Chapter VI
Summary, Findings and Conclusions

Introduction:

This chapter is designed to present summary, findings and conclusions of this research.

In this section chapter wise summary is given.

Chapter I: POVERTY AND POVERTY ERADICATION PROGRAMMES IN INDIA: AN OVERVIEW

Chapter I is designed to make clear the meaning of the concept of poverty, extent of poverty and to present an overview of evolution of poverty eradication programmes in India.

Defining poverty is the most difficult job to do for its varied, complex connotations and facets. The World Bank (1990:26) defines poverty as “the inability to attain a minimal standard of living”. Amartya Sen’s capability theory provides a more useful alternative to understand poverty. Capability approach to understanding poverty goes beyond income and emphasizes the whole range of means, available to achieve human capabilities like literacy, longevity and access to income. There are many other social dimensions of poverty like caste, untouchability, bondages, gender discrimination, social exclusion, domination and violence against the downtrodden.

Poverty in India is declining since last few decades. But According to 2005 World Bank estimate, 42% of India’s population falls below the international poverty line of $1.25 a day. Maharashtra Human Development Report 2002 shows that in 1997- 98 the number of families below poverty line in the Nashik district were 39.23% as against 34.55% for the whole Maharashtra.

There was no serious effort to tackle the issue of poverty before independence. After Indian independence in 1947, with the zeal and
inspiration to transform India on the lines of developed Western countries, Government of India initiated broader interventions in its socio-economic and political structures. The newly formed government in the beginning focused on big-push industrialization at the cost of anti-poverty policies and programmes. The limitations of such policies that based on urban bias and the western model have been gradually corrected after 1960s. In a due course, ‘Poverty Eradication’ became the major concern for the state. EGS in Maharashtra was one of such novel programme to eradicate poverty. Pro poor policies of the world and ‘Garibi Hatao’ agenda of the Central Government of India created conditions for emergence of EGS in Maharashtra in 1972. In September 1974, Maharashtra government resolution recognized "right to work" and EGS was settled as a regular scheme. Showing the unique and great character, EGS has been aimed to balance the unmatchable trio namely- means of subsistence to the village poor in critical conditions like drought, rural development through asset generation and development and empowerment of the poor through labour extensive works. EGS was further strengthened with the EGS Act of 1977, which guaranteed employment to the village poor with moderate facilities and convenience.

Taking inspiration from EGS many wage employment based central government programmes started. They have been subsequently consolidated into the Jawahar Rozgar Yojana (JRY). In 2001, the JGSY and EAS were amalgamated into one scheme i.e. Sampoorna Gramin Rozgar Yojana (SGRY) which started from 2001-02. This is the largest ever wage employment based PEP started at all India level from 2001-02. The National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (NREGA) was passed in September 2005 and provided right to employment to about 5.4 crore rural poor in India. Maharashtra Government formulated Maharashtra Rural Employment Guarantee
Scheme (MREGS) with some variations from NREGS and came in action from February 2, 2006.

EGS and SGRY in Nashik district of Maharashtra as a wage employment based Poverty Eradication Programmes have been selected for the present research.

**Chapter II: REVIEW OF LITERATURE AND RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

This chapter has been devoted to present review of relevant literature and to elaborate methodological procedures that have been adopted for the present study. EGS, for having a long history of about 35 and odd years and for being novel and revolutionary PEP, is obviously much discussed and studied by Indian and foreign scholars. In general, the studies on EGS have focused on planning, organisation and administration of EGS, its structural and functional aspects, targeting and poverty alleviation potential of the scheme. In the present chapter relevant literature on both EGS and SGRY has been reviewed which includes both the empirical and theoretical studies.

Vishal Jadhav (2006), Vishal Jadhav (2006), Rohini Nayyar (2002), Kumudini Dandekar and Manju Sathe (1980). All these studies were fundamentally non empirical or theoretical in nature. They mostly focused the issues of design, administrative set up, institutional arrangement, targeting, wages, mobilizations, historical background and issues related with the politics and economics of EGS in Maharashtra.


For understanding various aspects of SGRY, some relevant studies are reviewed but the number of such studies on SGRY is very few. However, some studies have been done on the antecedents of
SGRY, i.e. JRY and EAS. Besides some independent researches, the Programme Evaluation Organization (PEO) at the instance of Planning Commission mainly conducts the studies on EAS and JRY. For example, Gaiha, Kaushik and Kulkarni’s study (1988) on JRY, Raghav Gaiha (2000) on JRY, Rania Antonopoulos (2007), Subbarao K. (1997), Raghav Gaiha and Vani Kulkarni, (2002), Veron Rene, Corbridge Stuart, Williams Glyn and Shrivastava Manoj who studied (2003) EAS, Government studies like PEO study (No.147) on JRY and so on. They have been reviewed in the specific context of SGRY.

The second section has dealt with methodology of this study. The present study aims at comparative empirical understanding of the implementation and performance of the two leading poverty eradication programmes, namely, EGS and SGRY, in the specific context of Nasik district of Maharashtra State.

Accordingly, following were the specific objectives set out for the present study:

1) To study the salient features of administration and implementation mechanisms of EGS and SGRY as evident from the scheme documents/design.

2) To empirically examine the grassroots level implementation of EGS and SGRY in the selected sample villages from Nashik district.

3) To evaluate the performance of EGS and SGRY in a comparative perspective:
   a) To compare performance of EGS with SGRY.
   b) To compare the performance of EGS and SGRY in developed, semi developed and less developed areas of the Nashik district.

4. To provide suggestions based on the study, for better implementation of NREGS and its state wise versions.
Nashik district of Maharashtra state was purposively selected for the present study. Out of 15 talukas in Nashik district, six talukas were purposively selected as a sample. On the basis of researcher’s understanding of the level of development in different talukas, Nashik and Niphad talukas were categorised as ‘Developed talukas’, Dindori and Sinnar talukas were categorised as ‘Semi-Developed talukas’ and Trimbakeshwar and Peth talukas were categorised as the ‘Less Developed talukas’. The 12 sample villages were purposively selected from the six talukas for the empirical study. EGS and SGRY public works being implemented in these 12 villages have been considered as cases. In all, 12 cases of EGS and 12 cases of SGRY making the total of 24 cases, forms the empirical basis of the study.

Out of total 503 workers on EGS worksites, 51 (10.13%) EGS workers and out of total 222 workers on SGRY worksites, 34 (15.31) SGRY workers were selected as sample. The aggregate sample size of EGS and SGRY workers taken together comes to (out of 725, 85 workers) 11.72%.

