CHAPTER-IV

MONITORING OF THE PROGRAMME

4.1 INTRODUCTION

For the effective implementation of any development programme not only an efficient management is essential, but there is also a need for good supervision, control and follow-up of the programme. And for effective supervision, control and follow-up there is a need of continuous monitoring of the programme. An appropriate monitoring system is very essential to ensure full utilisation of the resources invested and to review the progress of the programme.

"Monitoring is a process or a strategy to keep a close watch on the progress of implementation of a project so as to ensure the timely completion of its various components within the sanctioned outlay by studying the difficulties and bottlenecks which are thrown up in the execution of projects and taking corrective action wherever necessary."¹

Monitoring is not merely an information gathering activity. Though it starts from the collection of informations relating to the coverage of targets, supply of inputs, continuation of the project/activity, conversion of inputs into outputs, benefits obtained, or generation

¹ Misra (1985), P. 43
of income and impediments in the implementation of the programme. Then it interprets and analyses the collected information and supply it to the concerned organisation with corrective measures for improving the implementation of the programme. Thus monitoring is a regular process of collection, compilation and communication of informations which help the decision making authorities to take quick actions for the removal of hindrances noted in the implementation of a programme. It is mainly concerned with the progress and the results of a programme. Monitoring can be said as an administrative activity undertaken for the effective supervision, control and follow-up of a development programme which is very essential to bring efficiency in the implementation of a programme. Monitoring has been defined as: "a management tool through which the administrative machinery controls the whole process of conversion of inputs into outputs, to achieve predetermined goals and objectives of a programme within the time frame and resource limitations." Monitoring is the continuous gathering of information relating to the projects, inputs, outputs and objectives of a programme. It tells about the constraints in implementation and ensures if everything is proceeding according to the plan and within the time and cost limits.

Monitoring is quite separate from "evaluation", though closely related to evaluation. Monitoring is an organisational activity and is concerned with collection, compilation, processing and communication of data relating the progress of the programme and follow-up action taken. It is an executive process in which informations are collected by the administrative agency. And if any problems arising in implementation are being noted, corrective measures are also to be taken by the implementing agency. "Evaluation is the procedure by which the programmes are studied to ascertain their effectiveness in the fulfilment of goals". 3 "Evaluation seeks to determine whether the effects are sustained and impacts are being or will be met. This leads to an assessment of the results achieved and the lessons to be drawn for future improvement in a later phase or in a similar project elsewhere." 4

Thus, 'evaluation' is a process of assessing the results and impacts of a programme. This is a feedback information system for policy makers, and is undertaken by some other agency outside the administrative machinery.

Monitoring and evaluation are essential for taking any corrective actions during implementation of a project and to know about the progress of the project and to identify not only how many but also who benefit from the project. Thus monitoring, as stated earlier, starts from the collection of information about implementation of a programme and goes up to corrective measures. Evaluation, on the other hand, is the entire gamut of policy, planning and events and makes recommendations for future changes in the policy framework. Evaluation is an "ex-post-facto" analysis while 'monitoring', also termed as concurrent evaluation, is a regular periodic assessment of progress. Evaluation helps in future plan and policy making, but monitoring provides information for decision making and for taking corrective action by the management.

4.2 THE MONITORING PROCESS OF THE I.R.D. PROGRAMME

The 'integrated rural development programme' is not only to identify the rural poor and provide assets to them, but to ensure the full utilisation of the assets and generate the required incomes to enable the identified rural poor households to rise above the poverty line. For the effective and efficient implementation of I.R.D.P. schemes it was considered essential to have a constant watch on the activities taken by the beneficiaries. For this continuous follow-up, monitoring was made essential in order to estimate the benefits accrued to the assisted beneficiaries.
As per guidelines provided in the Manual (1987) by the department of Rural Development, Ministry of Agriculture, the follow-up on the projects given to the beneficiaries should be done through the instrument of the 'Vikas Patrika'. The revised format of 'Vikas Patrika' has been given in the Manual on I.R.D.P. (1987). In this document particulars of the beneficiary's family, name of the scheme, its total cost, amount of subsidy and loan, purchase and maintenance of asset, repayment of loan, linkages with other schemes, generation of additional income etc. are to be registered. One copy of this 'Vikas Patrika' should be given to the beneficiary family and the other should be kept at the block headquarter. The copy at the block headquarter should be kept up-to-date about the availability and the health of the project. An annual physical verification of assets may also be undertaken on a campaign basis at the end of every year. The results of such verification should be incorporated in the 'Annual Action Plan' of the next year.

