VIII. HANDING OVER OF CHEQUES

It has been laid in the guidelines of the scheme that “Cheques” regarding sanctioned works should be given to executing agencies in the presence of respective MP or his representative. However during the course of survey it came to the notice of evaluation team that MP or his Representative insists as well as force the implementing agencies or receiptent DDO of cheque through administrative or potitical pressure to hand over the cheques to them for further distribution. In this way the Cheques issued remain rolling in their hands for months together & sometime these have to revalidated or changed. This not only increases the work load and harassment of implementing agency but also lead to the exploitation of executing agencies and causing delay in the execution of works. Strict instructions in this regard at Govt. of India level needs to be issued advising MPs to avert this practice.

IX. DEDUCTION OF (0.50 PERCENT) CONTINGENCY

A provision of 0.50 % as contingent expenditure out of total allocation of an MP in a year, has been made by Govt. of India for meeting out the contingent requirements of the District Collector/Implementing Agency. However during the discussion of evaluation team with the officers of implementing agencies it came to fore that there is utter confusion over deduction of contingency in respect of funds transferred to other districts. Both the districts consider it their prerogative to deduct the contingency as processing is done at both the places. It leads to double deduction on account of contingency charges. State nodal department is required to clear up this matter/ambiguity at its own or by taking up the matter with Govt.of India.

X. MONITORING

For effective implementation of the scheme, as laid down in the guidelines, the Head of the District was expected to visit and inspect at least 10 percent of these works every year. Likewise senior officers of implementing agencies, officers of districts, sub-division and block level have been entrusted the responsibility of monitoring the implementation of these works through visits to work sites. During the course of survey it was observed that out of 40 selected and 36 completed works, officers of the rank of Deputy Commissioner and Additional Deputy Commissioner had visited 17.5 percent works.

However, it was observed by the survey team that the works were generally visited by the lower level officials of the offices of implementing agencies/executive agencies.

XI. SANCTIONING OF PROPOSALS

As per guidelines all the sanctions for works were required to be accorded within 45 days. But only 57.50 percent of the selected works were found sanctioned within the stipulated period. 10.00 percent proposals were sanctioned within 90 days and the remaining 32.50 percent proposals have taken more than 90 days for sanctioning.

XII. ERECTING OF SIGNBOARDS

Signboard carrying the inscription 'MPLADS WORK' is required to be installed at the work site. But such boards were found only at 5(13.89 percent) of the selected and completed work sites.

XIII. INADEQUATE SANCTION OF FUNDS

During the study it has been observed that 50.40 percent of the sanctioned works were such where an allocation of funds upto Rs. 0.50 lakhs was made. Such a lower level allocation leads to creation of an insignificant or incomplete asset resulting into wastage of public money.

XIV. REGIONAL TILT IN ALLOTMENT OF FUNDS

It has been observed that due to political consideration only a small segment normally one or two MLA constituency of the MPs constituency get the funds frequently whereas other area remains devoid of funds. It results into lopsided development of the constituency leading towards regional imbalances.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

The following suggestions are made for bringing out improvement in the working of MPLADS.

1. ROUTING OF MPLADS FUNDS THROUGH ECONOMIC & STATISTICAL ORGANISATION/DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING, PUNJAB

The Economic & Statistical Organisation, Department of Planning in the state has been assigned the responsibilities of the nodal agency but without assigning any financial powers as well as physical control on it. The funds under the scheme are supplied directly to the Deputy Commissioners and are expended by them on the recommendations of MPs. As such nodal department has no control on it. Keeping in view the role assigned it is suggested:

- i) that the funds at least of the Rajya Sabha MP's who are representing the state should be routed through the Economic & Statistical Organisation, Department of Planning so as to ensure proper execution of works.
- ii) that a provision of 0.1 percent of the funds allocated to the state should be made for nodal department to meet out contingent requirement.
- iii) that separate independent cell consisting of suitable number of Grade A or B Officer, accountant alongwith supporting staff be created in state nodal agency as well as district level for proper functioning of the scheme.

2. UNIFORM PATTERN OF ROUTING FUNDS AT DISTRICT LEVEL

At present at district level the implementation of the scheme is being carried out through the various offices such as office of Deputy Economic & Statistical Adviser, Secretary Zila Parishad, Additional Deputy Commissioners (Development) causing thereby dicotomy in its implementation. Moreover, the scheme is implemented through a general type of staff of these agencies without assessing the feasibility and desirability of the work recommended by the MP. At one hand the scheme is implemented by the Additional Deputy Commissioner (Development) and on the other hand by office of Deputy Economic & Statistical Adviser. To understand the feasibility and desirability of all type of projects alongwith assessing the felt needs of the people a uniform pattern of implementation is the pre-requisite. So to adopt a uniform pattern for effective implementation of the scheme it is suggested:

- i) That Deputy Commissioners of the State should be asked to get this scheme implemented through the office of Deputy Economic & Statistical Adviser.
- ii) That the office of District Implementing agency should be equipped with appropriate additional staff i.e. Accounts Officer and Data Entry Operator specially for the MPLAD work in each district.

3. CONDITIONAL ALLOTMENT OF FUNDS

To avoid the creation of incomplete assets.

- i) The rough cost estimates of the work be got prepared by the implementing Agency before sanctioning the work and release of funds. No fund should be released without obtaining rough cost estimates. In case of non-compliance of these guidelines district level nodal offices as well as implementing agency should be made responsible for it.
- ii) On the basis of the rough cost estimates the implementing agency should get an assurance from executing agencies particularly Gram Panchayats and Municipal Committees for the contribution of additional amount from their own source before release of the amount in case the projects require larger investment or should ask the MP concerned to contribute additional amount envisaged in the amended guidelines.
- iii) The implementing agency should ensure that funds sanctioned under the scheme are released only after getting a certificate from the executing agency that work on the project would be started soon and completed within the stipulated period. The amount received under the scheme will not remain idle.

4. COMPETENT EXECUTING AGENCY

While selecting the executing agencies, it should be ensured that:

- i) Selected agencies should be accountable to the audit so as to avoid the risk of misappropriation of funds.
- ii) Such agencies should also be competent enough to handle the project at their own.
- iii) Only that agency should be handed over the project, which is expert in the concerned field.

5. SELECTION OF SITE PRIOR TO EXECUTION

To do away with the problem of non-utilisation of funds due to non-availability of land etc. for the execution of the work implementing agency should obtain an undertaking alongwith rough cost estimates from the technical authority as well as executing agency ensuring availability of land before sanctioning the work and funds.

6. ROLE OF THE GRAM PANCHAYATS/MUNICIPAL COMMITTEES

The Members of Parliament Local Area Development Scheme is the people's desire and aspiration scheme. In a democratic country the views of the people on the development issues related to rural/urban areas are of vital importance. It is therefore, suggested that:

- i) To ensure the involvement of people in the process of execution of the scheme as far as possible works under the scheme should be entrusted to Gram Panchayats/Local Bodies for execution.

- ii) To ascertain as to whether the work has been completed as per satisfaction of the Gram Panchayat/ Municipal Committee executing agencies should be directed to get a certificate in this regard from them and submit it to the implementing agency along with the utilisation certificate.

7. REGULAR MEETING OF MPs AND DCs

State nodal department should ensure holding up of atleast 2 meetings of Deputy Commissioners and Members of Parliament in a year to assess the progress under this scheme making them aware of the latest amendments in guidelines of the scheme and for interaction regarding improvement in the implementation of the scheme.

8. MONITORING OF WORKS

Strict instructions should be issued by Govt. of India/State Nodal department to district level nodal officers for adhering to physical monitoring schedule as envisaged in the guidelines of the scheme and for meticulous compliance of instructions regarding erection of sign boards, involvement of MP's in the inaugural functions of the works.

9. PROJECT RECOMMENDATION AND DISTRIBUTION OF CHEQUES

State Nodal Department/G.O.I. should issue guidelines advising MP's

- i) to avert recommending funds for petty works such as for Street/Drains,
- ii) Special repair of SC/NSC Dharmshalas just to please the masses for achieving their political ends. Instead they should recommend major projects such as bridges, causeways, choe embankments, water supply schemes etc. having significant bearing on the economy by way of development, providing facility and generating employment.
- iii) to recommend funds for complete or identifiable part of the project or which may lead to completion of the project.
- iv) to avoid recommending works covered regularly under state plan scheme unless it is bare necessity.
- v) to recommend only such works which are covered under the guidelines of the scheme to comply with GOI's instructions regarding handing over the cheques to executing agency in their presence instead getting it directly from implementing agency and keep it rolling for a long in their hands.

