CHAPTER-V

ORGANISATION & ADMINISTRATION
Organisation is the framework of management. Organisation of any concern, in fact, possesses a set of objectives and tasks before it. It is used as a machinery for running the management in order to accomplish the objectives. The integrated rural development programme is the largest programme of the central government. Its organisation is discussed in the following paragraphs:

5.1. CONCEPT OF ORGANISATION

The term organisation means the overall design or structure of a body or entity that undertakes the task of implementing a programme. The organisational structure reflects the objectives of the project. "Organisation is a process of identifying or grouping of work to be performed, defining and delegating responsibility and authority and establishing relationships for the purpose of enabling people to work most effectively together, in accomplishing objectives". (1) It includes the following characteristics such as the division of work, co-ordination, common objectives, co-operative relationship and well-defined authority relationship.

"The success of an Organisation depends upon the interaction of seven variables. It is described as the 7-S 'Framework' of an Organisation", (2) as shown in Fig.5.1.
Fig. 5.1
FRAME WORK OF AN ORGANISATION

Source: "Vasant Desai", Rural Development, Vol. - III
Here the structure and the strategy are referred to as hardware. The remaining five are software. Both soft and hard ware are inter linked with shared values in the focal point of an organisation. Moreover, in determining the most appropriate organisational structure, a number of basic management principles are to be applied. Those are as follows:

(i) There is a clear line of authority running from the top to the bottom of the organisation representing a clear chain of command;

(ii) The responsibility and authority of each supervisor is clearly defined in writing;

(iii) Responsibility is coupled with corresponding authority;

(iv) Authority is delegated as far down the line as possible indicating that the decision-making power is placed as near as possible; and

(v) the number of lines of authority is kept to the minimum.

5.2. ORGANISATION FOR RURAL DEVELOPMENT

Rural development is a very big national programme. For effective implementation of this programme
in an integrated manner, it is necessary to design and develop an effective organisation which can work as a framework for its efficient management and administration.

The organisational framework for rural development programme of this country is a big network. It includes in its perview different institutional services. The complexity that lies in co-ordinating the services of different institutions is probably responsible for a relatively weak organisation for rural development.

It is difficult to indicate what makes a rural development organisation effective. For manufacturing and service organisations it is the excellence of the product or quality of service rendered that indicate the strength of an organisation. For a rural development programme the impact on the target groups is considered to be an indication of success. Unless the poorer among the poorest is developed or poverty is completely alleviated the organisation of the programme may not be considered successful.

5.2.1. ORGANISATIONAL COMPLEXITY

The Rural Development Programme (RDP) includes agriculture and allied productions, supplies of inputs
for their direct servicing, capital intensive and capital extensive infrastructure in direct support of production, and social overheads such as water supply, sanitation and public health, education and so on. Institutions like banks, co-operatives and local governments are also included as facilitating agencies for rural development programme. In this maze of functions and organisations, management of RDP remains naturally unclear.

History tells us about the balkanization of rural field over the years. The design of field administration at the initial stage was simple, hierarchic and much differentiated due to small number of functions being discharged. Gradually economic and political factors led to the multiplication of functions and the resultant organisational complexity. The span of control of district officers became unwieldy and the functional departments stealthily started to by-pass them and forge direct vertical links with their head-quarter organisation. "District Officer acts like a comic opera man who despite heroic efforts fails to successfully conduct the administrative orchestra". (3)
After independence there are two factors which made the administrative situation more complicated. These are development through planning and decisions taken by politicians. Development planning brought in its trail rapid administrative expansions. New departments were born and the older grew in size. The birth and growth of departments and their trickle down effect at the field level developed with their sisterly concerns. As for example, Agriculture gives birth to other two sectoral departments namely, Horticulture and Agro Industries. These sectors have also no linkage with their sisterly concerns such as Animal Husbandry and Forestry. This sort of mini-department empire building was sumptuously fed by plan funds and enormously enjoyed by the specialists.