A new system of monitoring the physical and financial progress of the programme has been introduced in the Seventh Plan. Two revised proformae, along with revised key indicators for collecting and reporting the information with regard to the performance and progress of the programme, have been given in the Manual Annexures XII and XIII. Under the new system of monitoring the financial allocation, disbursement
of credit and subsidy, the physical progress made in assisting old and new families with separate informations about the Scheduled Castes/Scheduled Tribes and women households and the sectorwise break-up of the families assisted has been evolved. The performance report with regard to these indicators is to be collected by the D.R.D.A's on monthly, quarterly and yearly basis. The D.R.D.A's are allowed to have a special monitoring cell with an Assistant Project Officer (APO) incharge for the follow-up and monitoring of the programme. The informations collected by the D.R.D.A's are to be sent to the States monitoring cell; and the states will send them to the centre with the general comments on the implementation of the programme including suggestions, if any. The State Governments were advised to make suitable arrangements at the district levels to ensure effective monitoring of the IR.D.Programmes.

4.3 FOLLOW-UP AND MONITORING IN THE STUDY AREA;

The main purpose of this chapter is to know about the follow-up and monitoring system adopted by the D.R.D.A in the study area. In this chapter we made an attempt to test the following hypotheses:

(i) The 'Vikas Patrika', the Identity-cum-Monitoring card to register the beneficiaries economic
status, repayment schedules, problems, remedial action needed and taken and the like, were either not distributed, or in cases where distributed, no entry was made.

(ii) As regards to monitoring very rare visits have been made by senior officials and those who made the visits did mainly for the verification of assets or to urge repayment than for follow-up action.

FOLLOW-UP IN THE STUDY AREA

Follow-up of the beneficiaries is very important to find out whether assets obtained by beneficiaries were being properly utilised. Acquisition of the assets in the beginning is essential, but the beneficiaries also require assistance in the form of supply of raw material, technical guidance, marketing support etc. to utilise the assets properly and get additional income. It was reported that follow-up was done by the D.R.D.A. staff and services of the B.D.P.O's and Gram Sachives were also utilised for this purpose.

During the study it was found that none of the sample beneficiaries was provided "Vikas Patrika". The survey results showed that the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>12 (36.58%)</th>
<th>20 (66.67%)</th>
<th>20 (35.08%)</th>
<th>15 (26.66%)</th>
<th>15 (50.00%)</th>
<th>30 (52.63%)</th>
<th>15 (50.00%)</th>
<th>219 (46.45%)</th>
<th>149 (36.96%)</th>
<th>66 (14.60%)</th>
<th>18 (3.98%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Rohet</td>
<td>3 (15)</td>
<td>3 (15)</td>
<td>1 (8)</td>
<td>3 (15)</td>
<td>3 (15)</td>
<td>3 (15)</td>
<td>3 (15)</td>
<td>3 (15)</td>
<td>3 (15)</td>
<td>3 (15)</td>
<td>3 (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Mahan</td>
<td>12 (41)</td>
<td>12 (41)</td>
<td>12 (41)</td>
<td>12 (41)</td>
<td>12 (41)</td>
<td>12 (41)</td>
<td>12 (41)</td>
<td>12 (41)</td>
<td>12 (41)</td>
<td>12 (41)</td>
<td>12 (41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Sample</td>
<td>19 (43)</td>
<td>19 (43)</td>
<td>19 (43)</td>
<td>19 (43)</td>
<td>19 (43)</td>
<td>19 (43)</td>
<td>19 (43)</td>
<td>19 (43)</td>
<td>19 (43)</td>
<td>19 (43)</td>
<td>19 (43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Bankeraghar</td>
<td>8 (24)</td>
<td>8 (24)</td>
<td>8 (24)</td>
<td>8 (24)</td>
<td>8 (24)</td>
<td>8 (24)</td>
<td>8 (24)</td>
<td>8 (24)</td>
<td>8 (24)</td>
<td>8 (24)</td>
<td>8 (24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Beri</td>
<td>20 (60)</td>
<td>20 (60)</td>
<td>20 (60)</td>
<td>20 (60)</td>
<td>20 (60)</td>
<td>20 (60)</td>
<td>20 (60)</td>
<td>20 (60)</td>
<td>20 (60)</td>
<td>20 (60)</td>
<td>20 (60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. Roher</td>
<td>20 (60)</td>
<td>20 (60)</td>
<td>20 (60)</td>
<td>20 (60)</td>
<td>20 (60)</td>
<td>20 (60)</td>
<td>20 (60)</td>
<td>20 (60)</td>
<td>20 (60)</td>
<td>20 (60)</td>
<td>20 (60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10. Satmale</td>
<td>20 (60)</td>
<td>20 (60)</td>
<td>20 (60)</td>
<td>20 (60)</td>
<td>20 (60)</td>
<td>20 (60)</td>
<td>20 (60)</td>
<td>20 (60)</td>
<td>20 (60)</td>
<td>20 (60)</td>
<td>20 (60)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Figures in parentheses indicate percentages.
beneficiaries were rarely visited by the officials of the
D.R.D.A. or other concerned departments for following up
the schemes.