10. BALANCED ALLOCATION OF FUNDS

For the equitable distribution of funds, leading to balanced development of all the constituents of MP's constituency, MP's be advised to allocate at least 75% of the funds allocated in a year amongst all the development blocks of their constituency on the basis of their population. Similar is also required to be evolved /imposed in case of Rajya Sabha MP's.

11. CONSTITUTION OF DISTRICT LEVEL COMMITTEE

A separate District Level Committee consisting of MLA's and district level officers may be constituted for suggesting proposals of development works to the MP concerned.

12. CONTINGENCY DISTRIBUTION

State nodal department should take up the matter with GOI regarding sharing of contingency amongs funds sharing districts & issue suitable instructions in this context.

CHAPTER-I

INTRODUCTION AND PLAN OF INQUIRY

CHAPTER-I

INTRODUCTION AND PLAN OF INQUIRY

Members of Parliament Local Area Development Scheme (MPLADS) has been introduced w.e.f. 23rd December 1993. Under the MPLAD Scheme each Member of Parliament has a choice to suggest developmental works based on locally felt needs to the Head of the District. In the initial years, each MP could suggest work to the tune of Rs. one crore per year to be taken up in his/her constituency. Realising the usefulness of the scheme, the allocation per MP per year stand increased to Rs. 2 crores from the financial year 1998-99 as per the announcement of the Prime Minister on 23rd December, 1998. Elected members of Rajya Sabha representing the whole of the State as they do, may select works for implementation in one or more district(s) as they may choose. Nominated members of the Lok Sabha and Rajya Sabha may also select works for implementation in one or more district(s) but within one state of their choice.

1.2 Under the scheme each Member of Parliament will give a list of developmental works to the concerned Deputy Commissioner of the district who will get these schemes implemented by following the established procedures laid down by the state Government in accordance with the guidelines issued for implementation of this scheme. In regard to works in urban areas their implementation can be done through Commissioner's/Chief Executive Officers of Corporations, Municipalities. Implementing agencies can be either Government or Panchayati Raj Institutions or any other reputed non-governmental organisation, which may be considered by the District Head as capable of implementing the works satisfactorily. The Head of the District shall identify the agency through which a particular work recommended by the Member of Parliament should be executed.

1.3 The works under the scheme shall be developmental in nature based on locally felt needs. The emphasis is on creation of durable assets. Funds provided under the scheme should not be used for incurring revenue expenditure. The funds can also be used for purposes such as provision of service support facilities. However, they will not include any recurring expenditure like on staff to maintain such facilities.

1.4 Funds provided under the scheme can be used for partly meeting the cost of a larger work like for example for partly meeting the cost of a micro hydel work only in case it would result in completion of the works. Execution of work depending on the nature of work may span into more than one year. In such circumstances, funds under the scheme could be made available to the executing agency either in the advance or over more than one year, phasing of execution of work being clearly kept in view. The site selected for executing of the work by the MP shall not be changed except with the concurrence of the MP himself.

1.5 Land selected for execution of works should not necessarily be government land. It can be land surrendered by Municipal/Panchayat bodies, private trusts, individuals etc. The only care that needs to be taken is that the institution or the person surrendering the land has the title over it to so surrender.

1.6 Payment of advances of any type to the contractors/suppliers under any work falling within this scheme is prohibited.

1.7 The Heads of districts should ensure that provision for maintenance and up keeps of the works to be taken up under this scheme is forth coming from the concerned local body or the relevant agency, that is government-aided institution, registered society etc.

1.8 In the Punjab State under the Members of Parliament Local Area Development Scheme (MPLADS) upto the year 2000-2001 the entitlement of funds for the Lok Sabha MP s is Rs. 13065.00 lakhs and for Rajya Sabha MPs is to the tune of Rs. 4650.00 lakhs. The amount released against this by the Govt. of India (GOI) is Rs. 9765.00 lakhs and Rs. 3550.00 lakhs respectively. In this way during the same period the entitlement for both Lok Sabha and Rajya Sabha MPs is Rs. 17715.00 lakhs and the amount released by the Govt. of India is Rs. 13315.00 lakhs (As in Annexure-I). The amount of Rs. 4400.00 lakhs were not released due to non-sanctioning of works both for the Lok Sabha MPs and for Rajya Sabha MPs.

Pursuant to the decision taken in the meeting of Members of Local Area Development Scheme held on 9.10.2001 under the Chairmanship of Chief Secretary to Govt. Punjab an evaluation study of the MPLAD scheme has been conducted to identify the drawbacks, deficiency and bottlenecks and to suggest remedial measures to overcome them in districts of Ferozepur, Faridkot, Jalandhar and Patiala. The evaluation study of the scheme was conducted by the Evaluation Wing of the Economic & Statistical Organisation, Punjab with the following objectives in view.

1.9 OBJECTIVES

- a. To study the administrative set up and method of implementation of MPLAD Scheme;
- b. To find the snags in the identification of projects/scheme;
- c. To identify the drawbacks, in the implementation of project/scheme;
- d. To suggest remedial measures for the improvement in identification and implementation of the projects/schemes.

1.10 REFERENCE PERIOD

The secondary information regarding various aspects viz. financial and physical aspects of the scheme were collected for three years i.e. 1998-99 to 2000-2001 while primary data in respect of selected works especially physical aspects of the assets created under the scheme related to year 2002 the date of survey. The works selected for the study related to the year 1998-99.

1.11 SCOPE AND COVERAGE

The study was conducted in the four districts viz. Firozpur, Faridkot, Jalandhar and Patiala . The scope of the study was restricted to the works executed within the boundaries of the selected districts during the year 1998-99. The following was the coverage under the study:

- i) Firozpur: - List of works recommended by the MPs of Lok Sabha and Rajya Sabha in district Firozpur was obtained from Additional Deputy Commissioner (Development) the implementing agency of the scheme in the district and 10 works were selected at random from different categories of works.
- ii) Faridkot: - List of works recommended by the MPs of Lok Sabha and Rajya Sabha in district Faridkot was obtained from Secretary, Zila Parishad the implementing agency of the scheme in the district through Additional Deputy Commissioner (Development), Faridkot and 10 works were selected on random basis from different categories of works.
- iii) Jalandhar:- List of works recommended by the MPs of Lok Sabha and Rajya Sabha in district Jalandhar was obtained from the implementing agency i.e. Deputy Economic & Statistical Adviser through Additional Deputy Commissioner (Development) Jalandhar and 10 works were selected on random basis from different categories of works.
- iv) Patiala:- List of works recommended by the MPs of Lok Sabha and Rajya Sabha in district Patiala was obtained from the implementing agency i.e. Deputy Economic & Statistical Adviser through Additional Deputy Commissioner (Development) Patiala and 10 works were selected on random basis from different categories of works.
- v) Two beneficiaries/knowledgeable persons for each of the selected works were covered. Thus in all 80 beneficiaries/knowledgeable persons were covered under this study.

1.12 SAMPLING DESIGN

a) SELECTION OF DISTRICTS

Four districts viz. Firozpur, Faridkot, Jalandhar and Patiala, all the four divisional headquarters were selected for purpose of this study on the recommendation of the Technical Sub Committee.

b) SELECTION OF WORKS

For the selection of works, all the works recommended by the MPs of Lok Sabha and Rajya Sabha in the selected districts were classified into the following four strata depending upon the amount sanctioned for works.

- a. Upto Rs. 50,000.
- b. From Rs. 50 thousand to Rs. 2.50 lakhs.
- c. From Rs. 2.50 lakhs to Rs. 5.00 lakhs.
- d. More than Rs. 5.00 lakhs.

From the districtwise classified list of works by applying random number total 40 works were selected. Keeping in view the overall coverage of the scheme at least one work from each of above category was selected ensuring 10 works in each selected district. In this manner from district Firozpur 2 works from Ist category, two works from 2nd category, three works

from 3rd category and three works from 4th category were selected. In district Faridkot six works from 1st category, four works from 2nd category, no works from 3rd category and 4th category were selected. In Jalandhar district the selection pertained to four works from 1st category, two works from 2nd category, two works from the 3rd category and two works were from 4th category and in district Patiala two works from 1st category, three works from 2nd category, two works from 3rd category and three works from 4th category. In this way from all the four categories (1-4) a total number of 14, 11, 7 and 8 works were selected for the study purpose.

c) SELECTION OF EXECUTIVE AGENCIES & BENEFICIARIES

Detailed information regarding selected works was collected from the agencies which had been responsible for the execution of these works. Sites of the selected works were visited and opinion of the beneficiaries, Village Sarpanch/knowledgeable persons was sought regarding the quality and utility of assets created in the village. As such, two persons were contacted for each selected work. Besides opinion of Deputy Commissioner of selected districts, the views of the head of the office of the executing agencies, implementing the selected works were collected to know the bottlenecks/difficulties faced by them and their valuable suggestions for smooth functioning of the scheme.

