CHAPTER-VII
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Successful implementation of development programmes requires adequate funds, appropriate policy framework, formulation of suitable plan schemes, and effective delivery machinery. Past experience has suggested that availability of funds is no panacea for tackling the problems of poverty, backwardness and low human development in India; it may be necessary but not a sufficient condition. The determining factor seems to be the capability of the funding Ministries/ state governments to formulate viable schemes and the delivery system to optimally utilise funds and achieve sustainable growth. Issues of poor governance and weak implementation can no longer be stepped aside as merely field problems, these need to face squarely and redressed at the planning stage itself.

The Government of India is involved in a large number of programmes that are in the state list of the constitution. As these are implemented by the states, GOI has no control over the staff, or over day-to-day supervision or coordination so necessary for the success of such schemes.

Problem

A number of plan schemes are in operation with similar objectives targeting the same population. These should be converged, and the schemes that are not yielding results should be weeded out. The tendency to proliferate centrally sponsored schemes need to be curbed, and more funds should be provided to state specific programmes, as project based central assistance to the state plans with such budgetary arrangement, where central Ministries have adequate control over flow of funds but states too have flexibility in deciding the details of schemes. Role of the central Ministries should be capacity building, inter-sectoral coordination, and detailed monitoring and impact studies of state sector projects, so that the gain from public
spending is maximised. CSS funds should also be used for enhancing the budgetary allocation of successful development schemes that are being run by state governments on their own, or for meeting the state contribution for donor assisted programmes for poverty alleviation and social infrastructure. Punjab has a special place in India due to its geographical conditions. The total border area of the state is 6369.82 Sq. kms (approx). The total population of the four border districts as per 2011 census is 7936818. Since independence, there has been a substantial amount of trans-border activities of smuggling, border crossers and Pak spies. The problem became more serious with the advent of cross-border terrorism.

The border areas of India bordering Pakistan are more hostile than those, bordering with other countries. The reason has been that decade long terrorism in Punjab multiplied various problems of the state, such as illegal migration, drug trafficking, illegal trade, crime, insurgency, and killing of innocent civilians. In order to check these problems, more number of security personnel had been continuously deployed. The people living in border areas have been facing various socio-economic problems and psychological tensions. The constraints and prospects of the development along the border areas assume unique significance in the process of planning and development due to specific needs of the people living in the stressed conditions. However, the magnitude of the problems differ from region to region depending upon the geographical condition, socio-cultural set up of the region and attitude of the neighboring country.

The main characteristic features of the border areas have been inaccessibility and insecurity. Due to it, the border areas need special treatment for accelerated and integrated sustainable development. The creation of a congenial environment to impart a sense of security among the border residents should be a part of any
development strategy. While studying problems of the border areas, there is a need to make a comprehensive explanation into different socio-economic, cultural, psychological, environmental aspects in an integrated manner to identify the real issues. Majority border areas of Punjab do not form part of some backward isolated region of the state but has been rather well developed, yet they are suffering from acute discontent, both economic as well as social.

The government of India has been implementing a number of centrally sponsored schemes but there is only one scheme which has been launched specifically for the development of border; that is Border Area Development Programme (BADP) with the objective of building the much needed social and physical infrastructure to propel normal development activities and to enhance household income to promote economic growth. There are many other schemes which are being implemented in the border areas as well as in other regions of the state.

A huge amount of funds has been expended on such schemes over the period of time but no specific effort has been made to evaluate the socio-economic impact of such schemes in the region. This study, thus intends to make a systematic evaluation of the impact of major centrally sponsored schemes on the rural livelihoods. For the purpose three schemes namely; Border Area Development Programme (BADP), Member of Parliament Local Area Development Scheme (MPLADS) and Pardhan Mantri Gram Sark Yojana (PMGSY) have been selected for the evaluation in border areas of Punjab.