The survey results shown in table 4.1 indicate
that 48.45% beneficiaries were never visited by any officials
for monitoring and follow up. About 37% beneficiaries
were visited once and 14.60% twice and that was only in the
first year of assistance. There were eighteen sample
beneficiaries, i.e. 8 in Rohtak block and 6 in Kalanaur and
4 in Sample block, to whom the officials concerned made
several visits. All these 18 beneficiaries were provided
I.R.D.P. assistance for poultry farming. The D.R.D.A., Rohtak
paid special attention on poultry farming during the year
1986-87. A regular follow-up of poultry units was adopted
by the D.R.D.A. in order to make them a success. Arrangements
for regular supply of poultry feed, medical check-up of the
poultry birds and facilities for egg marketing were provided
by the D.R.D.A. The special staff with one Doctor and
ten poultry inspectors was kept by the D.R.D.A. who made
weekly visits to help and guide the poultry beneficiaries.
This made the poultry farming quite popular, though not
successful due to various reasons. It was reported that
in 50% cases most of the birds died in the very first month
of the start of the units. In most of the cases it happened
because of inadequate sheds, irregular supply of electricity, clean water, etc., and maintenance of proper temperature. There were also less facilities of health care and proper follow up. Besides, many of the beneficiaries were not interested in running these schemes. They were mainly attracted by big subsidy amount and persuaded by the D.R.D.A. officials to start the schemes. The only aim of the D.R.D.A. staff was to achieve its physical targets. It was also reported that the poultry units of 100 to 200 birds were not viable or profitable to continue.

Except the following up of the poultry units, especially during the year of their establishments, no other schemes were followed up by the D.R.D.A. or concerned departments in a regular manner. In several cases, it was noticed, especially in the animal sector, that the animal asset of the beneficiaries died due to lack of medical aid and regular follow up by Veterinary Surgeons. Some of the beneficiaries whose pigs, sheep and buffaloes died due to non-availability of timely medical aid really belonged to the poorest section of the society. They suffered great losses, which could have been avoided if timely help would have been provided to them. It was also informed by the poorest scheduled caste beneficiaries that the Veterinary Doctor did not come to their help even after repeated request.

**MONITORING OF THE STUDY AREA:***

It has already been stated that an efficient
monitoring system is very essential for measuring the progress and results of the I.R.D.P. The D.R.D.A., Rohtak set up a monitoring cell with the post of an A.P.O. (Monitoring), who is in charge of and responsible for the monitoring of the I.R.D. Programmes.

As per instructions of the Government of India and the State Government, each beneficiary was to be provided a 'Vikas Patrika'. It was expected that the senior official in charge should have himself visited the beneficiaries. The 'Vikas Patrikas' should have been distributed to all the beneficiaries. And the progress made by the beneficiaries and the problems faced by them in implementing their schemes should have been recorded in the 'Vikas Patrika'.

But it was found that none of the sample beneficiaries was provided the 'Vikas Patrika' for monitoring the I.R.D.P. Programme in the district. It shows that the 'Vikas Patrika' was not utilised for monitoring purposes. When a contact was made with the D.R.D.A., Rohtak, it was informed that since 1983-84, the D.R.D.A. had given up monitoring through 'Vikas Patrika'. The D.R.D.A., Rohtak, had adopted a different system of monitoring. We were told that the job of monitoring was now performed through the Gram Sachives.

Two registers enlisting all beneficiaries of every village assisted under the I.R.D.P. since 1980-81 were prepared. One register was given to the concerned Gram
Sachive and the other was to be kept in the D.R.D.A. office. The Gram Sachive has to personally contact the village beneficiaries at least once in six months and complete the 'monitoring schedule' provided to him for every beneficiary assisted under the I.R.D.P. In this 'monitoring schedule' the Gram Sachive has to record information about particulars of the beneficiaries, schemes started with I.R.D.P. assistance, amount of loan and subsidy, verification of the asset, i.e., its purchase existence, disposal, mortality, insurance claim, recovery etc. In these monitoring schedules all entries are to be made by the Gram Sachive. After this the details are to be recorded in the village level registers kept with the Gram Sachive. Then the filled up schedules are to be sent to the D.R.D.A. office where the monitoring cell incorporates the gathered informations in the registers kept with the D.R.D.A. office. The A.P.O. monitoring examines and verifies 10% cases in order to know the authenticity of the Gram Sachive's report.

This was the new system of monitoring adopted by the D.R.D.A., Rohtak. The agency claimed that it has made the process of monitoring quite simple and economical. It made it easier to verify and monitor all the beneficiaries as the Gram Sachives, knowing all the beneficiaries personally, could collect correct informations and provide the correct picture. It is not possible for the
A.P.O. (Monitoring) and its staff to make personal contact with the beneficiaries at least once in a month.