EGS and SGRY workers actually working on the work sites, the Mukadams supervising those sites, the Sarpanch, the Deputy Sarpanch, the Gram Sevak and the Talathi from the respective villages were the main respondents in the present study. Besides information has also collected from discussions and interviews with the Commissioner, Deputy Collectors, Taluka Tehsil officers, DRDA officers and clerks, other researchers, EGS committee members, villagers, representatives of NGOs and action groups. Thus, primary and secondary data has been used for this study.

This research being exploratory research, survey method was employed coupled with observation and photography. Interview schedules, unstructured interviews, informal discussions and on site observation were the basic tools of data collection. The researcher
began the field work from April 25, 2005 and ended around December 7, 2007. The data gathered from the field was codified and quantified by using computer and SPSS software.

**Relevance of the Study**

The present research is important in the light of several reasons given below,

i) The evaluative studies on poverty eradication programmes, their implementation and performance constitute an important area of sociological inquiry and this has remained one of the relatively neglected areas of research in the specific context of EGS and SGRY. The present work is the modest sociological exercise in this direction.

ii) The comparative empirical studies focusing on EGS and SGRY were almost non-existent. The present exploratory study is, therefore, first of its kind in Maharashtra in general and Nashik district in particular.

iii) In the present research, EGS is compared with SGRY and their actual working at the grass roots level is examined in the developed, semi developed and less developed areas in the Nashik district. This is unique academic contribution of the present study.

iv) The study comes out with certain suggestions, which if implementing authorities adopt for making the PEPs and especially the NREGS and MREGS more effective, are likely to result in better performance of the schemes.

**Chapter III: PROFILE OF NASIK DISTRICT: THE STUDY AREA**

The first section is devoted to present a broad profile of Nashik district, which constitutes the study area of the present research.
As per 2001 census, Nashik district’s rural population is 30,56,240 which is 61.17% of the total. Out of this, 24% are tribal and 8.5% are dalits. In terms of occupation, there are 51% cultivators and 33% engaged as agricultural labourers. Among the Blocks, there are 9 blocks with more than 90% population being rural. There are 6 blocks with more than 50% tribal population.

On economic grounds, Nashik district as a whole is one of the developed districts of Maharashtra. Rich agriculture, relatively developed industry, better water resources, rapid urbanization and growing tertiary sector are its strengths in economic sector. However, when we go into detailed (taluka and area wise) specifications, we find that 50% of its talukas are backward, showing major economic inequalities in the district.

While giving profile of the 12 villages selected as a sample for this study some village characteristics were selected which include: a) Population of village, b) No. of household 2001, c) BPL families, d) Majority BPL Category, e) Anewari (Rain count), f) Pakka road to village, g) School facility, h) Ration facility, i) S.T. bus facility, j) Health centre facility, k) Electricity available to household, l) Distance from Nashik, m) Distance from Taluka, n) Major economic activity of village, o) Unemployment period of the village, p) Percentage of peasants having alternative water resources, q) Integrity of village, r) No. of G.P. and G. S. meetings held in a year, s) Members participation in G.S., t) Members participation in G.P.

The data for the village profile is gathered from the Sarpanch, Deputy Sarpanch, Gram Sevak and the Talathi of the sample villages. They provided information that was not always uniform. The researcher has presented the most possible reliable information from the most concerned one from them.
Chapter IV: ADMINISTRATION AND IMPLEMENTATION OF EGS AND SGRY: A COMPARISON

Chapter four has dealt with the emergence and development of EGS and SGRY as a scheme and their comparison with focus on their administration and implementation.

This chapter elaborates different procedural aspects of administration and implementation of EGS and SGRY in a Comparative Perspective. For this comparison, following indicators were selected: Objectives of the schemes, Target group of the schemes, Aspects of guarantee / Right to demand the work, Extent of Participation / Right to plan the work, Nature of the work undertaken, Administrative structure, Implementing Agency, Sponsorship and funds generation, Information and propagation of the scheme, Annual action plan / Blue print, Wages under the programme, Provision of providing foodgrains, Facilities/amenities at work, Involvement of contractors, Use of machines, Supervision on the worksites, Monitoring, evaluation and redressal of grievances, Personal benefit schemes, Special safeguards for the weaker sections and women of the community and Social audit.

Although both EGS and SGRY are being wage employment based poverty eradication programmes, this chapter clarifies how the EGS and SGRY are distinct from each other. Major distinction between them is, EGS is demand driven, right based, centralized, with huge funds and administrative arrangements, and dominated by bureaucracy. On the other hand the strength of SGRY lies in its principle thrust of democratic decentralization, participatory management; local planning of works, ban on contractors, reservations to women, and special focus on the backward class people but it is constrained with limited funds. The two wage employment
based poverty eradication programmes thus have some special strengths and weaknesses.

**Chapter V: EGS AND SGRY IN NASHIK DISTRICT: GRASSROOTS LEVEL IMPLEMENTATION AND PERFORMANCE IN COMPARATIVE PERSPECTIVE**

This fifth chapter is designed to analyse the empirical data collected in the context of both the second and third objective of the present research. These two objectives were formulated to understand the salient features of administration and implementation mechanisms and performance of EGS and SGRY on the basis of empirical data. Regional variation among the three development areas has also been analysed. For this exercise data has analysed on the basis of following indicators.

The main variables relating to the process of implementation aspects that have been considered here for analysis include: a) Demand patterns and Decision making in bringing EGS-SGRY works; b) Decision making in selection of works; c) Means of communication to the concerned people in the village about the starting of work; d) Nature of work and Agency of implementation; e) Nature of Monitoring and supervision- who did it, visits, frequency; f) Number of days workers worked on the sample sites; g) Selection of workers: Social Inclusion and Social exclusion-bases, reasons and implications, h) Sufficiency of EGS/SGRY workers, alternatives; i) Wages and Income gains to workers, j) Amenities provided on work sites, k) Gaps in the work and its reasons, l) Measurement- who did, when, how; m) Observance of the procedures or norms laid down: cards, contractor, local and outsiders, 60:40 ratio; o) Unofficial involvement of political leaders and stakeholders, p) Which scheme is better implemented, q) Role of Agency, agency
officers and the implementers and r) The Level of political involvement.