1.13 INSTRUMENTS OF INVESTIGATION

The following five schedules were prepared and canvassed.

- Schedule I: Project Schedule
- Schedule II: Opinion Schedule of the D.C.
- Schedule III: Executive Agency Schedule;
- Schedule IV: Beneficiary Schedule (Sarpanch/Knowledgeable person)
- Schedule V: MP's Opinion Schedule.

1.14 PLAN OF REPORT

The report consists of three chapters. At the start of the report summary of findings and recommendations have been given. Chapter I is introductory. Chapter II presents the Organisational and Administrative set up. Chapter III deals with the progress and utility of the scheme.

CHAPTER-II

ORGANISATIONAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE SET-UP

ORGANISATIONAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE SET UP

Members of Parliament Local Area Development Scheme was launched by Government of India w.e.f. 23rd of December, 1993. Sanction of the President of India for release of funds for the year 1993-94 amounting to Rs. 37.75 crores at the rate of Rs. 5 lakh per M.P. was conveyed to states on 22.2.94. The amount was credited to the Secretary Rural Development Department of the respective State. The State Government was directed to immediately release the amount received under the scheme to the respective District Collectors to accommodate the choice of MPs in accordance with the guidelines of the scheme. The Department of Programme Implementation, Government of India has been assigned the responsibilities of Nodal agency at the centre and Department of Planning, Punjab has been made responsible as nodal department for the implementation of the scheme at the State level. The Heads of the respective districts have been made responsible for the coordination and supervision of works under this scheme at the district level.

Detailed guidelines on the scheme, concept, implementation and monitoring of MPLADS were issued subsequently in 1994. Pursuant to these guidelines, the Department of Statistics and Programme Implementation, Ministry of Planning and Programme Impementation has been issuing circulars, from time to time, on matters relating to operational details. After detailed discussions with the several Members of Parliament, based on their field experience and taking into account the various view points and suggestions, the revised guidelines were issued by the Department in February,1997. Thereafter amendments to some of the provisions of these guidelines have also been issued from time to time. These guidelines are issued after incorporating, such amendments and in supersession of the earlier ones. Broad guidelines issued by the Department of Programme Implementation for the implementation of the scheme are as under.

2.2 In identifying and selecting works and giving administrative sanction for the same, the Head of the district should invariably get the concurrence of the Members of Parliament. Normally the advice of the MP should prevail unless it be for technical reason such as land selected for work not being suitable for execution etc. Where the Head of the district considers that a work suggested by an MP cannot be executed, he should send a comprehensive report with reasons to the MP under intimation to the Department of the State Government dealing with the subject and to the Department of Statistics and Programme Impementation, Ministry of Planning and Programme Implementation-Government of India.

- ii) All sanctions for works should be accorded with in 45 days from the date of receipts of proposal from the concerned M.P.
- iii) All the decision making powers regarding the grant of technical and administrative sanctions required for the implementation /executing of works are vested in the hands of district technical and administrative functionaries.
- iv) In case, a constituency falls in more than one district, Head of the district who receives the money shall make the required funds available to other concerned district(s) in keeping with MPs choice so that the Head(s) of such other district (s) could implement the work suggested by the MP in his/her district(s).

- v) Since the works under the scheme would be implemented by different state Government agencies/departments, the heads of the respective districts would be responsible for the co-ordination and overall supervision of the works under this scheme at the district level. The implementing agencies may not collect any administrative charges, centage etc. for their services of preparatory work, implementation, supervision etc.
- vi) The Department of Statistics and Programme Implementation, Ministry of Planning and Programme implementation, Government of India, would have the nodal responsibilities for this scheme at the centre. The Department concerned of the State Government will issue general instructions to all the Planning and implementing agencies at the district level to co-operate, assist and implement the works referred to them under this scheme by the Heads of the districts. Copies of such instructions shall also be sent to the MPs at their constituencies and at their Delhi addresses.
- vii) Allocation of Rs. 2 crore per year under the scheme is for the constituency. Though there may be change in the MP representing a constituency, whatever may be the reason for such change, the allocation being for the constituency, continuity of action in implementing works under the scheme should be maintained. The Head of the district should play a co-ordinating role in this regard between the past and the present MP and the implementing agencies concerned.
- viii) When there is a change in the MP, for whatever reasons it may, the following principles should be followed, as far as possible in executing works:
- a) If the work indentified by the predecessor MP is under execution, it should be completed.
 - b) If the work identified by the predecessor MP is pending and sanction due to administrative reasons beyond a period of 45 days from the date of which advice was received for taking up the work, it should also be executed provided the work is otherwise as per norms.
 - c) If the predecessor MP had identified the work, but it was not taken up for execution because of reasons other than those mentioned in the preceding sub-para, it can be executed subject to the confirmation of the successor M.P.
- ix) In respect of Members of Rajya Sabha, the unspent balance left by the predecessor Members of Parliament in a particular State will be equally distributed amongst the successor Rajya Sabha Members in that particular State.
- x) Ideally, it would be desirable that the MPs suggest individual works costing not more than Rs. 10 lakhs per work. However, the limit of Rs.10 lakhs per work should not be rigidly constructed. Amounts higher than Rs.10 lakhs per work can be spent depending upon the nature of the work. Under the amendment of the guidelines, the scheme envisages that it would be ideally desirable to the MPs to suggest individual works costing not more than Rs.25

lakhs per work. However the limit of Rs.25 lakhs per work should not be too rigidly construed. Amounts higher than Rs.25 lakhs per work can be spent depending upon the nature of the work. Besides MPs can also recommend works outside their constituencies/State for an amount not exceeding Rs.10 lakhs per annum for construction of assets that are permissible in the guidelines, for rehabilitation measures in the event of a natural calamity of rare severity in any part of the country.

- xi) Funds received under MPLADS are to be operated without involving the State budget. For this purpose district Collector is required to open a Personal Ledger Account (PLA) or open PLA in DRDA separately for each member of Parliament for depositing the funds. Money cannot be withdrawn or transferred from the bank for any other purpose. DPI, if desired, will have an access to verify the account for individual MP at any time. As the funds released will be handled by the executing agencies through their local bank account it is necessary to establish proper linkages with their accounts to enable the collector to have a comprehensive picture of the utilisation of funds. The collector should therefore, keep a close watch over the utilisation of the funds released and should ensure monthly receipt of accounts from the executing agencies.
- xii) Funds shall be released to the Districts each year immediately after the vote on Account/Budget is passed. The funds released by the Govt. of India under the scheme would be non-lapsable. Funds released in a particular year, if they remain un-utilised can be carry forward to the subsequent year without detracting from the allocation of rupees two crores per year per constituency. However, release of funds will be made with reference to the actual progress achieved in expenditure and execution of works. In other words, funds would be available in the budget to the extent of rupees two crores per year per MP and works will not suffer for want of provisions. At the same time releases will be regulated according to progress. The idea is that any given time no excessive money should remain outside the government treasury that is reasonably expected to be spent within a year. For example, if out of Rs. 2 crore allotted for a constituency in a year, Rs. 150 lakhs are spent, the balance of Rs. 50 lakhs can be carried over for the year when this amount together with fresh allocation of Rs. 2 crore (total of Rs. 2.5 crore) would be the entitlement of the year and could be spent. But actual physical release of funds will be with reference to the amount expected to be spent. It should be seen, however, that unspent amounts do not excessively snow ball into huge entitlements.
- xiii) The release of funds by the Department of Statistical and Programme Implementation, Ministry of Planning and Programme Implementation will be done four times a year on the basis of the physical and financial progress of the works under implementation and further requirement of funds for works.
- xiv) Funds for individual works should be promptly released. 75 percent of the cost of the works can be released in the first instalment itself, the balance of 25 percent being released watching

progress. To the maximum extent possible, release of funds should be arranged through the administrative authority available nearest to the work spot. The objective should be that release of funds also is made through decentralised administrative mechanism already available on the ground and that implementing agencies have the quickest feasible access to such decentralised authorities.