After making enquiries from the sample beneficiaries, it was found that they were rarely visited by the senior officials to make such investigations. The Gram Sachiv or any other official never went to them for the purpose of completing the monitoring schedule. Even many of them did not know who the gram sachiv was and how did the Gram Sachiv fill up the monitoring schedules. It all shows that the 'monitoring schedules' were being filled in without contacting the beneficiaries. It was informed by the sample beneficiaries and even by Sarpanches and fellow villagers that some of the officials came to them only during the first year in which I.R.D.P. assistance was obtained. And those officials verified only whether the asset was in existence and whether the beneficiaries were repaying the loans regularly. The beneficiaries were never helped to remove any hinderances faced in the running of their schemes. Even some of the beneficiaries, whose animals died because of some disease, could not get the insurance claims due to lack of guidance. Some claimants complained that they could not get the claim because they could not pay any bribe to the veterinary surgeon for obtaining the required reports from him.

Another fact came into light from the results derived that the number of beneficiaries not visited
ever by the officials was higher in the blocks far off from the D.R.D.A. headquarter. It is clear from table 4.1 that the highest percentage of not visited beneficiaries was found in the blocks of Lakhan Majra (68%), Nahar (66.67%) and Salhawas (60%).

The monitoring system adopted in the district depended mainly on the informations accorded by the lowest level village officials, i.e., by the Gram Sachives. The Gram Sachives are not well trained functionaries for the monitoring of I.R.D. Programme. Secondly, these functionaries are overburdened with other rural works like preparing and maintaining records for B.D.P.0s and village panchayats. They find very little time to make contacts with I.R.D.P. beneficiaries and collect correct information. As stated earlier, most of them fill-up the Monitoring Schedules provided for every beneficiary in a very short-time:irregular manner. They recorded the data in the 'monitoring schedule' according to their own estimates as the recording of such informations were considered a mere formality to report ahead. How can such informations collected by the untrained and unconcerned lower-level official, be reliable? These informations were never used for decision making by the D.R.D.A. as no follow-up actions were taken, except in the case of poultry farming, in the district.
Despite the following-up of poultry farming, it was found that almost all with an exception of a few, the poultry units started during the period under study were closed within the very first year of their start. In the monitoring schedules provided there was no column to note the reasons of failures of the I.R.D.P. schemes. So it was not recorded whether poultry units failed due to lack of infrastructure/ies, marketing, lack of feed or due to higher mortality of birds or some other reasons. Without having such informations the monitoring is useless and it cannot become the basis of decision-making process and follow-up actions. In the monitoring schedules used in the district the informations collected are mainly about the name of the I.R.D.P. scheme, the amount of loan and subsidy, the asset exist or not, annual income generated from the scheme and whether the loan is paid regularly or not.

The above informations were collected only during the first financial year in which the beneficiaries were provided I.R.D.P. assistance. After one year no more enquires were made whether the beneficiaries really got their incomes permanently raised, crossed the poverty line and were maintaining that level. It is not necessary that one beneficiary who crossed the poverty line once would be able to keep that, if he has not utilised
the increased income in some productive work. In monitoring it must also be noted how and where the increased incomes have been used by the beneficiaries, and they must be guided during the follow-up for making proper use of their increased incomes. The monitoring of I.R.D.P. beneficiaries should also show and record whether there are any improvements in the living conditions of the beneficiary like consumption level, quality of clothing used, housing condition etc. Through monitoring we must also know people's behaviour for whom the programme is meant. The informations gathered through monitoring must be utilized for decision making during the implementation of the programme. The implementors should make the combined efforts with people's participation to make the programme more effective and successful.

4.4 CONCLUSION

The regular monitoring and following-up of the beneficiaries is very important for the proper utilisation of the assets and success of the programme. The beneficiaries are in need of supply of essential raw-material, technical guidance and marketing facilities to get additional income from the I.R.D.P. schemes. It has been stressed by the Ministry of Rural Development, Government of India, that for regular monitoring and following up, all the
beneficiaries should be contacted by the concerned staff. Along with acquisition, verification of the assets and their proper use is very essential. But our present study clearly points out that no serious attention was paid towards regular and efficient monitoring and follow-up of the I.R.D. Programme in the district of Rohtak. In this study it was found that no 'Vikas Patrika' was provided to the beneficiaries and the 'Monitoring Schedules' were filled in by the 'Gram Sachives' without contacting the beneficiaries. It was also observed that no visits were made by the D.R.D.A. officials for monitoring purposes. Very rare visits were made by the officials of the concerned departments for follow-up and help the beneficiaries in running their schemes successfully.