The main variables relating to the performance aspects that have been considered here for analysis include: Objectives and Design of the schemes, Funds allocation to the schemes, Income gains through wages and foodgrains, Punctuality of wages, distribution, Amount of machine use replacing the labour participation, Leakages and malpractices, Number of mandays generated, Nature of monitoring and vigilance-Impact, Completion of the work in time and delays-reasons, Quality of works, Level of utility of works, Who benefitted from the assets, Relevance of the scheme in need satisfaction, Future profits of the work/asset, and outputs for the village.

Major Findings Regarding the Implementation of the EGS and SGRY

The findings regarding implementation of the EGS and SGRY, based on empirical data collected from the respondents are as follows:

a) **Knowledge about the scheme and pattern of demanding the work:**

To impart knowledge at grass root level about the schemes and educate the needy is the responsibility of the Talathis in case of EGS and Gram Sevaks in case of SGRY. It was observed that, this responsibility was not carried out by them in all areas under the sample. EGS is demand driven scheme but due to insufficient knowledge about the scheme, genuine demands from the workers were not made. The workers were either relied on some intermediary or they did not make work demands. The workers from the less developed region were more aware about demand making
under EGS. Though SGRY is not a demand driven scheme, very few villagers were aware about its nature.

b) Decision making in selection of works

Under EGS villagers do not have much say in decision making about the selection of the works. SGRY, however, emphasises collective and participatory decision making about the selection of the works and their management. This has not been done in case of majority of the villages under the sample. Local elites and contractors had upper hand in deciding the nature of SGRY works.

c) Means of communication to village about starting of the work

Under EGS, drum beating, notice-boards, meetings are expected to be used as means to make aware the workers. Only in 25% cases of EGS such efforts were made. In case of SGRY Notice boards, meetings are expected to be used to make aware the workers aware about the starting of the work. In 91.6% SGRY cases, the workers were not communicated. Not much regional variation was observed in this regard.

d) Nature of works undertaken

The norms of both of the schemes emphasise on water and soil conservation works. EGS works did follow this norm. Under SGRY since 49.8% works were building and construction works they did not follow the norm. EGS generated afforestation and water and soil conservation works were better in less developed areas. Under SGRY tribal areas preferred water and soil conservation works while villages from developed and semi-developed areas preferred construction works.
e) **Funds allocation to the schemes**

EGS works had better fund allocation. SGRY funds under IIst stream were based on the size of the population and backwardness criterion. Thus these funds were meager.

The data revealed that developed areas received higher funds under EGS. Small villages from less developed areas received slightly less funds under SGRY II stream.

f) **Supervision and monitoring**

Agency officers and officers at revenue department and different Monitoring committees are more responsible for supervision and monitoring under EGS. In practice supervision and monitoring has not been properly done by the concerned ones and some unofficial intermediaries were involved in doing this job. Under SGRY, DRDA and Gram Panchayat, Gram Sevak-Sarpanch are responsible for supervision and monitoring. In practice, the involvement of Mukadams and contractors was noticed for doing this job. Monitoring and supervision from the Gram Panchayat officials was also not up to the mark.

In developed areas, monitoring and supervision of the EGS worksites was found better. In SGRY Sarpanch, Gram Sevaks from the less developed areas were not more serious in monitoring and supervision. Social audit too was almost nonexistent.

g) **Gaps in the works**

No specific norm in this regard exists, but expectation is that gaps should be fewer. In this study it was found that gaps were frequent and of greater duration in EGS works. SGRY performed better here due to availability of funds and less technical obstruction.
Gaps were frequent and of higher in developed and semi-developed areas. In SGRY no specific regional variation in this regard was observed.

h) **Frequency of measurement of the works**

As per EGS guidelines, measurement of the works should be at every fortnight. It was found that there were significant delays in taking measurement. Many a times workers were unsatisfied of measurement of the work done by them. SGRY guidelines mentioned that, measurement of the works should be taken at every week. Delays in taking measurement were also observed in SGRY too. No significant regional variation was observed regarding the delays in different areas of Nashik district.

i) **Sufficiency of workers on worksites**

EGS norms say that, local workers should be given preference in employment.

SGRY norms also say that local workers should be given preference in employment. But involvement of contractors and outsider workers was observed relatively higher in case of SGRY when compared with EGS.

In both EGS and SGRY, participation of local workers was better and sometimes more than the sufficient in less developed areas.

j) **Were the local workers given preference in employment?**

**Whether contractors were employed?**

Both the schemes are meant for providing employment for the local workers. However, outsider and far outside workers were also found on the working sites. This was mainly due to the involvement of the contractors. On SGRY projects, involvement of outside workers, those coming along with the contractors was higher than EGS.
Both on EGS and SGRY worksites local workers were better attended in from the less developed areas.

**k) Whether technicalities of 60:40 ratio of expenditure were followed?**

EGS guidelines say that except some particular works, the 60-40 or at least 49-51 ratio with regard to expenditure on labour and material/machinery components should be followed. On general this 60:40 ratios were not followed. Such situation was also there in case of SGRY; there too 60:40 ratio was not followed.

There was no prominent regional variation as far as following the 60:40 ratios in case of EGS worksites. In semi-developed areas the rage of not following the norms of 60:40 ratios was as much as the double as the SGRY projects from the developed and less developed areas.

**l) Involvement of intermediaries, contractors in the implementation of the schemes:**

EGS generally do not allow involvement of contractors and intermediaries. However, there are some exceptions to that. On certain projects limited involvement of contractor is permissible. However, in reality intermediaries, contractors were observed on some of the EGS projects contractor was not expected.

Ban on Contractors is specifically mentioned in SGRY. However, Intermediaries, contractors were observed on SGRY sites in such a portion which was more than the EGS.

Intermediaries, contractors were observed more on worksites of SGRY from developed and semi developed areas than the EGS.

**m) Female participation:**

Under EGS there are no special provisions for women’s participation. In Nashik district, there was no single site of EGS
where women workers were excluded totally. Special amenities to women, however, were not provided.

SGRY guidelines specify that 30% of its employment opportunities are reserved for women. This norm was not followed. Rather, in five villages (i.e. on 41.66% worksites), women were totally excluded from the SGRY works. This was because of involvement of outside contractors.

Average female participation in EGS in developed and semi developed belt was surprisingly higher. Female participation in semi developed and less developed regions was higher in SGRY works. This was mostly due to plantation works from these areas where women workers always get priority to work on.

n) Caste related issues in inclusion and workers’ participation

For scheduled castes and Scheduled tribes some provisions are made under EGS and SGRY for getting benefits of special schemes. For instance Jawahar well scheme under EGS and some additional grant and special 22.5% reserved funds under SGRY. However, being self targeted schemes there is no provision of caste or tribe-based participation under both EGS and SGRY.