- xv) In case the concerned MP is not interested in utilising the funds, he may write to the Department of Statistics and Programme Impementation so that the release of funds is withdrawn.
- xvi) Funds under the scheme shall be deposited in nationalised banks. Interest accrued on the funds deposited in nationalised banks may be used for works approved under these guidelines.
- xvii) Each State Government/U.T. Administration shall designate one nodal Department for physical monitoring through field inspection and for co-ordination with the Department of Statistics and Programme Implementation Ministry of Planning & Programme Implementation, Government of India. The Heads of Districts shall visit and inspect at least 10 percent of these works every year. Similarly, it should be the responsibilities of the senior officers of implementing agencies of these works to regularly visit the work spots and ensure that the works are progressing satisfactorily as per the prescribed procedure and specifications. Likewise, officers of district at the sub-divisional and block level shall also closely monitor implementation of these works through visits to work sites. The Head of the District should also involve the MPs in such inspections and monitoring to the maximum extent possible. They should also furnish monitoring reports once in two months to the MPs and the Department of Statistics and Programme Implementation . A schedule of inspections which prescribed the minimum number of field visits for each supervisory level functioning of the implementing agencies may be drawn up by the Department of Statistics and Programme Implementation.
- xviii) The District Heads should also communicate information on the progress of works under the scheme on the internet to the Department of Statistics and Programme Implementation, Ministry of Planning & Programme Implementation. Copies of such reports shall also be forwarded to the MPs. Software required for reporting on the internet will be furnished by the Department of Statistics and Programme Implementation. This will also facilitate instantaneous monitoring of the progress of the scheme constituency-wise.
- xix) The Chief Secretary or in his absence a senior Principal Secretary/Additional Chief Secretary should conduct a meeting involving the Heads of Districts and MPs to assess progress of works under the scheme at least once in a year.
- xx) Periodic tele conference may also be organised, availing of the infrastructure and expertise available with the Indira Gandhi National Open University (I.G.N.O.U.) and the Indian Space

Research Organisation (I.S.R.O.). In these conferences to be organised by the Department of Statistics and Programme Implementation, Ministry of Planning & Programme Implementation, instantaneous contact could be established with the Head of districts and other local functionaries to clarify doubts and remove bottlenecks. MPs also should be associated with such conferences.

- xxi) In order to bring about continuous improvements in the implementation of the scheme, the Bureau for Parliamentary Studies and Training (B.P.S.T.) may arrange training of MPs and district officials in batches, involving and bringing about interaction with MPs

GENERAL

- xxii) In order that local people become aware that particular works have been executed with MPLADS funds, signboards carrying the inscription 'MPLADS WORK' with the name of MP may be prominently erected at the sites.

- xxiii) In execution of works, MPs may face special problems/situations not envisaged and covered under these guidelines. Such cases may be taken up with the Department of Statistics and Programme Implementation, Ministry of Planning & Programme Implementation for suitable clarification.

2.3 IMPLEMENTATION OF THE SCHEME IN THE STATE

In Punjab this scheme is being implemented by the Economic & Statistical Organisation, Punjab i.e. Department of Planning through the Deputy Commissioners of respective districts in the State. The Economic & Statistical Organisation Punjab i.e. the Department of Planning bearing responsibility of the nodal department at the state level on the behest of the Department of Statistics & Programme Implementation, Ministry of Planning & Programme Implementation Govt. of India is issuing general instructions to all the Planning and Implementing agencies at the district level to cooperate, assist and implement the work referred to them under this scheme by the Heads of the districts.

No doubt the Economic & Statistical Organisation, Punjab, Department of Planning is the nodal agency at the State level but the funds for the implementation of the scheme are being sent directly by Government of India, Ministry of Planning & Programme Implementation to the respective Deputy Commissioners in the State. Deputy Commissioners in their turn have authorised some senior level officer of the district normally Additional Deputy Commissioner (Development) to run the scheme.

Punjab state having 13 MPs of Lok Sabha and 8 MPs of Rajya Sabha (one nominated) is receiving Rs.42 crores annually under the scheme. This amount is credited to the Personal Ledger Account (PLA) of respective MPs separately. These accounts are being maintained by the Deputy Commissioners of the districts concerned in respect of the MPs who have chosen that district under this scheme. The Head of the district or any senior officer, authorised by him utilises these funds on his behalf for the execution of works (as per guidelines of the scheme) recommended by the MPs. The works under this scheme are implemented by different State Govt. Agencies such as PWD, Rural Development, Irrigation, Agriculture, Health, Education, Area Development Authorities, Water supply and Sewerage Boards, Housing Corporation etc. The Heads of the respective districts have been made responsible for the co-ordination and overall supervision of the works under this scheme at district level.

The implementing agencies are not authorised to collect any administrative charges, centage etc. for their services of preparatory works, implementation supervision etc. Physical monitoring of the assets created under this scheme is being done through field inspection by the Heads of districts and senior level officers of implementing agencies of these works.

The Nodal Department at the State level is required to convene annually a meeting of district Heads and MPs to review progress under the scheme.

The Deputy Commissioners are furnishing release wise utilisation certificate to the Department of Programme Implementation on its utilisation.

2.4 IMPLEMENTATION OF THE SCHEME IN THE SELECTED DISTRICT

Four districts viz. Firozpur, Faridkot, Jalandhar and Patiala were selected for detailed study of the scheme. In district i.e. Faridkot Secretary, Zila Parishad in Jalandhar and Patiala office of Deputy Economic & Statistical Adviser and in district Firozpur Additional Deputy Commissioner (Development) in charge of the District Rural Development agency had been entrusted the responsibilities of implementing agency of the MPLADS. These implementing agencies were normally receiving the proposals from the respective MPs direct or through the Deputy Commissioner of the district, examining the proposals according to the guidelines of the scheme and getting the works executed through various government agencies. Panchayati Raj Institutions or other reputed non-government organisations in the district.

2.4.1 Executing Agency for a particular work was decided by the Deputy Commissioner of the district. In case any project was identified by the Deputy Commissioner himself, concurrence of the MP was invariably obtained before sanctioning the project.

2.4.2 The executing agencies were not authorised to charge any administrative charges, centage etc. for their services of preparatory work, implementation, supervision etc.

2.4.3 All the decision-making powers regarding the grant of technical and administrative sanctions required for the implementation/execution of works were vested in the hands of district, technical and administrative functionaries.

2.4.4 To keep a close watch over the utilisation of the funds released under the scheme, Deputy Commissioner(s) of these district (s) were ensuring monthly receipt of accounts from the various executing agencies. Districtwise details regarding the implementation of the scheme are as follows:

2.5 DISTRICT FIROZEPUR

2.5.1 In this district the scheme was launched during the year 1993-94. But since funds under the scheme for the year 1993-94 were received by the end of the year, the scheme actually came into operation during the year 1994-95. Since the initiation of the scheme, funds in respect of Ex-MPs of Lok Sabha and Rajya Sabha had been received in the district. Under this scheme upto 31st March, 2003 funds to the tune of Rs. 1865.00 lakhs were received out of which Rs. 1201.00 lakhs had been spent on the developmental works recommended by the MPs.

2.5.2 Works recommended by the MPs, after proper scrutiny and sanction from the competent authority were entrusted for execution to various agencies. Executing agency for a particular work was decided by the Deputy Commissioner of the district. Following executing agencies in the district were engaged in the construction/repair of works under the MPLADS.

- a. Gram Panchayat through Block Development and Panchayat Officers of Block.
- b. Executive Officers of Municipal Committees.
- c. Principal of the School/Parents Teachers Association.
- d. Executive Engineer, Punjab Water Supply and Sewerage Board.
- e. Executive Engineer, Central Works Division PWD, B&R, Abohar.
- f. Principal/Management of the aided colleges.
- g. Punjab Lok Kala Academy.
- h. XEN Prov. Div. PWD.
- i. District Zila BAR Association.
- j. District Olympic Association.

Sanctions for the execution of works to various executive agencies were issued by the Deputy Commissioner with a copy of the concerned MP and account section DRDA, Firozpur (for record) subject to the following terms and conditions:

- i) The amount released should normally be spent during the financial year itself.
- ii) The department/executing agency will furnish the utilisation certificates for the amount spent during the financial year.
- iii) The amount shall be utilised exclusively for the purpose for which it has been sanctioned.
- iv) It shall be the responsibility of the executing agency to obtain the technical sanction from the competent authority.
- v) It shall be the responsibility of the department to maintain accounts for the requirement of A.G. Punjab for Audit purposes.
- vi) It shall be the responsibility of the department to utilise the sanctioned amount in accordance with the Govt. instructions issued from time to time and norms of expenditure approved by the Govt. must be followed.
- vii) The un-spent amount if any must be surrendered immediately.
- viii) Escalation of cost will not be allowed.

2.5.3 Funds received under the scheme were being operated without involving the State budget. Separate savings accounts of the MPs had been opened in the office of District Rural Development Agency, Ferozepur and the funds received in respect of each MP were being deposited in these accounts. These accounts were being operated by the Deputy Commissioner of the district for the execution of the “Works“ suggested by the concerned MP. The funds for the “Works” to be executed were being released in instalment. Workwise utilisation of the funds released was being ensured from the executing agencies through meetings and periodical reports and a copy of the release-wise “Utilisation Certificate” was being sent to Department of Programme Implementation Govt. of India.