The main objective of the BADP is to meet the special developmental needs of the people living in remote and inaccessible areas situated near the international border and to saturate the border areas with the entire essential infrastructure through convergence of Central/State/BADP/Local schemes and participatory approach. The
BADP is a 100% centrally funded programme. The BADP cover 362 border blocks, which are located along the international border and come under 96 border districts of 17 states viz Arunachal Pradesh, Assam, Bihar, Gujarat, Himachal Pradesh, Jammu & Kashmir, Manipur, Meghalaya, Mizoram, Nagaland, Punjab, Rajasthan, Sikkim, Tripura, Uttar Pradesh, Uttarakhand and West Bengal. Funds are allocated to the states on the basis of (i) length of international border (ii) population of border blocks and (iii) area of border blocks with these criteria having equal weightage. Besides, 15% weightage is given to hilly, desert and Rann of Kutchh areas on account of difficult terrain, scarcity of resources, higher cost of construction etc.

Member of Parliament Local Area Development Scheme (MPLADS) was introduced in December, 1993 to enable the members of parliament to identify and get implemented small works of capital nature based on locally felt needs with emphasis on creation of durable assets in their respective constituencies. The objective of the scheme is to enable MPs to recommend works of developmental nature with emphasis on the creation of durable community assets based on the locally felt needs to be taken up in their constituencies. Right from inception of the scheme, durable assets of national priorities viz. drinking water, primary education, public health, sanitation and roads, etc. are being created.

In 1993-94, when the scheme was launched, an amount of Rs. 5 lakh per Member of Parliament was allotted which became rupees one crore per annum from 1994-95 per MP constituency. This was stepped up to Rs. 2 crore from 1998-99 and Rs. 5.00 crores from financial year 2011-12.

Rural road connectivity is not only a key component of rural development by promoting access to economic and social services and thereby generating increased agricultural incomes and productive employment opportunities in India, it is also as a
result, a key ingredient in ensuring sustainable poverty reduction. Notwithstanding the efforts made, over the years, at the state and central levels, through different programmes, about 40% of the habitations in the country are still not connected by all-weather roads. It is well known that even where connectivity has been provided, the roads constructed are of such quality (due to poor construction or maintenance) that they cannot always be categorised as all-weather roads. With a view to redressing the situation, government have launched the Pradhan Mantri Gram Sadak Yojana on 25th December, 2000 to provide all-weather access to unconnected habitations. The Pradhan Mantri Gram Sadak Yojana (PMGSY) is a 100% centrally sponsored scheme. 50% of the cess on high speed diesel is earmarked for this Programme.

It has been observed that border area of Punjab has been deprived of basic necessary amenities. The socio-economic level of people residing in border area is low compared to residents of other part of the state. If one moves in the state and enter in the border area he will feel that suddenly he has entered in some other state due to deteriorated conditions of roads lack of other basic infrastructure. One can easily feel the gap in the availability of infrastructure. The government has made an attempt to fill this gap by introducing various centrally sponsored schemes particularly Border Area Development Programme (BADP). There are many other normal centrally sponsored schemes operational in other parts of the country but also available in the border areas. These schemes have been in operation since decades. However, there has not been any systematic evaluation of the scheme to assess its impact on the well-being of the people and the effectiveness of the implementation methods adopted by the implementing agencies. Nor do the monitoring mechanisms adopted by the implementing agencies and the Planning Commission throw up information that could provide even a rough assessment of the performance of the scheme. Also occasional
media reports on illegal activities like smuggling, unaccounted trade, terrorist activities, etc., seem to indicate that the centrally sponsored schemes have not made the intended impact. Thus, it is pertinent to evaluate the impact of different government schemes under Border Area Development Programmes (BADP), Member of Parliament Local Area Development Schemes (MPLADS) and Pardhan Mantri Gram Sadak Yojana (PMGSY) on the socio-economic development of the border development blocks. The impact analysis of different programs and schemes is necessary to get the feedback to decide the future course of action and direction of the development. The present study is an attempt to analyze the impact of different activities implemented/being implemented under the selected schemes, on the total development of the border development of the state of Punjab. The study emphasis on identification of the existing levels of development, existing gaps in infrastructure, employment opportunities and status of government schemes in operation under BADP, MPLADS and PMGSY.