It was generally observed on the sites of EGS and SGRY that, workers belonging to local, lower backward castes and tribes were participating in their labour force. In less developed areas, over 95% of the workers were tribals.

o) Wages and foodgrain gains to workers

Wages to the workers on EGS and SGRY are generally paid partly in cash and partly in Food grain according to the minimum wages (that was at the rate of Rs. 47/- for the Nashik region during the period of this research).

On an average, the EGS workers got wages per day including
the amount of foodgrain at the rate of Rs. 56.35. Average Wages to workers, including the amount of foodgrain, under SGRY were at the rate of Rs. 70.70 per day. Foodgrains were not provided as per the norms. The involvement of skilled workers has increased the average wage rate. Few of the workers both in EGS and SGRY received wages less than Rs. 30/-.

EGS wages in semi developed areas were little higher than the other areas. SGRY wages in semi developed areas were remarkably higher than the other areas.

p) **Promptness or delays in wage distribution**

EGS norms say that wages should be paid by every fortnight. Delays in Payments were more frequent and were more on EGS worksites.

As per SGRY norms, wages should be paid by every week. Delays in payments were comparatively less in SGRY than EGS due to relatively faster availability of funds and less bureaucratic technicalities.

q) **Delays in distribution of foodgrain to workers**

Part payment in the form of foodgrains is given but foodgrains are not compulsory part of the wages. 86.2% of the EGS workers did not receive foodgrains as a part of their payments. The wages they received were in cash.

Under SGRY foodgrains (5 kgs a day) are compulsory part of the wages. 64.7% of the SGRY workers did not received foodgrain as a part of their payments. The wages they received were in cash Rupees.

EGS workers from the less developed areas received better amount of foodgrains. SGRY workers from the developed areas received foodgrains relatively quicker.
r) **Amenities provided on work sites**

EGS regulations make provisions of provided ample amenities to the workers on its worksites like drinking water, first aid, crèches, ex gracia amount against accidents and so on. The evidences from the fields show that, 58.82% of the EGS workers did not receive any kind of amenities on working site, not even potable water. On some sites, medical kit and sun protecting sheds was available.

Drinking Water, crèches, rest rooms, similar amenities also need to be provided on SGRY projects. 76.47% of the SGRY workers said that they did not receive any kind of amenities on working site including potable water.

The incidences of not providing amenities was little lower in semi developed belt. Shelter plus water was provided to the 6 EGS worksites in less developed belt that proved better in providing amenities.

As far as SGRY was concerned, no significant regional variation was observed in this regard.

s) **Interventions of political leaders and stakeholders**

In EGS, implementation process needs to be free from political interests and biases; however, positive political interventions are welcomed. Some political interventions in EGS projects were observed. Most of them were negative as they were full of personal stakes, for example, in selection of beneficiaries under Jawahar Well Scheme, in bringing certain work to certain villages, in appointing contractors etc. Positive interventions were also observed. The political leader took initiatives in demanding the EGS works for the poor; many complaints launched for the grievances redressal were also from the political leaders.

SGRY is closely associated with political leaders. Political interventions and stakes were more often in SGRY than EGS. In
general terms, rural elites dominated the selections and planning of the works. They had nexus with the contractors as well.

Political interventions and stakes were more observed on EGS projects from developed and semi developed areas. Political interventions and stakes were slightly more regarding SGRY worksites from developed belt.

t) **Role of Agency, agency officers and the implementers**

Agency, agency officers and the Implementers did play major role in the implementation of EGS and SGRY projects. Their physical presence, supervision and technical guidance has been significant for better quality of assets. In some cases, they did well in performing their job. Workers and villagers too appreciated their work. But in most of the cases due to their reliance on Mukadam, their less contact with the local villagers and their busy schedule, the performance of the schemes was hampered. This was more remarkable on SGRY worksites. There was no significant regional variation in this regard.

u) **Which is better implemented?**

Most of the respondents from the categories of Gram Sevaks, Sarpanchs and Deputy Sarpanchs reported that SGRY was better implemented than EGS. Except the Talathis, officers and the workers, all the other respondents favoured SGRY than EGS.

Sarpanchs and Deputy Sarpanchs in general and specifically those from the semi developed and less developed areas, preferred SGRY than EGS.

**Major Findings Regarding the Performance of EGS with SGRY**

Major findings of this research relating to the performance of EGS and SGRY are as follows.
a) **Objectives and design of the schemes**

By design EGS is better than the SGRY. EGS has more comprehensive objectives than SGRY. Especially it has better funds and better mechanisms that enhance better targeting, better administration, monitoring, vigilance and checks and balances. Thus, by the design of the scheme EGS has better capabilities to perform well than that of SGRY.

b) **Nature of works and developments**

Not much difference is observed in the nature of works in EGS and SGRY. However, SGRY schemes gave importance to water and soil conservation work and more of building construction works.

Plantation and forest development works under EGS were taken up in developed and semi developed areas. EGS and SGRY projects from less developed belt have focused on soil and water conservation works.

c) **Funds allocation to the schemes**

Since SGRY distributed funds thinly, EGS looks better in fund allocation. EGS performed better in this regard since most of the EGS projects have higher fund allocation than SGRY.

d) **Income gains through wages and foodgarin**

The field data showed 53.81% of the EGS workers and 38.23% of the SGRY workers did receive wages including the amount of grain below Rs. 50/-. In terms of averages the EGS workers got wages at the rate of Rs. 56.35 per day including the amount of foodgrain.

Average Wages to workers, including the amount of foodgrain, under SGRY were at the rate of Rs. 70.70 per day. This is because the higher number of skilled and contract workers under SGRY increased the wage averages.
The workers from the semi developed regions received higher average wages. EGS wages they earned at the rate of at the rate of Rs. 61.57 as against SGRY at the rate of Rs. 96.0.

e) **Punctuality of wages, distribution**

The payment of wages and food grains under EGS were relatively more delayed. The data from the workers show that only 13.74% of the EGS workers and 67.64% of the SGRY workers could get timely wages.

SGRY had the same problems but relatively, it was better in payments and delivering food grains due to availability of having the funds and food grains in hand.