Politicians are the direct out-come of our democracy and are regarded as the holder of public trust. They derive authority from their upward linkage as well as from local constituency. Their formal and informal foothold in every field administration has disarmed the spirit and purity of public administration.
"This type of para-statal organisations added to the field of organisational complexity further. Different kinds of co-operatives grew up to deal with the diary development, minor irrigation, marketing and so on. The field has become over organised and under managed".\(^{(4)}\) This type of organisational overgrowth has resulted in the following complexities:

a) Every new task has its own organisational pattern which is completely detached from other similar organisations;

b) The sequencing of tasks suffers on account of lack of communication between sister departments. As for example, irrigation projects are constructed by irrigation department but crop and credit planning may not be done by Agriculture and co-operative departments;

c) Resource sharing becomes impossible among the different departments as each would be zealously guarding its own domain. The vehicles of one department, are not used by another department;

d) Wastage of funds takes place in two ways. Firstly, the output of one organisation is not used by other organisations. Secondly, immortality being the characteristic feature of public organisation, once it is born, it
goes on receiving funds irrespective of whether or not it has become defunct in course of time; and

e) Rural Development is the cumulative result of actions by many organisations. More insular the organisation, more difficult it is to achieve the result.

Of course, the present organisational complexity is removable through the creation of a single super-organisation at the field level for IRDP. What is necessary at this juncture is to co-ordinate and integrate different organisations at field level by bringing effective changes in its administration.

5.2.2. SELECTING AN ORGANISATION

While selecting the organisational agency for a programme a number of options may be considered. These may range from the use of an existing institution to the creation of an entirely new organisation. The organisational arrangement depends on the following considerations:

(i) The existence of institutions already empowered to carry out the proposed functions;

(ii) The capacity and efficiency of these institutions; their success in assuming these functions and the priority
which they would be able to attach to project activities;

(iii) The sensitivity of the components of the project to local conditions;

(iv) The urgency of implementing the project; and

(v) The extent of dependance on government bureaucracy.

Generally the planners always support the creation of new organisation for a new project for getting better result. It is visualised that new organisations often duplicate the functions of older ones. They take a longer period for preparation and eventually become obsolete but self-perpetuating after some years. Thus, the creation of a new institution for a programme brings complexity by creation of additional institutions. Of course, certain specific tasks require the creation of an entirely new agency, but this is advocated only when there is no existing institution with appropriate function or where the institution is overburdened with other functions.

It is decided by the central government that IRD Programme will be implemented in areas where no programme like SFDA or DPAP are implemented and also in
the areas where these activities are going on. Where SFDA or DPAP are implemented the same implementing agency has to implement IRD programme. In the areas where no programme previous to IRDP are there, the State governments are requested to create their own organisations at par with SFDA pattern. For establishment expenses, the state government may utilise 5 percent of the total outlay of IRDP. The excess amount over 5 percent would be met by them.

Again if the number of IRD blocks will be more than five then a separate organisation at district level may be created. In case the IRD blocks are less than five, a committee may be formed and attached to the office of the Collector. In this case Collector would be the Chairman of the committee. It is observed that the new organisations created by various state governments are very minimum because in most of the states, district level organisations are there prior to implementation of IRDP.

Keeping in view the objectives of decentralisation of authority, the state governments have delegated powers to district level authorities for according approval to the block plans envisaged under IRD programme.
5.3. ORGANISATIONAL SET-UP FOR RURAL DEVELOPMENT

The organisational set-up at the apex level for rural development comprises of five tiers as follows:

i) The ministry of Rural Development at the central level;

ii) Co-ordination committee at the state level;

iii) The DRDA with the district Collector as the Chief Co-ordinator at the district level;

iv) The block development officer at the block level; and

v) the village level worker or gram sevaka at the village level.