Objectives

Present study was undertaken with the main objectives to examine the impact of centrally sponsored development schemes in the border area of Punjab. The study aimed at examining the following specific objectives:

i. To evaluate the impact of different activities implemented/being implemented under major development schemes of the government on the dynamics of socio-economic change and occupational mobility among the local people of the selected border development blocks.

ii. To assess the availability of funds and existing status of development infrastructure, problems of its maintenance and the level of critical gap in the physical and social infrastructure requirement of the blocks for sustainable development.
iii. To assess the impact, performance and effectiveness of the scheme with special reference to create confidence and sense of security among the local people under major centrally sponsored schemes sponsored by the central government.

iv. To evaluate the existing levels of development and identify the potential areas for intervention for future development as per the requirements of the people and scope of people’s participation.

v. To identify the problems and potentials for better utilization of the infrastructure created under major centrally sponsored schemes for the mobilization of local resources and skills for new avenues of employment and income generating activities.

vi. To suggest an action plan for socio-economic development and occupational diversity for sustainable human and regional development with special reference to built confidence and sense of security among the local people.

Methodology

The nature of the study was such that it required both primary as well as secondary data. The secondary data were obtained from various published sources on various aspects of border area development programme. As such most of the secondary data were collected from the Punjab Governments’ official website. A multistage sampling technique was employed to reach out the ultimate sampling units. At the first stage all four border districts were chosen purposively. At the next stage two blocks from each sample district were chosen randomly. At the third stage two villages each were chosen randomly from each sample block. At the last stage 10 respondents belonging to different socio-economic group were selected randomly from each village and thus, making a sample of 160 respondents.

Along with this primary data has also been collected from the government employees working in the border area under different departments of the state.
government with the help of pretested schedules. For this purpose 60 employees of different departments were interviewed.

The requisite primary data pertaining to various aspects of border area development programme and their perception about it were collected through personal interview method on pre-tested schedule. The data were analyzed by using simple statistical tools such as averages, percentages, etc.

In the present study selected centrally sponsored schemes namely; Border Area Development Programme, Member of Parliament Local Area Development Scheme and Pardhan Mantri Gram Sadak Yojana were evaluated from various aspects in the selected border areas of Punjab.

Findings

It has been analysed in the study that under BADP Ferozepur district had received maximum funds under the scheme and the Amritsar district was the least recipient. Since financial year 2004-05 Ferozepur district had received maximum Rs.5179.97 lacs, whereas Amritsar district got only Rs. 1678.29 lacs. Other districts namely; Gurdaspur and Tarn Taran received Rs. 2621.03 lacs and Rs. 2003.20 lacs respectively.

Under border Area Development Programme funds were released for various types of development works. Under the scheme government of India approved the work under six sectors namely infrastructure, education, health, agriculture and allied, social and security related works. In the present study sector-wise utilization of funds was reviewed.

It has been observed that in Amritsar district maximum amount of funds received under BADP were utilized on infrastructure sector. Block Ajnala had utilized 65.72 percent and block Chogawan utilized 79.77 percent of funds for infrastructure
development. It has been found that there were many small works like construction of streets and drains, phirnies, approach roads, roads to deras etc covered under infrastructure sector. Block Ajnala had utilized 16.29 percent funds on education, 3.43 percent on health, 2.12 percent on agriculture, 4.32 percent on social and 8.12 percent funds on security related works. Block Chogawan utilized 1.70 percent funds on education, 1.66 percent of health, 3.12 percent on agriculture, 6.77 percent on social and 6.98 percent funds on security related works.

In Ferozepur district maximum amount of funds received under BADP were utilized on infrastructure sector. Block Ferozepur had utilized 72 percent and block Guru Har Sahai had utilized 57.40 percent of funds for infrastructure development. Block Ferozepur utilized 4.02 percent funds on education, 0.48 percent on health, 2.61 percent on agriculture, 12.34 percent on social and 8.80 percent funds on security related works. Block Guru Har Sahai had utilized 9.10 percent funds on education, 1.25 percent on health, 3.74 percent on agriculture, 21.23 percent on social and 7.27 percent funds on security related works.