EGS workers from semi developed areas received very late payments and SGRY workers from developed and semi developed areas received wages more promptly.

f) **Machine use**

Data from Mukadam did reveal that in 16.66% of the EGS works occasional JCB machine was used. In 16.66% EGS works frequent small machines and in 16.66% cases occasional small machines were used. EGS works with no machines were 41.66%.

There was more widespread use of illegal heavy machinery, especially JCB earthmovers, to substitute for labour in SGRY projects than the EGS.

The data revealed that the less developed tribal region was better with respect to machine use since there was less use of machine.

g) **Involvement of contractor-middleman**

In 8.3% cases of EGS 100% involvement of big outside contractors was observed. In 16.66% cases of EGS not complete but higher involvement of the big outside contractors was found.
SGRY employed big outsider contractors on higher scale. 33.3% of SGRY cases were of 100% involvement of big outside contractors.

Involvement of contractors and middleman was observed in all the three regions. Involvement of big outsider contractors was highest in developed regions. It was followed by semi developed regions and less developed regions.

h) **Leakages and malpractices**

It is hard to collect data and explore leakages and malpractices precisely. There was very little difference but reportedly the level of leakages was comparatively higher in the SGRY cases than EGS cases. With more involvement of the contractors in SGRY higher level of malpractices was observed. Developed and semi developed areas were found more prone to such malpractices both under EGS and SGRY.

i) **Number of mandays work generated**

When we see at the averages, it was noticed that, as compared to the EGS, SGRY created less employment generation and less number of mandays for each village. The average mandays generated under the EGS for each worker under sample were 24.43 days.

The average mandays generated under the SGRY for each worker under sample were 17.54 mandays.

The sample data reveals that EGS works from developed region generated slightly more mandays to the workers than the other regions. The SGRY works from semi developed areas generated more mandays than other regions.

j) **Nature of monitoring**

Although not satisfactory, monitoring and supervision was better in EGS. EGS at least has some visible and operational
mechanisms of monitoring and supervising. On SGRY projects monitoring and supervision was very poor.

**k) Quality of vigilance and grievances redressal**

EGS has better mechanisms and working of grievances redressal. At least to some extent, that was reflected through the operation of the EGS worksites. 25% of the EGS work projects were visited by vigilance officers constituting Tahsildar and upper level agency officers.

Vigilance & Monitoring Committees at the State, District & Panchayat Samiti level constituted for overseeing the various programmes of the Ministry of Rural Development are held responsible to monitor SGRY projects. Their site visits were not observed on fields.

EGS works from the developed belt were more frequently visited by the vigilance squads.

**l) Completion of the work in time and reasons for the delays**

EGS took longer time to complete the works. SGRY did better in this regard with less number of delays.

More delays to complete the work were observed more in case of EGS from developed and semi developed belt.

**m) Quality of work and assets**

On an average EGS did relatively better in generating better quality assets. The credit should be given to the better mechanisms under the EGS.

The data revealed that, SGRY did not produce quality assets due to - a) Meager funds, b) Poor monitoring and supervision, c) Higher amount of works done by the contractors, d) inexperience of the Gram Sevaks and Talathis in managing such kind of works. EGS and SGRY works from less developed areas were better in
n) Level of utility

From the responses of the respondents, it could not be inferred that assets under SGRY were of better utility to the locals. There was no considerable deviation when the data for assessing regional variation was analysed. But still we can say that the tribal-less developed region created assets under both EGS and SGRY that were more useful for the community.

o) Who benefitted the most

The responses from different categories of respondents were confusing for, their district opinions about distribution of benefits. However, a general impression among the respondents was that, the SGRY was superior in delivering benefits to the villagers than the elites.

The backward sections the semi and less developed areas were benefitted slightly more from the EGS assets than the developed areas. Further, the SGRY assets, comparatively more benefitted to the elites from developed and semi developed areas. Villagers from backward sections were also benefitted more than the ones from the developed and semi developed areas.

p) Relevance of the scheme in need satisfaction

The responses from the Sarpanchs, Deputy Sarpanchs, Gram Sevaks and Talathis did reveal that EGS was more relevant for supportive employment and need satisfaction.

q) Future profits or outputs of the work assets

With regard to long-term village development, workers thought that, SGRY was slightly better. But EGS was outstanding for generating forestry and plantation assets that would benefit the villagers in long term and in comprehensive way.
r) **Outputs for the village**

Both EGS and SGRY works produced different outputs. But SGRY generated the feeling among the local villagers that they have received certain village specific and concrete outputs.

**CONCLUDING REMARKS AND CRITICAL COMMENTS**

As mentioned in the chapter-II, following research questions were framed to guide the research and an attempt has been made here to answer those questions with empirical data.

The research questions covering the first objective comprise:

a) How EGS and SGRY get planned and administered according to the scheme guidelines?

b) How they are different from each other on these lines?

The detailed description of both the schemes is presented in chapter IV.

The planning and administrative design of the two schemes is different from each other. Both the schemes have their own strong points. EGS has been extraordinary and novel scheme by the design. Its demand driven nature, right based–law supported design, fund generation through taxes on the richer classes made EGS a special scheme.

In terms of availability of funds, administrative set up, nature and size of the assets, and mechanisms of monitoring, vigilance, checks and balances EGS has been outstanding. Thus, the expectations from the EGS have been very high.

SGRY is also one of the biggest employment programmes in the world. SGRY design has at least five special features:

- Local planning and management, participation in decision making through Gram Sabhas and Gram Panchayats.
Specific targeting through stream-I (for some specified villages) on one hand, and generalized targeting (for every villages) on the other through stream-II which provided funds to the village according to the size of their general population and backward population.

- Freedom to villagers of selecting nature of the assets by their choice
- Capacity to manage or implement the selected works locally by the villagers on their own in participatory, democratic decentralization based
- Special resources and sub schemes for the most backward sections and reservation for the female workers participation

EGS and SGRY have different frameworks of planning and administrating the works in order to reach their objectives of poverty eradication through generating employment and building useful durable assets in rural areas.

The research questions pertaining to the second objective were related to aspects of EGS and SGRY implementation. The research questions were:

a) **Which PEP is more effective in its implementation at the grassroots level?**

The first striking observation brought out from this research exercise is that the institutional setups of design of the schemes and its special features have been hardly reflected in the implementation of both EGS and SGRY.