2.5.4 No monthly progress report was sent to the Department of Programme Implementation, Govt. of India upto 1995-96. However, since then the office was sending monthly progress report to DPI regularly.

2.5.5 Audited Statement of Accounts (Audited by Chartered Accountants) of MPLADS Scheme was done from time to time and was sent to the Accountant General(Audit) Punjab Chandigarh by the Deputy Commissioner Ferozpur for getting the audit/review audit of the scheme done by A.G.(Audit) Punjab, Chandigarh. Thus audit/review audit of the scheme had been got done through the copy of the same has not been supplied.

2.5.6 As per guidelines of the MPLADS, the Head of the District shall visit and inspect atleast 10 percent of these works every year. However, during the survey it was observed that the Deputy Commissioner entrusted the work of implementation of MPLADS of the district rarely visited any work site. The only system of monitoring prevailing in the district was the progress report of work sent by the various executing agencies implementing the scheme.

2.5.7 Progress of the scheme as per the specified formats was being fed to NICNET. However, the facility of internet was not made available to this district.

2.6 DISTRICT FARIDKOT

2.6.1 In this district also the scheme was launched during the year 1993-94. But since funds under the scheme were received by the end of the year, the scheme came into operation during the year 1994-95. Since the initiation of the scheme funds in respect of Ex-MPs of Lok Sabha and Rajya Sabha had been received in the district. Under this scheme upto 31st March, 2003 funds to the tune of Rs. 1405,00 lakhs were received out of which Rs. 810.19 lakhs had been spent on the developmental works recommended by the MPs.

2.6.2 Works recommended by the MPs after proper scrutiny and sanction from the competent authority were entrusted for execution to various agencies. Executing agency for a particular work was decided by the Deputy Commissioner of the district. Following executing agencies in the district were engaged in the construction/repair of works under the MPLADS.

- a. Gram Panchayat through Block Development and Panchayat Officers of Block.
- b. Executive Officers of the Municipal Committees.
- c. Principal of the School/Parents Teachers Association.
- d. Elders Service Society.
- e. XEN, Panchayati Raj.
- f. Youth Sports Club/District Sports Officer.

Sanctions for the execution of works to various executive agencies were issued by the Deputy Commissioners with a copy to the concerned MP through the Secretary Zila Parishad Faridkot subject to the following terms and conditions.

- i) The amount released should normally be spent during the financial year itself.
- ii) The department/executive agency will furnish the utilisation certificates for the amount spent during the financial year.
- iii) The amount shall be utilised exclusively for the purpose for which it has been sanctioned.
- iv) It shall be the responsibility of the executive agency to obtain the technical sanction from the competent authority.
- v) It shall be the responsibility of the department to maintain accounts for requirement of A.G.Punjab for Audit purposes.
- vi) It shall be responsibility of the department to utilise the sanctioned amount in accordance with the Govt. instructions issued from time to time and norms of expenditure approved by the government must be followed.
- vii) The un-spent amount if any must be surrendered immediately.
- viii) Escalation of cost will not be allowed.

2.6.3 Funds received under the scheme were being operated without involving the State budget. Separate savings accounts of the MPs had been opened in the office of Zila Parishad Faridkot and the funds received in respect of each MP were being deposited in these accounts. These accounts were being

operated by the Deputy Commissioner of the district for the execution of the works suggested by the concerned MP. The funds for the works to be executed were being released in one instalment. Workwise utilisation of the funds released were being ensured from the executing agencies through meetings and periodical reports and a copy of the releasewise “utilisation certificate “ was being sent to the Department of Programme Implementation Govt. of India.

2.6.4 No monthly progress report was sent to the Department of Programme Implementation Govt. of India upto 1995-96. However, since then the office was sending monthly progress report to Department of Programme Impementation regularly.

2.6.5 Audited Statement of Accounts (Audited by Chartered Accountants of MPLADS Scheme) was done from time to time and was sent to the Accountant General (Audit) Punjab Chandigarh accordingly by the Deputy Commissioner Faridkot for getting the audit/review audit of the scheme done by A.G. (Audit) Punjab Chandigarh. The copy of the audit/review audit was not supplied.

2.6.6 As per guidelines of the MPLADS the Head of the District shall visit and inspect atleast 10 percent of these works every year. However during the survey it was observed that the Deputy Commissioner entrusted the work of implementation of the MPLADS of the district rarely visited any work site. The only system of monitoring prevailing in the district was the progress report of work sent by the various excuing agencies implementing the scheme.

2.6.7 Progress of the scheme as per the specified formate was being fed to NICNET However, the facility of internet was not made available to this district.

2.7 DISTRICT JALANDHAR

2.7.1 In this district the scheme was launched during the year 1993-94. But the funds under the scheme received by the end of the year and the scheme came into operation during the year 1994-95. Since the initiation of the scheme funds in respect of Ex-MPs of Lok Sabha and Rajya Sabha and sitting MPs of Lok Sabha and Rajya Sabha had been received in the district. Under this scheme upto 31st March, 2003 funds to the tune of Rs. 3350.00 Lakhs were received out of which Rs. 3172.20 lakhs had been spent on the developmental works by the MPs.

2.7.2 Works recommended by the MPs, after proper scrutiny and sanction from the competent authority were entrusted for execution to various agencies. Executing agency for a particular work was decided by the Deputy Commissioner of the district. Following executing agencies in the district were engaged in the construction/repair of works under the MPLADS.

- a. Gram Panchayat through Block Development and Panchayat Officers of Block.
- b. Executive Officers of Municipal Committees.
- c. Principal of the School/Parents Teachers Association..
- d. Executive Engineer, Punjab Water Supply and Sewerage Board.
- e. Chairman Area Welfare Committees.
- f. XEN, Provisional Division.
- g. Sub Divisional Magistrate.
- h. ADGP,PAP.
- i. District Red Cross Society.

Sanctions for the executive of works to various executive agencies were issued by the Deputy Commissioner with a copy to the concerned MP and office of Deputy Economic and Statistical Adviser subject to the following terms and conditions.

- i) The amount released should normally be spent during the financial year itself.
- ii) The departments /executing agency will furnish the utilisation certificates for the amount spent during the financial year.
- iii) The amount shall be utilised exclusively for the purpose for which it has been sanctioned.
- iv) It shall be the responsibility of the executing agency to obtain the technical sanction from the competent authority.
- v) It shall be the responsibility of the department to maintain accounts for the requirement of A.G.Punjab for audit purposes.
- vi) It shall be the responsibility of the department to utilise the sanctioned amount in accordance with the Govt. instructions issued from time to time and norms of expenditure approved by the Govt. must be followed.
- vii) The un-spent amount if any must be surrendered immediately.
- viii) Esclimation of cost will not be allowed.

2.7.3 Funds received under the scheme were being operated without involving the state Budget. Separate saving accounts of the MPs had been opened in the office of Deputy Economic and Statistical Adviser, Jalandhar and the funds received in respect of each MP were being deposited in these accounts. These accounts were being operated by the Deputy Commissioner of the district for the execution of the works suggested by the concerned MP. The funds for the works to be executed were being released in instalments. Workwise utilisation of the funds released was being ensured from the executing agencies through meetings and periodical reports and a copy of the release wise 'Utilisation Certificate' was being sent to Department of Programme Implementation Govt. of India.

2.7.4 No monthly progress report was sent to the Department of Programme Implementation Govt. of India upto 1995-96. However, since then the office was sending monthly Progress report to the Department of Programme Implementation regularly.

2.7.5 Audited Statement of Accounts Audited by Chartered Accountants of MPLAD Scheme was done from time to time and was sent to the Accountant General (Audit) Punjab Chandigarh Accordingly by the Deputy Commissioner Jalandhar for getting the audit/review audit of the scheme done by A.G. (Audit) Punjab Chandigarh. Thus audit/review audit of the scheme had been get done through the copy of the same has not been supplied.

2.7.6 As per guidelines of the MPLAD scheme the Head of the district shall visit and inspect at least 10 percent of these works every year. Though all the Deputy Commissioners responded to it positively and admitted that either himself or SDM have visited sites. But however, during the survey it was observed that the Deputy Commissioner entrusted the work of implementation of MPLAD scheme of the district rarely visited any work site. The only system of monitoring prevailing in the district was the progress report of work sent by the various executing agencies.

2.7.7 Progress of the scheme as per the specified formats was being sent to NICNET. However the facility of Internet was not made available to this district.