In Gurdaspur district maximum amount of funds received under BADP were utilized on infrastructure sector. Block Dera Baba Nanak had utilized 70.32 percent and block Kalanaur utilized 91.49 percent of funds for infrastructure development. Block Dera Baba Nanak had utilized 3.43 percent funds on education, 1.49 percent on health, 13.74 percent on agriculture, 1.43 percent on social and 9.60 percent funds on security related works. Kalnaur block had utilized 3.55 percent funds on education, 0.88 percent on health, 0.38 percent on agriculture, 2.11 percent on social and 1.58 percent funds on security related works.

In Tarn Taran district block Bhikhiwind had utilized 80.00 percent and block Valtoha utilized 83.19 percent of funds for infrastructure development. Block
Bhikhiwind had utilized 3.62 percent funds on education, 0.57 percent on health, 2.99 percent on agriculture, 6.20 percent on social and 6.62 percent funds on security related works. Valtoha block had utilized 2.67 percent funds on education, 0.36 percent on health, 3.76 percent on agriculture, 2.58 percent on social and 7.44 percent funds on security related works.

It has been analysed that since the inception of MPLAD scheme the state of Punjab had received Rs. 58775.10 lacs from government of India under account of different MPs. Jalandhar district had received maximum amount (Rs. 7491.22 lacs) of funds under MPLADS but the district could utilize only 89.90 percent of funds. Mukatsar district ranked first in the state tally by 100 percent utilization of funds received under MPLADS. Border district Amritsar received Rs. 7387.80 lacs out of which it could utilize Rs. 7129.17 lacs and ranked 3rd. Among other border districts Ferozepur received Rs. 3352.66 lacs and utilized Rs. 3227.05 lacs, Gurdaspur received Rs. 4872.43 lacs and utilized Rs. 4505.08 lacs and district Tarn Taran had received Rs. 1650.84 lacs and utilized Rs. 1539.56 lacs.

It has been found that under MPLADS 62927 works were sanctioned in the state of Punjab since the inception of the scheme, out of these, 58184 works were completed with work completion percentage of 92.46. The maximum number of works (9425) were sanctioned in Jalandhar district, out of which 8732 works were completed and it ranked 11th in the state’s tally. District Mansa ranked first with 100 percent works completion and district Ropar ranked 15th with only 0.99 percent work completion. Among border districts Ferozepur, Gurdaspur, Amritsar and Tarn Taran ranked, 4th, 8th, 9th and 14th respectively. It has been observed that except Ferozepur district all the other border districts had performed poorly in implementation of works sanctioned under MPLADS.
The block-wise availability of funds in the border districts of Punjab has also been examined. It has been observed that in Amritsar district MP Lok Sabha had sanctioned Rs. 255.50 lacs for 107 development works, out of which only 10 works costing Rs. 20.00 lacs were sanctioned for border block Ajnala. The top priority of MP was Majitha block. In Ferozepur district MP (Lok Sabha) had recommended 135 works costing Rs. 280.99 lacs, out of which Rs. 38.00 lacs were sanctioned for border block Guru Har Sahai, Rs. 48.50 lacs for Jalalabad, Rs. 24.00 lacs for Mamdot and Rs. 14.50 lacs were sanctioned for various development works in Fajilka block. In Gurdaspur district the MP had sanctioned Rs. 23.20 lacs for border block Gurdaspur and Rs. 8.00 lacs for border block Dinanagar. In Tarn Taran district concerned MP (Lok Sabha) had sanctioned Rs.38.00 lacs only in one border block Valtoha.

It is surprising to know that the concerned MPs did not wish to give any funds for the development of their border blocks from their MPLADS funds but at the same time they demanded special package for border districts and border state.

It has been observed that under PMGSY Amritsar district (including Tarn Taran district) had received Rs. 21045.98 lacs since 2004-05 for the construction of rural roads under PMGSY, which was highest share. Moga district was the least recipient of funds under this scheme with Rs. 4231.96 lacs making a share of only 2.54 percent of total funds received by the state government.