*Both EGS and SGRY largely have failed in planning to provide the sufficient works to the needy sections of the society. SGRY has budgetary limitations but EGS, despite having plenty of funds and resources did not do well to materialise the objectives. The*
implementers say they did not receive demands; workers did not seem eager to register their demands in writing for work; on the other hand workers are not getting adequate employment opportunities on EGS works. *The demand driven nature of EGS has been proved many times ineffective, for variety of reasons.*

EGS works are sanctioned to the villages the demands of the workers but because of efforts of the Gram Panchayats, intervention by the local politicians, stakeholders and sometimes due to the initiatives taken by the agency men. The unofficial middleman, elite stakeholder farmers and political leaders at different levels thus get scope to intervene and satisfy their interests as well. Political patronage associated with electoral processes also comes in picture in implementation of the schemes.

The most notable observation is about the inclusion of non poor in EGS and SGRY. The contractor, middlemen extract large amount of funds into their pockets. The wages under EGS and SGRY were generally low. Only the skilled workers and workers on contract could earn better. *Lower wages to EGS and SGRY resulted in lower transfer of earnings to the workers and thus the overall participation rate of the real poor became low.* Many villagers on the field said, they did see EGS and similar works unattractive because they get very low wages there. Around 35% of the EGS and SGRY workers received wages less than the minimum wages and the relatively better off, skilled workers get the handsome wages. These skilled workers were employed in higher proportion under SGRY projects and the average wages per day to the workers were beyond Rs. 70/-. There was no uniform pattern in EGS to provide foodgrains but the foodgrains were distributed on very few worksites there. SGRY despite having prescribed norms of distributing foodgrains, it did not utilise the foodgrain quota from the centre.
Delays in distributing wages and foodgrain have been usual lacuna in both of the scheme. SGRY did slightly better due to the funds available in their hands. Long delays in the payment of wages to workers were observed due to complicated norms and red-tapism of the bureaucratic procedure and also due to delays in taking measurement of the works done by the workers. EGS works are generally larger and technically more complex than SGRY projects, and therefore intrinsically more likely to fall victim to logistical or organisational delays. Waiting for payments has been the most unpleasant part of EGS from workers’ point of view.

Lapses in providing amenities at both EGS and SGRY worksites were significant. Even potable water was not provided on some sites. Implementers of SGRY showed more negligence about this. When asked why he did not provided prescribed amenities to the workers, one Sarpanch informally told, the rules in the books are most of the time not meant to follow.

Quality of assets generated under PEPs is mostly dependent on supervision, monitoring and vigilance. A general tendency of negligence regarding supervision, monitoring and vigilance is observed in the implementation of both of the schemes. A small soil conservation work projects under SGRY and one big project under EGS were designed so badly that they were washed out in the first heavy rain after their construction. EGS, despite having very systematised monitoring and vigilance mechanisms, the real picture is showing big discrepancy.

SGRY has intrinsically poor mechanisms of monitoring and vigilance. That reflected in its improper implementation at ground level. Technical supervision on the SGRY work sites was very poor.

This may be due to systems of vested interests, nexus, and bureaucracy-local elite-politicians alliance. Some of the higher-level
implementing officers are genuinely working to break shackles but these efforts are proved insufficient.

*Cases of malpractices reported were might be the tip of the iceberg, but they reflect systemic loopholes.* EGS has record of cases of vigilance and grievances redressal. It reveals that very few of the culprits, not more than 10% were actually punished. Punishing the individual involved is also not adequate. The government data of Nashik district shows that most of the cases of EGS grievances launched were based on the complaints made by the political leaders or by the civil society organisations. These grievances are associated with malpractices of measurement, muster wages, amenities, paying excess wages, poor quality of work and use of illegal heavy machines like JCB on the worksites.

SGRY did not have any oraganised mechanisms and maintenance of such information. But the ground conditions show that there is less control over the agencies and other implementers.

*The government mechanisms to control the malpractices, irregularities, grievances, lacunas and limitations of the both of the scheme implementation are insufficient. However, EGS is better in comparison with SGRY.*

To sum up it can be said that EGS did better than SGRY in following areas of implementation:

1. Relatively more funds were available in comparison with SGRY.
2. Its demand driven capacity, despite full of saviour limitations and lacunas from the machinery of implementation, proved potentiality to reach the needy sections for longer period than SGRY.
3. It did relatively better in supervising and monitoring the worksites with better mechanisms
4. Measurements under EGS were relatively frequent and found more caring about the regulations
5. EGS projects were bigger than SGRY
6. EGS was seen to be relatively better in providing employment opportunities to the local people
7. In general terms, technicalities of 60:40 ratios were neither followed in EGS nor in SGRY. Still, EGS was relatively better. EGS also did better in employing less outside big contractors and heavy illegal machinery. Despite ban on contractors and machinery on SGRY worksites, intermediaries, contractors were observed more on SGRY sites than the EGS.
8. EGS proved better in not excluding women. SGRY guideline specifies that 30% of its employment opportunities reserved for women. This norm was not followed under SGRY.
9. In some cases, the agency implementing officers did well in performing their job. Workers and villagers too appreciated their work. But in most of they did not performed well. This was more remarkable on SGRY worksites.

SGRY on the other hand, was observed better with respect to following:
1. SGRY worksites were more within the village. People think that they were thus more useful for them.
2. SGRY projects also seemed to perform better to have fewer, smaller time gaps in project implementation.
3. SGRY implementation was better in the sense that there were less delays in paying wages and foodgrains to the workers
4. SGRY projects also seemed better with regard to completion of projects in stipulated time.
5. Most of the respondents from Gram Sevaks, Sarpanchs and Deputy Sarpanchs reported that SGRY was better implemented than EGS. Except Talathi and workers all favoured SGRY than EGS.

6. On an average SGRY paid better wages to the workers

b) **What are the conditions associated with better or poor implementation of the two PEPs at grassroots level?**

The conditions conducive to poor implementation were diverse. Most prominent among them were as follows:

A) Conditions associated with better implementation

1) Some agency officers were good in performing their role and also co-operative to the workers
2) SGRY observed to be more flexible so that workers could negotiate
3) Earlier experience of the workers on such PEPs help them to negotiate with the implementers
4) Unity and homogeneity of the villagers helped to plan out for useful assets under SGRY
5) Distance from home to worksites or locality of the workers

B) Conditions associated with poor implementation

1) Poor educational background of the workers make them poor in understanding whether the measurement was proper or not
2) Poor knowledge of making demands under EGS
3) Economic dependence of the workers on the ruling elites who dominated the SGRY works
4) Poor knowledgebase of the workers and villagers about the implementation aspects of the schemes.
5) Implementer-contractor-politician's liaison
6) Personal stakes of the rural elites
7) Mistimed works i.e. works did not get started when the workers in desperate need for employment

8) Period of workers’ need of employment and actual opening of the EGS and SGRY works did not match (mistimed works)

9) Poor participation of local workers

10) No efforts from the implementers to make aware the workers in making demands and in studying the rural needs.

c) **Whether there is variation in implementation of the two PEPs in terms of the difference in the levels of development?**

There was no significant variation as per the three areas of development selected under the sample. Still, some variation was observed in several aspects of implementation. Those include:

1. The workers from less developed region being more needy and vulnerable to the problems of droughts and poverty responded well in participating both EGS and SGRY worksites. They were found more aware of demand making under EGS.