2.8 DISTRICT PATIALA

2.8.1 In this district the scheme was launched during the year 1993-94. But since funds under the scheme for the year 1993-94 were received by the end of the year, the scheme actually came into operation during the year 1994-95. Since the initiation of the scheme, funds in respect of Ex-MPs of Lok Sabha and Rajya Sabha and sitting MPs of Lok Sabha & Rajya Sabha had been received in the district. Under this scheme upto 31st March, 2003 funds to the tune of Rs. 2305.00 lakhs were received out of which Rs. 1789.40 lakhs had been spent on the developmental works recommended by the MPs.

2.8.2 Works recommended by the MPs, after proper scrutiny and sanction from the competent authority were entrusted for execution to various agencies. Executing agency for a particular work was decided by the Deputy Commissioner of the district. Following executing agencies in the district were engaged in the construction/repair of works under the MPLAD scheme.

- a) Gram Panchayat through Block Development and Panchayat Officers of Blocks,
- b) Executive Officers of Municipal Committees in the District.
- c) Municipal Corporations.
- d) Divisional Manager Railways.
- e) Punjab State Electricity Board.
- f) XEN-I Central Works Division.
- g) XEN-II PWD Building and Roads.
- h) Project Officer, Thapur Institute of Engineering & Technology (TIET).
- i) S.S.P, Patiala.

Sanctions for the execution of works to various executive agencies were issued by the Deputy Commissioner with a copy to the concerned MP and office of Deputy Economic & Statistical Adviser, Patiala subject to the following terms and conditions.

- i) The amount released should normally be spent during the financial year itself.
- ii) The department/executing agency will furnish the Utilisation Certificates for the amount spent during the financial year.
- iii) The amount shall be utilised exclusively for the purpose for which it has been sanctioned.
- iv) It shall be the responsibility of the executing agency to obtain the technical sanction from the competent authority.
- v) It shall be the responsibility of the department to maintain accounts for requirement of A.G.Punjab for Audit purposes.
- vi) It shall be the responsibility of the department to utilise the sanctioned amount in accordance with the Govt. instructions issued from time to time and norms of expenditure approved by the government must be followed.
- vii) The un-spent amount if any must be surrendered immediately.
- viii) Escalation of cost will not be allowed.

2.8.3 Funds received under the scheme were being operated without involving the State budget. Separate savings Accounts of the MPs had been opened in the office of Deputy Economic & Statistical Adviser, Patiala and the funds received in respect of each MP were being deposited in these accounts. These accounts were being operated by the Deputy Commissioners of the district for the execution of the work suggested by the concerned MP. The funds for the works to be executed were being released in instalment. Workwise utilisation of the funds released was being ensured from the executing agencies through meetings and periodical reports and a copy of the releasewise. Utilisation Certificate was being sent to Department of Programme Implementation, Govt. of India.

2.8.4 No monthly Progress report was sent to the Department of Programme Implementation Government of India upto 1995-96. However, since then the office was sending monthly progress report to DPI regularly.

2.8.5 Audited statement of Accounts (Audited by Chartered Accountants) of MPLAD Scheme was done from time to time and was sent to the Accountant General (Audit) Punjab Chandigarh accordingly by the Deputy Commissioner Patiala for getting the audit/review audit of the scheme done by A.G. (Audit) Punjab, Chandigarh. Thus audit /review audit of the scheme had been get done of the scheme though the copy was not supplied.

2.8.6 As per guidelines of the MPLAD scheme the Head of the District shall visit and inspect atleast 10 percent of these works every year. However, during the survey it was observed that the Deputy Commissioner entrusted the work of implementation of MPLAD scheme of the district rarely visited any work site. The only system of monitoring prevailing in the district was the progress report of the work sent by the various executing agencies implementing the scheme.

2.8.7 Progress of the scheme as per the specified formats was being fed to NICNET. However, the facility of Internet was not made available to this district.

CHAPTER-III

PROGRESS AND UTILITY OF THE SCHEME

REVIEW OF THE SCHEME IN SELECTED DISTRICTS

In the selected districts of Ferozepur, Faridkot, Jalandhar and Patiala upto 31.3.2003, DPI Govt. of India, released funds amounting to Rs. 8925.00 lakhs under the MPLAD. In these districts the total amount available including interest accrued on it amounts to Rs. 9117.49 lakhs. Out of which Rs. 8647.72 lakhs have been sanctioned and the total expenditure incurred amounts to Rs. 6972.79 lakhs. Out of the total amount available with the Deputy Commissioners of the selected districts the amount spent is Rs. 6972.79 lakhs and the remaining amount i.e. Rs. 2144.70 lakhs was lying as unspent (as on 31.3.2003) with the Deputy Commissioners of the selected districts. Percentage of amount spent of the total amount available under the scheme upto 31.3.2003 varied from 55.76 percent in district Faridkot to Rs. 92.97 percent in district Jalandhar. Districtwise position of amount received, amount sanctioned and amount spent upto 31.3.2003 is given below in table 3.1. Summary Statement for release/expenditure of funds for Lok Sabha and Rajya Sabha MPs is given in Annexure-II.

Table No. 3.1 Summary Statement for Release /Expenditure for Members of Parliament (Lok Sabha & Rajya Sabha) for selected districts. (as on 31.3.2003)

(Rs. in lakhs)

S N	Nodel Agency	Entitlemen t of funds	Released by G.O.I	Interest Incurred	Total amount available	Amount Sanctioned	Expenditure Incurred	%age Utilisation over amount available
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1	Ferozepur	1865.00	1865.00	16.52	1881.52	1835.20	1201.00	63.83
2	Faridkot	1805.00	1405.00	47.93	1452.93	1306.86	810.19	55.76
3	Jalandhar	3850.00	3350.00	62.18	3412.18	3172.20	3172.20	92.97
4	Patiala	2405.00	2305.00	65.86	2370.86	2333.46	1789.40	75.47
	Total	9925.00	8925.00	192.49	9117.49	8647.72	6972.79	76.48

3.2 UTILISATION OF FUNDS BY MPs

During the course of study, it was observed that funds provided to MPs under the scheme were not being utilised by them regularly. As a result of this in certain cases huge balances of funds in respect of selected districts of Ferozepur, Faridkot, Jalandhar and Patiala were piling up. MP wise utilisation of funds in respect of selected districts of Ferozepur, Faridkot, Jalandhar and Patiala are given in Annexure-III, IV,V and VI respectively.

3.2.2 Figures in Annexure-III in respect of district Ferozepur reveal that two MPs of Lok Sabha & Rajya Sabha namely Sh. Zora Singh Mann and Sh. Kuldeep Nayar, upto 28.2.2003 had spent 84.31 percent and 0.43 percent respectively of the funds received by them under the scheme.

3.2.3 The position as revealed by Annexure-IV in respect of the MPs who spent under the scheme in district Faridkot is also not very encouraging. Sh. Jagmeet Singh Brar, MP Lok Sabha and Smt. Gurcharan Kaur MP Rajya Sabha could utilise 68.18 percent and 7.69 percent respectively of the funds allotted to them under the scheme. It showed that in district Faridkot under MPLAD scheme utilisation of funds was found just 54.16 percent.

3.2.4 In district Jalandhar under the MPLAD scheme the utilisation of funds by Sh. Balbir Singh and Smt. Santosh Choudhary Lok Sabha MP and Sh. Kartar Singh Duggal Rajya Sabha Member showed 99.30, 92.50 and 87.86 percent respectively.

3.2.5 In district Patiala the position of utilisation of funds under MPLAD scheme as revealed by Annexure-VI in respect of MPs Smt. Preneet Kaur MP Lok Sabha and Sh. Gurcharan Singh Tohra MP Rajya Sabha showed 83.02 percent and 62.43 percent respectively.

3.2.6 Irregular spending and delay in sanctioning by MPs leads the piling up of funds outstanding to their credit, MP wise figures of amount outstanding to the credit of various MPs giving in Annexure-III,IV,V and VI.

3.3 WORKS

In the selected districts of Ferozepur, Faridkot, Jalandhar and Patiala 9463 works were sanctioned and 5644 (59.64 percent) works were completed as on 30.6.2001. In this way 3819 (40.36 percent) works had been remain incomplete during this period. The districtwise position of complete works under the scheme had been found as 89.64 percent in Ferozepur, 76.79 percent in Faridkot, 40.62 percent in Jalandhar and 49.40 percent in district Patiala. The detailed position of this is shown as under in Table 3.2 below:-

Table No. 3.2 Position of works as on 3.6.2001.

Sr.No.	District	No.of Works Sanctioned	No.of Works Completed	No.of Works Incomplete
1	2	3	4	5
1	Ferozepur	1573	1410 (89.64)	163 (10.36)
2	Faridkot	2383	1830 (76.79)	553 (23.21)
3	Jalandhar	3602	1463 (40.62)	2139 (59.38)
4	Patiala	1905	941 (49.40)	964 (50.60)
	Total	9463	5644 (59.64)	3819 (40.36)

Note: Figures in brackets show percentage to the total numbers of works sanctioned.