Border District Ferozepur had received Rs 18188.81 lacs (10.92 percent ) and Gurdaspur district Rs. 10220.69 lacs ( 6.13 percent). Keeping in view the worst condition of roads in the border areas of Punjab, Prime Minister of India announced a special package of Rs. 23535.84 lacs in financial year 2009-10 for the rural roads of border districts of Punjab ; Amritsar, Ferozepur and Gurdaspur of Punjab. The government had sanctioned the amount in financial year 2009-10 but the executing agencies still have not started the works in the concerned area because of official and technical formalities.
It was found that 10 roads measuring 102.99 KMs of rural roads were constructed in Amritsar district since 2004-05 with an expenditure of Rs. 3780.29 lacs. Block Rayya had received maximum funds of Rs. 873.02 lacs (23.10 percent). In border block Ajnala and Chgawan Rs. 732.03 lacs and Rs. 584.66 lacs have been utilised respectively.

In case of Tarn Taran district 13 roads measuring 206.57 KMs were constructed since 2004-05 with an expenditure of Rs. 7267.44 lacs. Block Khadoor Sahib had utilised maximum funds of Rs. 2535.84 lacs (34.90 percent).

It has also been observed that Rs. 279.63 lacs, Rs. 563.12 lacs and Rs. 614.17 lacs had been spent in border block Valtoha, Bhikhiwind and Gandiwind respectively.

In Ferozepur district 21 roads measuring 272.93 KMs of rural roads were constructed since 2004-05 with an expenditure of Rs. 8630.95 lacs. Block Abohar had utilised maximum funds of Rs. 1763.62 lacs (20.43 percent).

It has been analysed that Rs. 1241.35 lacs, Rs. 1003.25 lacs, Rs. 201.31 lacs, Rs. 392.36 lacs and Rs. 312.48 lacs were spent in border block Jalalabad, Guru Har Sahai, Khuian Server, Mamdot and Ferozepur respectively.

In Gurdaspur district 42 roads measuring 135.83 KMs had been constructed since 2004-05 with an expenditure of Rs 2785.60 lacs. Block Kahnuwan had utilised maximum funds of Rs. 768.30 lacs (27.58 percent).

It has also been observed that under PMGSY during financial year 2004-05 border block Narot Jaimal Singh, Dinanagar and Dera Baba Nanak had utilised Rs. 13.50 lacs, Rs. 77.60 lacs and Rs. 53.19 lacs respectively. During financial year 2005-06 and 2006-07 border block Dinanagar and Dera Baba Nanak had utilized Rs. 490.40 lacs and Rs. 488.80 lacs respectively.
It has been analysed that implementation of PMGSY was very slow in the state of Punjab. Too much of official formalities take years to commence the work. Sometimes due to delay in utilization of funds under PMGSY government of India had also stopped the further release.

Impact, Performance and Effectiveness of the selected centrally sponsored schemes has also been analysed. It has been found that many schemes had already been operational in the state of Punjab for the upliftment of educational infrastructure since years but in case of border districts no positive impact was seen. It was found in the study that 100 percent villages had Anganwari Centres for pre schooling kids. Similarly 100 percent villages had primary schools, but after primary level of education situation was not so good. It has been observed that only 12.50 and 25 percent selected border villages had availability of middle and secondary schools respectively. No selected border village had any ITI, polytechnic college or other professional institutions. It seems to be the worst educational infrastructure scenario. What the educational status of people be expected when the villages have hardly any educational institution above primary level. There was poor health infrastructure availability in border areas. It seems that people were left on the grace of God only as there were only 31.25 percent of villages with either a hospital or dispensary. Tarn Taran district had 50 percent of villages with a government hospital or dispensary where as all other districts had only 25 percent of dispensaries or hospital. The animals had also been suffering from poor health facilities. There was not even a single big industry in the selected border villages. Only industry available was either village level cottage industry or very small scale industry.

It has been found that selected border villages had received only Rs. 86.96 lacs for various development activities under BADP. Majority of funds were received for
the construction of roads i.e. 74.63 percent. Second highest percentage was 10.35 which were utilized for the drainage and irrigation purposes. It has been analysed that only Rs. 7.06 lacs were utilized for the development of education infrastructure in the selected border villages and its percentage came out to be 8.12. For other works such as construction of cremation shed, construction of Dharmsala etc. Rs. 6.00 lacs were received.

Under MPLAD scheme Rs. 23.56 lacs were received for various development activities during last three years. Majority of funds had been received for the construction of streets and drains i.e. 36.08 percent. Second highest percentage was 27.59 which were utilized for the development of education infrastructure. It has been observed that only Rs. 1.31 lacs were utilized for the development of sports activities, Rs. 3.00 lacs for drainage and irrigation purposes and Rs. 4.25 lacs for other works such as construction of cremation shed, construction of dharmsala etc., the respective percentage of same came out to be 5.56, 12.73 and 18.04 percent.

It has been observed that under PMGSY no funds had been received by the concerned gram panchayats ever for the construction of roads under the scheme. No link roads were constructed in the selected border villages from financial year 2008-09 to 2010-11 under PMGSY. The existing link roads were constructed under PMGSY connecting these villages since more than 8-10 years back. It was surprising that no local resident was aware of the cost of construction of these roads. Hence it can be concluded that local residents were not taken into confidence before making plan of the road or while doing construction of the roads. All the works had been done by the executing agencies of the state government and even the concerned gram panchayats were not involved in the process of the development works under PMGSY at any stage. Hence the absolute transparency of the utilization of PMGSY funds cannot be ensured.
The main impact of MPLADS has been observed on infrastructure development mainly because of construction of streets and drains in the villages under the scheme. Otherwise the scheme could not leave its positive impact on any of the sector discussed above. It is observed that the scheme could not achieve its objectives in the spirit in the selected border villages.

Pardhan Mantri Gram Sark Yojana had left a good positive impact on village infrastructure development, development of education infrastructure and developing sense of security among the people of border areas. The primary impact of PMGSY has been observed on infrastructure development mainly because of construction of link roads in the villages under the scheme. As the connectivity of border village with other villages was of top most importance hence the villagers also recognized its importance and secondary positive impacts on other sectors.

Potential areas for intervention for future development has also been tried to find out. In the study it has been concluded that there was a great potential for the efficient and effective utilization of BADP and MPLAD scheme funds if spent on social infrastructure development of the choice of border residents. It may fulfill dual purpose as on one hand the funds received under the schemes would be spent in a transparent manner as the people will be involved in the project on the other hand the effectiveness and efficiency of the funds utilization may increase more than 100 percent as people were ready to contribute in such projects. Similarly construction of link roads adjoining these social infrastructure centres under PMGSY could be more fruitful. Hence the schemes have a great potential if in future interventions are made in the sectors of the choice of public concerned. It was found during field visits that there was no drug de-addiction centre in any selected block of all the border districts. There was no old age home, no multi-specialty hospital and no solar power house in
any selected village of the entire selected border areas of the state. It shows that the border area was badly lacking such social services. It is well known that the border belt is worst hit by the drug addiction among youth. Border residents were deprived of multispecialty health facilities, miserable condition of olds and severe power shortage were the most severe problems of the border residents. It has been analysed that highest percentage of residents i.e. 76 percent living in selected border villages were willing to contribute in cash and were ready to offer their land for the construction of drug de-addiction centre in their village, 12 percent people were willing to contribute if a multispecialty hospital is constructed in their area, 9 percent wanted to contribute for old age home and 3 percent for the installation of solar power house. There is a great potential for the future intervention in these social sector interventions under BADP and MPLADS.

In the present study an attempt has been made to find out the problems of border area and to suggest measures for better implementation of major centrally sponsored schemes. It was observed that 55.62 percent respondents of border areas felt the drug addiction among youth as the most severe problem of their area. Unemployment was the issue explained by 20.63 percent residents. Lack of health facilities was the problem of 14.38 percent, illiteracy 1.87 percent and poisonous drinkable water was the problem reported by 7.50 percent residents of border areas.

It has been observed that more than 90 percent of people of border areas were dependent on agriculture as their profession. Among other 10 percent many were small shopkeepers and service class. The study has revealed that there were a number of problems even from occupational point of view as 35.62 percent farmers reported that they suffer from the problem of labor scarcity for farm operations. Out of total selected respondents 28.75 percent reported that main drawback of underdevelopment
of border area was unavailability of medium or large scale industrial units in the area. Proper transportation facilities were also lacking as per 23.13 percent respondents.

In almost all the selected districts the same type of infrastructure was lacking. The problems were so severe that still majority of border villages were lacking proper streets and drains. It was reported by 46.25 percent people of border area that their villages were still lacking streets and drains, 29 percent felt that non availability of approach roads to deras as their main problem, RO system of water supply was the problem of 8.1 percent of people and 6.25 percent people had reported the problem of non availability of community centres and cremation shed in their village. There were few senior secondary schools in the selected border villages hence 3.75 percent people had the problem because of unavailability of senior secondary school, whereas 3.13 percent respondents wanted that their existing school building should be renovated. It has been observed that poor health, street lights, construction of toilets, big industry and veterinary hospital were also the problems of 2.50, 1.88, 1.25, 1.25 and 0.6 percent people of the border areas respectively. In almost all the selected districts the same type of infrastructure was lacking.

Villages on zero line of the international border have cultivated land across the fence. Due to restrictions on movement by the defense personnel the crops on other side did not get equal care and equal necessary farming practices like weeding, irrigation etc. Almost 12.50 percent residents of border area suffer from this problem. In case of Amritsar and Tarn Taran district 25 percent residents reported about this problem.

It has been found that root problem for proper implementation of development work was the political interference. The political leaders finalised the proposals of development works only as per their choice to take political mileage and the exact
need of the village was over sighted. Out of total respondents 31.25 percent felt that improper implementation of the schemes was just because of the political interference. Another group of 30.63 percent respondents felt that fractions in the villages was the root of failure of such schemes as if one group want to start one particular work the other group immediately resist and as a result the village development get suppressed. It has also been found that there was no transparency in the utilization of funds under many schemes ( works) particularly under PMGSY as 15.62 percent people were found ignorant about the funds spent in their village under different schemes.

Non availability of basic necessary working atmosphere and infrastructure availability the officers / employees did not want to stay at the border stations. Due to short stay the officers cannot concentrate of the development schemes properly and the implementation of various development schemes was found to be half hearted.

Suggestions

On the basis of the findings of the study it has been suggested that funds under MPLADS be lapsed at the end of financial year. It may increase the efficiency of the scheme as the concerned MPs and district administration would give more attention towards expedite utilization of funds.

It has been analysed that funds under selected centrally sponsored schemes were not released uniformly in the entire district due to political motives. Hence many villages were deprived of the benefits of these schemes. It is suggested that there should be block wise/ district wise plan prepared taking all the requirements of the villages under consideration. The plan should be prepared for at least 10 years in advance and funds should be released accordingly under the schemes. Master plan of the entire border villages be prepared with the consent of concerned gram panchayats only. The role of political persons be minimised for the finalization of the projects.
The district administration should involve the gram panchayats in implementation of all the schemes. The community participation should be encouraged for the implementation of all the centrally sponsored schemes in the border areas of Punjab as it has been found that people were really willing to contribute in the development process.

The social auditing of the centrally sponsored schemes should be mandatory. It has been observed in the study that funds under BADP and MPLAD scheme were released only for hard infrastructure development. As per requirement of the area the funds should be distributed evenly under other sectors like social infrastructure development, agriculture sector, health sector, education sector etc. It will lead to balance development of the border areas.

The effective and timely implementation of the scheme needs a proper mechanism for the monitoring of the expenditure and work performance. However, this is the weak area in the implementation of the BADP, MPLADS and PMGSY schemes. There is no monitoring committee and monitoring schedule in any of the blocks. A permanent monitoring committee should be formed at the district level, having all district level heads (including BSF) of the implementing agencies its permanent members.

The effective and timely implementation of the scheme needs a proper mechanism for the monitoring of the expenditure and work performance.

It has been observed that the need of border areas is totally different from the other state. Hence it needs attention differently and different schemes need different intervention in border areas. It is suggested that there should be a separate directorate of the border area of the state and employees deputed in border area should work only under its jurisdiction.