2. On both on EGS and SGRY worksites, local workers participated in better proportion in less developed areas.

3. In semi-developed areas, the 60:40 ratios were not adhered to.

   It was double than what was observed in case of the SGRY projects from the developed and less developed areas.

4. Intermediaries, contractors were observed more on worksites of SGRY in developed and semi developed areas than the EGS.

5. Average female participation in EGS from developed and semi developed belt was surprisingly higher. Female participation in semi developed and less developed regions was higher in SGRY works.
6. EGS wages in semi developed areas were little higher than the other areas. SGRY wages in semi developed areas were remarkably higher (Rs.96/-) than the other areas.

7. Sarpanchs and Deputy Sarpanchs in general and specifically from semi developed and less developed areas, preferred SGRY than EGS on scales of implementation.

The research questions pertaining to the third objective were:

a) **Which PEP is more effective in its performance at the grassroots level?**

It is also difficult to say that any one of the scheme was better in performance than the other. In general and relative terms both the scheme performed well with respect to some aspects of performance. About 90% workers working on the EGS and SGRY sites were representing the needy tribal and low caste people. As far as the inclusion of the backward labourers to the sites is concerned both of the schemes did well in targeting the poor.

With regard to performance EGS did better in case of:

1. Employing relatively less illegal machines on the sites. There was more widespread use of illegal heavy machinery, especially JCB earthmovers, to substitute for labour in SGRY projects.

2. Involvement of big outsider contractors was relatively less on EGS worksites.

3. EGS was slightly better than SGRY in terms of less leakages and malpractices.

4. Monitoring, supervision and vigilance were better in EGS.

5. Quality of assets generated under EGS was better. SGRY, in general terms, did not produce quality assets.

6. The respondents believed that EGS was relevant for supportive employment and need satisfaction, especially during the adverse conditions.
7. EGS was outstanding for generating forestry and plantation assets that would benefit the villagers in long term and comprehensive way.
8. EGS generated better employment to the rural poor
9. EGS with less contractors on the sites, facilitated better inclusion of women workers

On the other hand, SGRY performed better in case of following:

1. SGRY transferred better average earnings to the workers.
   Average Wages to workers, including the amount of foodgrain, under SGRY were at the rate of Rs. 70.70 per day while as EGS paid at the rate of Rs. 56.35.
2. Assets generated under SGRY seemed to be of better utility to the locals since most of its projects were related to their urgent need.
3. SGRY was superior in delivering benefits to the villagers than the elites.
4. SGRY produced such an environment that, the workers could better negotiate with the implementers about advance payments, wages and foodgrains. The observations from the field showed that some of the workers did such negotiations. Thus, SGRY was seen more flexible in nature.
5. In terms of the long term village development, workers thought that, SGRY was slightly better. SGRY generated the feeling among the local villagers that they have received certain village specific and concrete and usable outputs.

b) **What are the conditions associated with better or poor performance of the two PEPs at the grassroots level?**

   A) Conditions associated with better performance
      1) Better co-ordination among the agencies and the villages
2) Better contacts of the villagers with the Panchayat Samiti and Zilla Parishad
3) Positive political interventions
4) Workers in some of the villages had some NGO support. (Vachan, Pragati Abhiyaan, Lok Adhar, Shramajivi Sanghatana are some of the NGOs and action groups working in Nashik district in building awareness about EGS and MREGS).
5) Better monitoring and supervision in case of EGS
6) Some mobilizations like strike for delaying the wages

B) Conditions associated with poor performance
1) Poor participation of the worker-villages in Gram Sabhas
2) Involvement of big contractor on sites
3) Elitist stakes and negative political interventions
4) Poor capabilities and bargaining power of the rural poor
5) Less NGO or action group support
6) Poor monitoring and supervision in case of SGRY
7) No knowledge of right to work under EGS
8) Leakages and malpractices
9) Weak capability of the rural poor/workers in general
10) Poor vigilance
11) No practical support from the taluka and state level monitoring committees

c) **Whether there is variation in the levels of performance of the two PEPs in terms of the levels of development?**

In relation with the performance of the schemes there are very few regional variations. Those are as follows:

1. The less developed tribal region there was less use of machines.
2. Involvement of big outsider contractors was highest in developed region.

3. Developed and semi developed areas were found more prone to certain malpractices both under EGS and SGRY.

4. EGS works from developed region generated slightly more mandays work than the other regions. While SGRY works from semi developed areas generated more mandays work than other regions.

5. In developed areas monitoring and supervision was better.

6. EGS works from the developed belt were more frequently visited by the vigilance squads.

7. EGS and SGRY works from less developed areas were better in quality.

8. Assets created under both EGS and SGRY were more useful for the community in less developed tribal areas.

9. EGS was more felt suitable to the rural poor from the less developed areas but they were still not very happy about the number of mandays of employment they got during the lean agricultural season.

10. Workers from less developed areas were slightly better in getting organized and in mobilizing against the EGS implementers.

**Critical Comments**

From the whole exercise of this research it has found that neither scheme is unambiguously superior to the other, each performed better in some respects and in turn outranked in case of some areas. Both the schemes did fail to withstand their specialized ambitious objectives.
On one hand, the “guarantee of work” aspect in the theory (Act of 1977) of EGS could not come into reality since nobody from the Nashik district in last two and half decades has received “unemployment allowance”. The workers and the villagers were highly ignorant about the concept of right to work involved in EGS framework. Those who tried to get such right realised through demanding unemployment allowance at many places in Maharashtra failed to do so. Therefore the claim of right based EGS has no realistic evidence. The state’s discourse of right based PEPs has thus turned out to be just welfarist exercise. SGRY projects on the other hand, do not conform to the expectations of 'democratic localists'. The PRIs in Nashik district like all others from India are with weak capabilities. The capabilities of Gram Sabhas and Gram Panchayats have been judged in this study in terms of- 1) Frequency of Gram Panchayat and Gram Sabha meetings 2) Attendance in the meetings 3) Information sharing in the meetings 4) Number of demands they raised 5) Who takes the decision etc. The information and onsite observations revealed that the poor, the potential workers have very weak political abilities and voice. The principles and spirit of democracy are very hard to locate out at the grassroots level. This is especially very difficult in Nashik district as majority of its EGS and SGRY workers are tribals characterised with subordination, less assertiveness, and less awareness.