3.4 UTILISATION CERTIFICATE

Deputy Commissioner of the district being custodian of funds received from DPI, Govt. of India for the implementation of MPLAD scheme is responsible to furnish releasewise utilisation certificate of DPI on its utilisation. In the selected three districts except Jalandhar where information of U.C. awaited from 1998-99 to 31.3.2001 out of the 1776 completed works, utilisation certificate in respect of 1461 (82.26 percent) works had been sent to DPI. Districtwise utilisation certificate received out of the completed works are given below in table 3.3 were in Firozpur district out of the 693 completed works U.C. received of 422(60.89 percent) works, in Faridkot out of the 289 completed works, U.C. received of all 289 (100.00 percent) works, in Patiala out of 794 completed works, utilisation certificate received during the period 750(94.46 percent) works.

Table 3.3 Status of Utilisation Certificate as on from 1998-99 to 2000-01

Sr. No.	District	No.of works Completed	No.of works for which U.C. sent to DPI	Percentageof U.C.received out of the completed works
0	1	2	3	4
1.	Firozpur	693	422	60.89
2	Faridkot	289	289	100.00
3.	Jalandhar	1974*	-	-
4.	Patiala	794	750	94.46
		1776	1461	82.26

*From 1993 to July 2002.

3.5 REVIEW OF SELECTED WORKS

Ten works are selected from each selected four districts i.e. Ferozepur, Faridkot, Jalandhar and Patiala for detailed study. Information on various aspects viz. system of issuing sanction in the selected districts, time taken for sanctioning the proposals, time taken in execution of the work, calling of rough cost estimates, status of completion of the works, status of utilisation certificate, erecting of signboard carrying the inscription MPLADS work relating to selected works was collected from the office of the implementing agencies i.e. Additional Deputy Commissioner (Development), Deputy Economic & Statistical Adviser of the respective districts and the executing agencies to whom these works were entrusted for execution. Views regarding utility and efficiency of the work created under the scheme were ascertained from beneficiary/knowledgeable persons.

3.6 EXECUTION OF WORKS BY DIFFERENT AGENCIES

Although Deputy Commissioner of a district has been empowered to select a executing agency for a particular work but in practice executing agencies are decided keeping in view the recommendations of the concerned M.P. In this way out of 40 selected works, 19 are assigned to Block Development and Panchayat Officer (through Gram Panchayat), 5 to Principal/Parents Teachers Association, 6 to Municipal Committees, 3 to Punjab Water Supply and Sewerage Board, 3 to Thapur Institute of Engineering and Technology Patiala (TIET) 1 each to Construction Division of the Guru Nanak Dev University, Amritsar, to village Sports Youth Club, to XEN Panchayati Raj and to Tehsil Welfare Officer (As per Annexure-VII). Gram Panchayat executed the works assigned to them under the technical guidance and supervision of Junior Engineer posted in the Block Development office of Panchayati Raj under the supervision of its own staff through some contractors. Block Development and Panchayat Officer got the work executed through Gram Panchayat under the supervision of J.E. Panchayati Raj. Municipal Committees are reported to be executing the work assigned to them through approved Govt. agencies or some reputed organisation, SDO (Civil) Phillaur executed the works through Tehsil Welfare Officers of the area by forming a committee of villagers. The Registrar Guru Nanak Dev University has assigned the work to the Construction Division of the University.

3.7 IMPLEMENTING AGENCY

In the State of Punjab the scheme is being implemented through different agencies in different districts. In four selected districts i.e. in Ferozepur the implementing agency is Additional Deputy Commissioner (Development), in Faridkot Secretary, Zila Parishad and in Jalandhar and Patiala, the implementing agencies are Deputy Economic & Statistical Adviser. It has been observed by the survey team that the staff posted in the offices of these implementing agencies is non-technical, ignorant of accounts matters and financial rules and regulation and schemes were being implementing without the application of guidelines and goals of the scheme in mind. Feasibility and desirability of the works recommended by MP is not being assessed at all. Neither any evaluation or any monitoring of the works is being done at any stage. Even upto date record of works done under this scheme is not being properly maintained in these offices. It has been observed that even periodical reports of progresses are not being collected and maintained regularly. It has also been observed that these offices are not sending regularly the periodical progress reports to the State Nodal Department / Department of Programme Implementation Govt. of India.

The district level Economic & Statistical Adviser's Office has shown its vulnerability in implementing the scheme because of its pre-occupation in the Planning and Statistical Data Collection work due to shortage of staff. Further more, the major portion of the MPLAD funds is being used for development works in the rural areas and ADC (D) is mainly concerned with the subject. Hence it will be appropriate if the work regarding implementation of the scheme were carried out by the offices of ADC (D) in all the districts of the State on uniform pattern.

3.8 EXECUTION OF WORKS

It has been laid down in guidelines of the scheme that works recommended under the scheme should be of developmental in nature based on local felt needs. In other words emphasis has to be laid on the creation of durable assets. Even repairs have not been allowed unless it is special repairs leading to restoration/upgradation of durable assets. However, the survey results have revealed that out of 40 selected works recommended 7(17.50) works are of minor nature costing upto Rs. 31,000. Sanctionings of such type of work is not in accordance to the spirit of the scheme as such minor amounts does not help such in the restoration/upgradation of durable assets. The following works have been recommended with the sanctioned amount upto or less than Rs. 31,000 only.

- i) Repair of Harijan Dharamshala village Virk Patti Mallo (Block Phillaur) sanctioned amount Rs. 20,000).
- ii) Provision of material for the library in the Girls Senior Secondary School Baja Khanna (Block Kotkapura) (Sanctioned amount Rs. 25,000)
- iii) Construction of Harijan Dharamshala village Ganna Pind (Block Phillaur) (Sanctioned amount Rs. 25,000).
- iv) Construction/Repair of Sansi Dharamshala village Ganna Pind (Block Phillaur) (Sanctioned amount Rs.25,000)

- v) Construction/Special repair of Bazigar Dharamshala village Malsian (Block Shahkot) (Sanctioned amount Rs. 25,000).
- vi) Construction of Boria Dharamshala in village Bagrari (Block Kot Kapura) (Sanctioned amount Rs. 31,000).
- vii) Development of Sports in village Bander Jatana (Block Kot Kapura) (Sanctioned amount Rs. 31,000).

3.8.2 As per instructions regarding construction inforce work sanctioned under the scheme is required to be completed within a working season. Accordingly, all the selected works should have been completed by 31.3.99. However, it has been observed during the field inquiry, the following works have not been even taken up for construction due to one or the other reason.

- i) Construction of Public Rest House/Community Centre Pattran (Sanctioned amount Rs. 10.00 lakhs)
- ii) Construction of Public Rest House Samana (sanctioned amount Rs. 10.00 lakhs)
- iii) Construction of Community Centre Samana (Sanctioned amount Rs. 10.00 lakh).
- iv) Construction of Community Hall in village Paddy Jagir (Phillaur) (Sanctioned amount Rs. 4.84 lakhs).

3.8.3 During the course of study evaluation team has observed that some works were assigned to SDO (Civil) Phillaur for execution under the MPLAD Scheme. SDO (C) Phillaur had not technical mechanism at his disposal to execute these works. To a great surprise it was observed that SDO, Phillaur formed of five members (all Scheduled Castes) in each village with the Tehsil Welfare Officer at helm of affairs to execute the works. Thus village Panchayat was side lined and funds were kept outside the audit. Such type of serious financial irregularity needs to be curbed.

3.8.4 During the courses of study observed that against the guidelines a partial amount for partly meeting the cost of unidentifiable part of the large work is sanctioned. For the construction of community centre at Jalalabad an amount of Rs. 7 lakh was sanctioned under the MPLADS, though the total cost of the project was to the tune of Rs. 95 lakhs. Similarly for the construction of Community Centre at Fazilka an amount of Rs. 3 lakhs was sanctioned for the project of costing Rs. 52 lakhs. In Regional Centre of Guru Nanak Dev University at Jalandhar an amount of Rs. 10 lakh was sanctioned for the construction of rooms against the project of Rs. 3 crore. In all these above works, the share of the MPLADS funds was negligible and the work was also physically unidentifiable.

3.8.5 During the course of study evaluation team had observed that the Municipal Committees Zira, Fazilka, Jalalabad and Abohar assigned the construction of works to agencies, which were not expert in the specific field. The Municipal Committees instead of allocating works related to construction of roads to Public Works Department (B & R) executed works at its own level. Simiilarly MC, Abohar, Jalalabad and Fazilka allocated the construction of Community Centres to Punjab State Water Supply and Sewerage Board.

3.9 STATUS OF COMPLETION

The analysis of data regarding status of completion of the selected works (Table 3.4) indicates that on the day of survey out of the total 40 works covered in the study 36 (90.00 percent) works were found complete and the remaining 4(10.00 percent) works had not been taken up due to various reasons viz selection of sites/executing agencies etc.

Table 3.4 Classification of Selected Works according to Status of Completion.

(As on date of Survey)

Sr.No.	District	Completion	In Progress	Not Taken Up	Total
1	2	3	4	5	6
1.	Firozpur	10(100.00)	-	-	10(100.00)
2.	Faridkot	10(100.00)	-	-	10(100.00)
3.	Jalandhar	9(90.00)	-	1(10.00)	10(100.00)
4.	Patiala	7(70.00)	-	3(30.00)	10(100.00)
	Total	36(90.00)	-	4(10.00)	40(100.00)

Districtwise position revealed that 100.00 percent of the selected works were found completed in district Firozpur and Faridkot 90.00 percent in District Jalandhar and 70.00 percent in district Patiala.

3.10 COMPLETION OF WORKS BY THE STIPULATED DATE

Keeping in view the time required for the completion of a work, implementing agency while issuing sanction for the execution of the work stipulated a date by which the work should be completed. The selected works should have been completed by 31.3.1999. Data collected in this regard is given in following table:-

Table 3.5 Classification of Completed Works according to stipulated date of Completion.

Sr. No.	District	Total No.of selected works	Works which should have been completed by 31.3.1999	Works completed upto 31.3.1999	Works completed with the stipulated Period	Works completed after the stipulated Period
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1.	Firozpur	10	10	8 (80.00)	8 (80.00)	2 (20.00)
2.	Faridkot	10	10	7 (70.00)	7 (70.00)	3 (30.00)
3.	Jalandhar	10	10	6 (60.00)	6 (66.67)	3 (33.33)
4.	Patiala	10	10	4 (40.00)	4 (57.14)	3 (42.86)
	Total	40	40	25 (62.50)	25 (69.44)	11 (30.56)

Out of the 40 works selected for the evaluation study 36 works were taken up and found completed by the day of survey. From the completed 36 works 25 (69.44 percent) works were found completed within the stipulated period and remaining 11 (30.56 percent) works were completed after the stipulated period. Districtwise analysis reveals that works completed after the stipulated period vary from 20.00 percent in district Firozpur to 42.86 percent in district Patiala.

Delay in the completion of works may lead to escalation of cost, which cannot be allowed under the scheme. It is therefore, suggested that time schedule for the completion of works should be strictly adhered to. In case of any lapse head of the executing agency should be held personally responsible.

3.11 STATUS OF UTILISATION CERTIFICATES

Workwise utilisation of funds released was required to be ensured by the implementing agencies from executive agencies. As regards the position of Utilisation Certificate in respect of selected works among the four sample districts the study revealed that out of a total of 40 selected works on the day of survey. Utilisation Certificate had been received for 35 (87.5 percent) works. Districtwise position as shown in Table 3.6 indicates that utilisation certificate in respect of 100.00 percent works has been received in district Firozpur and 90.00 percent works had been received in district Faridkot and Jalandhar as compared to 70.00 percent works in district Patiala.

Table 3.6 Status of Utilisation Certificate (As on date of Survey)

Sr.No	District	No of selected works	Utilisation Certificate Received	
			Yes	No
1	2	3	4	5
1.	Firozpur	10	10 (100.00)	-
2.	Faridkot	10	9 (90.00)	1 (10.00)
3.	Jalandhar	10	9 (90.00)	1* (10.00)
4.	Patiala	10	7 (70.00)	3* (30.00)
	Total	40	35	5

*Sites of works not taken up.

3.12 DEVIATION FROM GUIDELINES ISSUED BY DPI

On the basis of information supplied by the implementing agencies in respect of selected works it has been observed that guidelines issued by Department of Programme Implementation, Govt of India were not adhered to in letter and spirit by implementing agencies. Some of the observed deviations are as under:-

3.12.1 TIME TAKEN IN SANCTIONING THE PROPOSALS

It has been laid down in the guidelines that as far as possible, all sanctions for works should be accorded with in 45 days from the date of receipt of proposals from the concerned M.P. Information collected in this regard for selected works is given in table under neath:-

Table 3.7 Classification of Selected Works according to time taken for Sanctioning the Proposal.

Sr.No.	District	Time taken for sanctioning the Proposal			
		Up to 45 days	46-90 days	More than 90 days	Total No of Selected Works
1	2	3	4	5	6
1	Firozpur	6 (60.00)	1 (10.00)	3 (30.00)	10 (100.00)
2	Faridkot	10 (100.00)	-	-	10 (100.00)
3	Jalandhar	1 (10.00)	3 (30.00)	6* (60.00)	10 (100.00)
4	Patiala	6 (60.00)	-	4 (40.00)	10** (100.00)
	Total	23 (57.50)	4 (10.00)	13 (32.50)	40 (100.00)

* One site of work not taken up.

** Three sites of works

Data reveals that out of 40 selected works in the four districts only 57.5 percent of the proposals were sanctioned within the stipulated period whereas 10.0 percent proposals were sanctioned with in 46-90 days and 32.50 percent after 90 days. Districtwise analysis shows that in districts Jalandhar, only 10 percent proposals got through in 45 days, in districts Firozpur and Patiala 60.00 percent proposals were sanctioned in 45 days. Only in district Faridkot 100.00 percent proposal got sanctioned in stipulated period. The implementing agencies at the districts level i.e. ADC (D), Deputy Economic and Statistical Adviser, Secretary Zila Parishad etc. attributed this lapse to non receipt of rough cost estimates from technical personnel and due to shortage of staff with them as no additional staff had been provided under the MPLAD scheme for its implementation.

3.12.2 MONITORING ARRANGEMENTS

As per guidelines the Heads of districts shall visit and inspect at least 10 percent of these works every year. Similarly senior officers of implementing and executing agencies have been advised to closely monitor implementation of these works through visits to work sites. From the information collected in this regard from the field, it was observed that the works generally visited by lower level officials of the offices of implementing agencies/executing agencies.

In district Ferozepur out of 10 selected works Deputy Commissioners and Additional Deputy Commissioners (Development) Ferozepur visited only three works. In district Faridkot, out of the 10 selected works Deputy Commissioner and Additional Deputy Commissioners (Development) Faridkot visited only two works. In Jalandhar, out of the 10 selected works Deputy Commissioners and Additional Deputy Commissioners visited two works. Position of district Patiala in this regard was rather disheartening where neither Deputy Commissioner nor the Additional Deputy Commissioner (Development) visited the selected site. The detail of visiting officers/officials responsible for the implementation/execution of works is given in Annexure VIII, IX, X, and XI.

3.12.3 ERECTING THE SIGN-BOARDS

It has been laid down in the guidelines that in order that local people to become aware that particular works have been executed with MPLADS funds, signboards carrying the inscription “MPLADS WORKS“ may be prominently executed at the sites”. However, survey of the selected works revealed that out of 36 completed works only 5 works (13.89 percent) were carrying these signboards. In district Ferozepur 5 out of 10 completed works were found having signboards erected. In district Faridkot and Jalandhar out of the 10 selected and completed works and 9 completed works found having no signboards. In district Patiala 7 completed works were found without signboards. Detail position is given in Table 3.9.

Table No.3.9 Classification of Selected Works according to Status of Signboards Erected.

Sr.No.	District	Signboard Erected		
		Total No.of completed works	Yes	No
1	2	3	4	5
1.	Ferozepur	10	5	5
2.	Faridkot	10	-	10
3.	Jalandhar	9	-	9
4.	Patiala	7	-	7
	Total	36	5	31

ANNEXURE-XII

OFFICERS AND OFFICIALS OF ECONOMIC AND STATISTICAL ORGANISATION, PUNJAB ASSOCIATED WITH THE EVALUATION STUDY OF MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT LOCAL AREA DEVELOPMENT SCHEM,E RESEARCH TEAM

Name	Designation
Sarvshri/Smt.	
1. Gurdev Singh Bains	Director
2. Urmiljit Khosa	Joint Director (Plan Evaluation)
3. Jaspal Singh Kapil	Assistant Research Officer
4. Lachhman Singh	Investigator
5. Sadhu Ram	Investigator
6. Surinder Singh	Investigator
7. Sukhwinder Singh	Investigator
8. Nirmal Kumari	Junior Scale Stenographer
9. Veena Rani	Steno typist.