"The ministry of rural development has different wings to oversee various types of rural development activities operating inside the country. It also conducts research, provides training, creates market and other facilities and welcomes public participation in various types of rural development projects". (5)
a) Administration wing deals with administration, general co-ordination and matters relating to training.

b) The subject matter dealt by the Rural Employment are National Rural Employment Programme (NREP), Rural Landless Employment Guarantee Programme (RLEGP), the Rural Manpower Employment (RME), Public Co-operation etc.

c) The third wing namely 'Land Reforms' undertakes the activities of land reforms, land acquisition, Drought Prone Area Programme (DPAP), Desert Development Programme (DDP), and Panchyat Raj.

d) The fourth wing is the IRDP wing which deals with IRDP including Industries Service and Business (ISB) Component, Training For Rural Youth for Self Employment (TRYSEM), Special Live Stock Production Programme (SLPP), Rural Nutrition Programme, Rural Women's Programme (RWP) and the schemes for Development of Women and Children in Rural Areas (DWCRA). It also undertakes nodal responsibility for elementary education, adult education, rural health care and rural electrification.
e) The finance wing deals with integrated finance, institutional finance for rural development programmes, work study, plan co-ordination, rural roads and administrative intelligence (AI).

f) The ministry also has the following organisations under its administrative control:

i) Directorate of Marketing and Inspection (DMI);

ii) National Institute of Rural Development (NIRD);

iii) People's Action for Development (INDIA) (PADI);

and

iv) Council for Advancement of Rural Technology (CART).

(i) DMI—This is an attached office of the Ministry with head quarters at Faridabad and branch head quarters at Nagpur having various branch offices at different places of India. Its functions include promotion of grading and standardisation of agricultural commodities, market research, survey and planning, statutory regulation of markets and market practices, Development of Markets, training for marketing personnel, market extension and administration etc.
(ii) NIRD-It is an autonomous body with the Minister of Rural Development as the Chairman of its general council. It has an executive council under the chairmanship of the Secretary, Rural Development. The Director General of the Institute plans and guides its day-to-day operations and ensures that the policy laid down by the general council and the Executive Council is implemented. It was established in 1955 at Mussoorie and later shifted to Hyderabad in 1964. Its main functions include promotion of studies in rural development, organising training and study courses, conferences, seminars and undertaking research work on problems relating to planning and implementation of Rural Development.

iii) PADI-It is a registered society with headquarters at New Delhi which works in close collaboration with the ministry. Minister, rural development is the President of the society. It seeks to promote voluntary action to supplement governmental efforts in the field of rural development by assisting voluntary organisations in preparing and executing schemes for the socio-economic development of weaker sections of the rural community. It channelises the assistance received from foreign donors into the developmental activities of voluntary organisations engaged in rural development.
iv) CART—It is a new society registered on 6th October 1982 under the Societies Registration Act, 1960 with its head quarters at New Delhi. The objective of the council is to act as a national forum for co-ordination of rural development activities, identification of crucial problems encountered by the rural people and funding the research and developmental efforts of different organisations. Further, it takes steps to develop rural institutions to disseminate knowledge on rural technology to manufacturers of machinery, tools, equipments and spare parts. It conducts or sponsors training programmes for improvement of technology. It carries out research studies, surveys, evaluation etc. on the use of appropriate technology.

5.4. ORGANISATION AND ADMINISTRATION OF IRDP

After having a discussion on the organisation of rural development in a broad sense, it is necessary to discuss the organisation and administration of IRDP at the national, state, district and block level.

5.4.1. NATIONAL LEVEL

Department of Rural Development in the Ministry of Agriculture, Government of India has the over all
responsibility of policy formulation, monitoring and evaluation of the programme. "A central committee on IRDP and allied programmes has been constituted with the following membership". \(^{(6)}\)

5.4.1.1. STRUCTURE OF CENTRAL COMMITTEE

**CHAIRMAN**
1. Secretary, Department of Rural Development.

**Members**
2. Secretary, Department of Agriculture & Co-operation.
3. Secretary, Planning Commission.
4. Secretary, Finance.
5. Secretary, Department of Women & Child Development.
6. Secretary, Ministry of Industries.
7. Secretary, Ministry of Welfare
(The above Secretaries may send their nominee to the Committee not below the rank of Joint Secretary)
8. Representative from Prime-Minister's Office.
10. Joint Chief Officer of RBI, Bombay.
11. Additional Secretary, Rural Development.
12. Joint Secretary, Finance Department of Rural Development.
13. Joint Secretary (IRD), Rural Development.
14. Joint Secretary, Banking Division, Ministry of Finance.

15. Concerned State Secretaries of Rural Development.

5.4.1.2. FUNCTIONS OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE

The Committee performs the following functions:

i) Framing and revision of guidelines for programmes;

ii) Ensuring effective implementation of guidelines;

iii) Reviewing preparation of block plans, district plans and credit plans;

iv) Considering changes in administrative set-up under IRDP and for other development programmes;

v) Reviewing linkages for supporting services for the IRDP beneficiaries;

vi) Reviewing progress of these programmes;

vii) Considering concurrent evaluation reports;

viii) Providing a forum for a continuous dialogue with the state government; and

ix) Considering proposals for strengthening infrastructure of the existing as well as new training institutions.
5.4.2. STATE LEVEL

The objective of national policy is to bring all the special programmes under the umbrella of the IRDP. At the state level the department of Rural Development is responsible for planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of IRDP. A state level co-ordination committee (SLCC) has been constituted to assist this department in discharging these responsibilities. The composition of SLCC is as follows:

5.4.2.1. STRUCTURE OF STATE LEVEL CO-ORDINATION COMMITTEE

Chairman
Chief Secretary/Agricultural Production Commissioner/Development Commissioner

Secretary
Joint/Deputy Secretary, Department of Rural Development.

Members
i) Secretary, Department of Finance.
ii) Secretary, Department of Planning.
iii) Head of the Department of Agriculture.
iv) Head of the Department of Animal Husbandry.
v) Head of the Department of Irrigation.
vi) Head of the Department of Co-operation.
Head of the Department of Forest.

Head of the Department of Fisheries.

Head of the Department of Industries and Mines.

A representative of Government of India not below the rank of a Deputy Secretary.

The State may include other officials and non officials whose presence is deemed necessary in the meetings.

5.4.2.2. FUNCTIONS OF SLCC

This committee should meet every quarter to discharge the following functions:

i) To provide leadership and guidance to the DRDA in planning, implementing and monitoring of the programme;

ii) To secure inter-departmental co-ordination among various implementing agencies of programmes like Operation Flood, Operation Black-board, Applied Nutrition Programmes, etc. and to ensure development of strong backward and forward linkages for the programmes;

iii) To consider needs and changes in the administrative set-up for the implementation of the programme
and to approve the establishment of pattern and to sanction the posts;

iv) To fix norms for office expenses, equipments, vehicles, hiring of accommodation etc. where necessary;

v) To review the physical targets of the district keeping in view conditions affecting the operation of viable schemes and if necessary to modify the targets for the districts;

vi) To monitor and evaluate the implementation of the programmes with reference to their objectives; and

vii) To provide a machinery to facilitate communication between the policy makers at the state level and the implementing agencies at the field level.

According to the central guideline, a project formulation-cum-monitoring cell is to be organised at the state level. The cell consists of seven experts/officers from the departments of planning, animal husbandry, general co-ordination, finance department, department of economics and statistics, Deputy Secretary Women's Development and the Director of TRYSEM.
5.4.3. DISTRICT LEVEL

At the district level the IRDP was initially administered by special programme agencies such as SFDA, DPAP, CADA. Later these agencies were merged and the District Rural Development Agencies (DRDA) was formed. The programme was implemented in all the blocks. The Collector is the Chairman of DRDA. He co-ordinates the implementation of the programme throughout the district.

5.4.3.1. COMPOSITION OF DISTRICT RURAL DEVELOPMENT AGENCY

The DRDA has a governing body with Collector of the concerned district as the Chairman. The Project Director is the member Secretary and the other members include the M.P.'s and M.L.A's of the district.

A few other district level officers are also included in the governing body. The structure of the governing body is as follows:
STRUCTURE OF THE GOVERNING BODY

Chairman

1. Collector of the District

Secretary

2. Project Director

Other Members

3. All M.P.'s and M.L.A.'s of the district.


5. Chairman of Zila Parishad or his representative.


7. General Manager, DIC.

8. District Officer incharge of Family Welfare Programme.


10. District Employment Officer.

11. Project Officer, IRDP.

12. Regional/District Officer, Scheduled Caste Finance Corporation.

13. Representative of District Milk Union.

14. Two representatives of beneficiaries of weaker sections.

15. One representative of rural women.
The chairman of DRDA is empowered to form an executive committee to assist DRDA. This executive committee may consist of all the district level officers and any other officer deemed necessary for the programme. The governing body of DRDA meets once in a quarter and the executive committee once in a month. The important functions of the governing body of DRDA are (i) to provide policy guidelines in respect of implementation of IRDP, (ii) to act as a co-ordinating agent among sectoral departments, banks and DRDA for smooth implementation of IRDP and (iii) to ensure overall implementation of IRDP in all the blocks of the district.

5.4.3.2. FUNCTIONS OF DRDA

The DRDA is in overall charge of planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the programme in the district. Accordingly the following functions are contemplated for DRDA:

(a) "To keep the district and block level agencies informed of basic parameters, requirements of the programme and the task to be performed by all these agencies";(7)

(b) To co-ordinate and oversee the family surveys,
preparation of Perspective Plans and Annual Action Plans of the blocks and finally to prepare a district plan;

(c) To evaluate and monitor the programmes to ensure their effectiveness;

(d) To secure inter-sectoral and inter-departmental co-ordination and cooperation;

(e) To give publicity to the achievement made under the programme and disseminate knowledge and build up awareness about the programme; and

(f) To send periodical returns to the state government in the prescribed formats.

5.4.3.3. ALLOCATION OF TASKS AND IT'S PERFORMANCE

The broad staffing pattern of DRDA is as under:
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The tasks of Assistant Project Officers are divided into general and specialised functions. In specialised function area, APO's are expected to assist the block officials in the identification and formulation of schemes related to their areas of specialisation. The APO, planning is concerned with the preparation of block plans. APO, co-operation/credit planning officer prepares IRDP credit plan as a component of block plan. The APO monitoring is in charge of monitoring of IRDP.

In the field of general functions, the APO's supervise the implementation of IRDP and take follow-up actions. They are expected to perform all other functions relevant to the implementation of the programmes. No specific demarcation of duties for individual APO's is done. Each APO provides assistance required by the blocks within his jurisdiction. He maintains liaison with banking institutions operating in the sub-region. APO, planning and monitoring are assisted by two investigators each. They help the block officials in preparation of perspective plans and monitoring the beneficiary schemes. APOs concerned with
5.4.4. BLOCK LEVEL

A block is the nucleus of villages. It is the basic administrative unit for preparation of perspective and annual action plans. It has a responsibility for implementing the IRD Programme as per the approved plan and also for providing feedback to the upper level on the impact of the programme. Therefore, the Block Development Officer (BDO) is required to perform the role of the chief co-ordinator in the block and also see that plans are prepared in time and implemented effectively. Generally, a senior officer of the state government is posted as BDO. As a block is the actual implementing machinery of the programme, greater attention is paid to strengthen the block administration.

BDO's are assisted by different specialised staff. As per the original schematic pattern, a block is to have one BDO along with five to eight Extension Officers, ten Gram Sevakes, two Gram-Sevikas, one Progress Assistant, four clerks and five class IV employees.
5.4.4.1. JOB PROFILE OF EXTENSION OFFICERS

The tasks performed by the extension officers are classified into different categories such as:

(i) Specialised task covering the whole block and

(ii) Rural development supervision which are done in a specified part or a sub-region of a block. Their specialised jobs include (a) collection and maintenance of basic information relating to their sectoral activities, (b) formulation of programmes/projects as per the tasks assigned to them by the respective departments, (c) the implementation and supervision of the departmental programmes/projects and (d) preparation of review reports on departmental programmes. Besides Extension Officer, there is a progress assistant in each block. The progress assistant, along with village level workers (VLW), is in charge of IRDP implementation.

The formal and functional control of BDO and different sectoral departments of the block is given in the following figure:
Fig. No. 5.3
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At the block level the VLW is considered to be the official who makes the institution respond appropriately to the changing needs of the situation. This base line worker is the via media for implementation of all the programmes in a village. He acts as a friend of the villagers in his circle, works as representative of the block machinery and acts as a medium of contact between all the development departments on the one hand and the villagers on the other. He creates proper understanding regarding objectives, contents and methods of work of the rural development programmes among the villagers. As a guide to the villagers, he creates the awareness among them for self-help efforts, understands their problems and finds out solution to such problems.

The responsibility of planning and implementation of IRDP lies mostly with the block organisation. In view of the new dimension of work at the block level, the organisational structure of the block has changed in respect of the staffing pattern. Further, there have been considerable changes in administrative and functional control system of the block particularly in respect of Extension Officers and village level workers. The Exten-
sion Officers are appointed by their respective parent departments and are placed under the administrative control of the BDO. The technicalities of their work performance are supervised by the parent department though they work as per the instructions of the BDO. It is observed that there is increasing control of line departments on the block staff. As a result the authority of the BDO and the cohesiveness of the block team have reduced to a marked extent.

5.5. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

The process through which the welfare policies of the state are translated into action to improve the socio-economic condition of the people is called development. The objectives of the development programmes are to provide all necessary input for the betterment of the people according to their individual as well as community needs. For this purpose a suitable strategy needs to be devised and developed. One of the strategic requirements for the success of a programme is public participation in the implementation and evaluation of the programmes.
Democratic decentralisation of the development process can be attained in its true spirit only through people's participation in decision-making at all levels particularly in the grass-root levels of programme implementation. It can be visualised in two ways i.e., participation of individuals and participation through representative organisations. The scope for direct participation of individuals is limited to only certain programmes which are focussed on specific target groups.

Participation through representative organisation implies involvement of local bodies formed by elected representative at the village and at higher levels. The Panchayat Raj system envisages organisation of village people into local bodies at village, block and district levels through elected representatives.

According to the Central Government guidelines, Voluntary Organisations are to be involved in the implementation process. Some funds are earmarked from IRDP for voluntary agencies through People's Action for Development India (PADI). The State Government also earmarks funds for voluntary agencies.
"It is necessary to create awareness and motivation among the beneficiaries through their involvement and participation in the anti-poverty programme. They should be helped to help themselves".\(^{(8)}\)

The process of the public participation in the rural development programmes can be seen in the following figure:
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*Source - Chamber, R (1974), "Managing Rural Development Ideas and Experience East Africa"*
As per the guidelines, 'Beneficiary Advisory Committees' at the block level have been constituted in some of the blocks to provide a regular forum to the beneficiaries to actively participate in the implementation of the programme. The committee is composed of members elected by IRDP beneficiaries of each village Panchyat in a block. The elected representatives of the panchayats of a block meet at the block level and elect a Chairman and a Vice Chairman from amongst themselves. The committee meets at least once in every quarter.

The functions of the committee include discussing the programme procedure, development of areas of coordination and identification of gaps in forward and backward linkages. It further includes locating areas of leakages and understanding steps to increase awareness of beneficiaries. It suggests remedial measures to remove all the bottlenecks of the programme.

Last but not the least, it is admitted that involvement of local people in schemes of rural development is expected to result in better planning and
decision making. The local people have a better awareness of their needs and preferences and fuller information on the conditions and potentialities of their areas. "The local communities with a more intimate knowledge of interdependence of activities at the micro level are in a better position to develop integrated programmes which can avoid a duplication and produce the maximum impact with minimum cost". The rural mass is motivated and attracted by block level machinery towards the programme. This method checks corruptions and leakages of fund and can make the programme more effective.

5.6. OBSERVATION

The discussions with state level, district level and block level officials revealed the following key points on organisation and administration of IRD Programmes.

1. DELAYED IMPLEMENTATION

There was a delayed commencement of IRDP in the state. In 1979, the programme started in a few blocks. In 1980, all the blocks of the state were covered under the scheme. The progress of the programme was somewhat slow during the 1st two years
i.e. in 1980-81 and 1981-82, but it picked up well during 1982-83. The progress however was not very satisfactory by the end of the 6th plan.

2. INADEQUATE ORGANISATION STRUCTURE

In the state the IRD Programme is being implemented and administered by the 'Panchyat Raj' department. At the state Capital, Bhubaneswar two senior level IAS Officers in the capacity of Secretary to Government, Panchyat Raj Department and Director, Special Project, are in charge of overall administration of IRDP in the State. They are assisted by one deputy Secretary of State Administrative Service Cadre, one statistical analyst and a group of investigators. This is a very small organisation at state level. This small state-level organisational pattern may be sufficient for formulation of programmes of IRDP but follow-up action and actual supervision of the programme are affected due to smallness of the organisation.

3. IMPLEMENTATION OF NEW SCHEMES

According to IRDP guidelines, the state governments are empowered to introduce viable economic
activities under this programme. The state authority have implemented certain new schemes based on the availability of local resources and local skills. They are mushroom cultivation, growing of Sabaigrass, mat making and preparation of earthen toys. Introduction of new schemes by the state authority is no doubt an ideal effort but marketing arrangements for these schemes are not properly done resulting in low income generation for the beneficiaries.

4. INADEQUATE REPRESENTATION

It is mentioned in the guidelines that the state level consultative committee is to sit twice in a year to review the performance of the programme in the state. It is a matter of great regret that the committee seldom sits twice in a year and when it sits it is hardly attended by all the members. The same type of situation is also found in district consultative committee and block consultative committee. This type of poor representation and passiveness of the blocks, district and state level officers is the main cause of failure of the programme in the state.
5. IMPROPER DATA PROCESSING

According to the guidelines, data are to be furnished by different blocks to DRDA. The DRDA in its turn transmits these information to state government. Finally, these information move to the central government. All these information are numerical in nature which indicate the fulfilment or otherwise of the targets. But these information do not always reveal the improvement of the actual financial condition of the beneficiaries. In otherwords, the data processing system does not show the quality of improvement in the socio-economic condition of the people.

6. NO EFFECTIVE BACKWARD AND FORWARD LINKAGE

The success of IRD programme depends upon the backward and forward linkages of the programme with other sectoral departments. Strong backward linkages are necessary for supply of qualitative assets and proper service facilities provided by the sectoral personnel to maintain the assets. Similarly forward linkages are necessary for quick utilisation of the output of the assets by which the beneficiaries can increase their income within a short time. Though much arrangements are made in pen and paper, they have no practical signi-
ficance. By field inspection it is found that adequate co-operation of sectoral departments is absent at the time of supply of assets, maintenance of assets and finally for marketing the output. Most of the beneficiaries pointed out that they could not obtain the help of different sectoral personnel inspite of their repeated approaches. This resulted in loss of assets, selling of assets and poor generation of income from the assets.

7. IMPROPER CONTROL MECHANISM

The organisational structure shown in Fig.5.3 reflects that for administration of development programme the block organisation is enlarged by the appointment of a number of Extension Officer (E.Os) and Junior Engineers (JE). They are drawn from the parent department and are deputed to blocks. They are required to supervise the developmental programmes controlled by the district sectoral departments on the one hand and poverty alleviation programmes controlled and implemented by BDO on the other. Therefore, it is likely that BDO has the formal linkage and control over them whereas the administrative and functional control over them is exercised by their parent sectoral departments at the district level.
It is obvious that due to this type of formal linkage with the immediate authority, the extension officers are playing passive role in poverty alleviation programme.

Similarly, DRDA which is a registered body under the Society Registration Act has no administrative control over blocks (which are controlled by revenue departments) as well as over the banking structure (the main funding agency of the programme) at the district level. In otherwords, the project officer is not empowered to take any action against the block and bank officials in case of their negligence of duty.

From the foregoing discussions it is clear that the organisational structure is complicated and there is lack of strong administrative control of the implementing agency at the district and block level. As a result, the single poverty alleviation programme i.e. IRDP sponsored by the central government is being implemented in a half-hazard manner. It is also observed that though the block and the district level officials are serious about the mechanical fulfilment of the targets assigned to them, they have no interest for the real success of the programme. In case of failure of schemes, a tendency for shifting the burden upon the shoulder of another is found to be deeprooted at all levels. It is
not conducive for the smooth progress of any poverty alleviation programme in the country.

5.7. CONCLUSION

On the observations made in the foregoing paragraphs, the following suggestions may be advanced for the improvement of organisation and administration of IRD programme in the state.

The delayed commencement and implementation of the programme between 1979 and 1983 was partially responsible for lack of progress of the schemes during the sixth plan. This experience suggests that such schemes which are so essential for the alleviation of rural poverty need to be given prior consideration for commencement and implementation in future.

It is necessary that the state level organisation may be expanded with appointment of a few more officers to speed up the work and to expedite the progress for a better fulfillment of the objective of IRDP. It is hoped that such expansion will reinforce follow-up action and strengthen supervision.
Introduction of new schemes by the state authorities under the IRD Programme is a novel attempt. Such schemes yield good results in terms of production. But the marketing network for such products needs to be further streamlined in order to save the beneficiaries from loss of income.

Poor participation of members in the consultative meetings at the state level, district level and block level shows that they do not have adequate interest in the activities. The government however should make it obligatory for the concerned members to attend the committee meetings as per the schedule. Further the committee meeting at all the three levels need to be held from time to time as per the programme.

The contribution of the programme in terms of net results for the upliftment of the socioeconomic condition of the beneficiaries requires evaluation from time to time. For this purpose, the present data processing system to evaluate the quantitative results in terms of target achievement may be supplemented by a system of data processing which can measure the qualitative improvement of the socio economic condition of the people.
Both backward and forward linkages are necessary for the success of IRDP. Of course, these linkages exist at present, but what is needed is the strengthening of these linkages between the beneficiaries and the appropriate sectoral departments.

The block level extension officers and the Junior Engineers were originally drawn from their respective parent departments for block level developmental work. Subsequently, they were given responsibility for implementation of schemes under IRD programmes. Though, these officers have a formal linkage with block level authorities they owe affiliation to their parent departments. This shows that there is a dual control system over them. It is therefore suggested that both administrative control and functional control over their activities may be exercised by the block level authorities for better functioning of the schemes. Similarly at the DRDA level the control over the staff drawn from sectoral departments may be exercised by the district authorities only.

Therefore, it is suggested that a pool of rural managers may be developed who can plan, co-ordinate, organise all the rural upliftment schemes including IRDP.
To produce real rural managers, rural development should be accepted as a separate discipline in the college career.

Last, but not the least, the attitude of rural people about the government machineries requires a change. Certain sections of the rural poor have started to believe that whatever loans are given to them are actually grants and are not to be repaid. In addition to this, they expect that everything concerning them is to be done by the government machinery. "These are very dangerous unintended consequences, the uncontrolled proliferation of which would be catastrophic for the Indian Society and Economy". (10)
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