It is quite suitable here to quote Niraja Jayal. Niraja Jayal (1999:25), rightly says that, “the concentration of social power is not reducible to, and can be as undesirable as the concentration of economic power, and indeed we know that the institution of society are frequently undemocratic, as they actively neglect or subordinate weaker social groups. Social relations of domination and subordination tend to distort democracy, such as that the voice of
powerful get expressed (through interest groups for example) while the powerless go in largely unrepresented, except in the formal and ineffectual sense of periodically participating in election”. She further says (Niraja Jayal 1999:255), the language of democracy is as far removed from the lives of the affected citizens. Claims of right and justice find no space in an invisible vocabulary of poorest”.

The planners and architects of the scheme were under impression that the rights and democratic decision making might be taking place at the grassroots level. But the assumption was proved wrong. Therefore to answer precisely wheatear right based centralised EGS is better than participatory democracy based SGRY is not possible.

The issues of ineffectiveness of the rural PEPs are often linked with the socio-economic dimensions of the rural poor but political dimension has been equally important. G. Shabbir Cheema (1985:6) rightly pointed that, “many of those who formulate policies and programmes assume that once policies (and programmes) are announced the bureaucracy will implement them and the intended results will be achieved in a technically competent way. However, the reality of the situation in the developing countries of Asia shows that the implementation of rural development projects is not merely a technical process of carrying out pre-conceived plans but rather one of political interaction”. The information and onsite observations revealed that the rural poor, the potential workers have very weak political abilities. The poor sections of the rural society have almost no voice in PRIs at various levels from Zilla Parishad to Gram Sabha. The incapability of the poor, caste domination, class domination, economic dependency over the higher class big farmers and games of electoral politics around villages has still remained strong there.
PEPs in India and all over the world are stressing on ideas of
democratic decentralization, participatory management of the PRPs
and social audit. The latest NREGS and its versions are also focusing
on these ideals. The reality of the situation from Nashik district reveals
that these ideas will not work without awareness building, capacity
building of the village poor backwards and without strengthening the
Gram Sabhas.

If one wants to work on to make poverty eradication programmes
perform better in favour of the poor, he should see there have been
serious lacunas in their implementation that have resulted the poor
performance of the PEPs and those should be removed.

The latest NREGS and its state wise versions have made several
positive alterations in implementation by focusing on the ideals like
awareness building, capacity building, transparency, better vigilance
and monitoring, social audit, inclusion of Rozgar Sevak, Gram Sabhas
and NGOs. They are showing some positive signs regarding
implementation and performance of NREGS but paradoxically the
problems in the earlier EGS have been carried forward in Maharashtra
despite the better reforms in implementation.

Maharashtra, the originator EGS and long experienced state
regarding its implementation is lagging behind when we compare it
with other states like Rajasthan, Andhra Pradesh. The village level
socio-economic and political conditions brought out by this research
exercise in Nashik district showed that, mere policy reforms will not be
sufficient to improve the performance of the schemes. Sheer democratic
decentralisation and localised management of the PEPs is also a
doubtful weapon in bringing PEPs in favour of the rural poor.
Organisation and empowerment of the poor, pressure from the civil
society, use of means and spaces provided in the socio- political and
legislative systems in India like IT, RTI, right based mobilizations, policy advocacy must be emphasized.

**Suggestions for the EGS, MREGS and NREGS**

The rural poor in India are having better avenues to get rid of the issues related with the poverty, livelihood and unemployment with the advent of NREGS. The NREGS has raised heavy funds for generating employment and assets in the rural belts with assurance of right to employment up to 100 days a year for each family. Now, with the emergence of NREGS, Maharashtra EGS is subsiding, although not completely vanished. SGRY has merged into NREGS. So, all the suggestions and alternative borne out of this research exercise need to be focused on NREGS and its state wise versions like MREGS in Maharashtra.

Implementation of MREGS in Nashik district has recently been studied by Pragati Abhiyan, a Nashik based NGO. The study reveals that most of the problems of EGS have been carried forward to MREGS. Despite many reformations and improvisations, the problems of implementations have been observed. Considering those, following suggestions may be given:

1) To create knowledge base of these schemes among the rural masses by providing training and concentration is necessary. Education and awareness, can contribute to capacity building, reduction of vulnerability. There should be special governmental and civil society promoted institutional arrangements.

2) Demand making should be enhanced with some assistance to the rural poor with training and practical guidance with the help of NGOs.
3) Quality control mechanisms should be made effective. In order to do this, monitoring, supervision and vigilance needs to be more accurate and regular.

4) Separate agencies for implementing NREGS should be made so that the routine agencies should not be overburdened.

5) In grievances redressal, workers or their representatives should have representation.

6) There should be better and transparent record keeping, reporting and data sharing supported with latest information technology like computer and internet. To do so ‘Social Audit’ should be made more practical and effective. Right to information can be used to control malpractices around PEPs.

7) The works should match length and time of the lean agricultural period and they should provide adequate employment. The involvement of middlemen and contractors must be effectively arrested to control mistargeting.

8) Rural housing, Sanitation, Jal Swaraj, Self-help/cooperative groups, women’s self-employment/ business activities and adult education centers are some of the arenas where these programmes can contribute indirectly to improve rural environment. They should be integrated with PEP s.

9) To control vested interest politics and patronage kind of leadership in the rural areas, local youth leaders, educational organizations and village study circles can play crucial role.

10) The NGOs and action groups in respective areas must be encouraged to take more interest in the programme implementation, monitoring and planning.

11) It is necessary to create a sense of collective participation and participatory democracy through the empowerment of Gram Sabha and other Panchayati institutions.
12) Tax Payers’ organisations should be created and strengthened so that they will put some control on government while implementing EGS since EGS funds are mostly collected through tax payers.

References: