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Employment generation is one of the major priorities drawing the attention of the governments and economic planners all over the world, and India is no exception. However the approach to tackling the unemployment programme has varied from time to time. The eleventh plan has set the correct goal in the form of moving towards ‘faster and more inclusive growth’ and it states, “Generation of productive and gainful employment, with decent working conditions on a sufficient scale to absorb our growing labour force, form a critical element in the strategy for achieving inclusive growth”. The best way to achieve this is to promote small as well as medium enterprises through various self-employment schemes and the amendments made to PMRY in 2007-2008 by relaxing the eligibility criteria and increasing the incentives were in this direction.

The present study about social security measures in Kerala gave specific attention to the performance of PMRY in Kerala and was undertaken with the following objectives:

1. To examine whether there was any increase in the family income and standard of living of PMRY beneficiaries.
2. To assess the extent of employment opportunities generated by the PMRY micro enterprises.
3. To ascertain whether the PMRY beneficiaries were able to repay the loans promptly with the income generated from their PMRY projects.
4. To know whether the PMRY beneficiaries were satisfied with the attitude and assistance of banks and Industries Department.
For the purpose of study, 12249 beneficiaries in Kerala assisted under PMRY during the year 2002-03 were fixed as the universe and three per cent of the same represented the sample, which was drawn from three districts of the State. Data was collected based on geographical considerations and number of beneficiaries in tune with the population parameters.

Search for previous studies on the subject led to sufficient literature on social security measures all over the world as well as on various employment generating schemes, but very limited literature was available on PMRY in terms of its operations.

Examination for the various social security measures in the developed and developing economies for the labourers belonging to the organised and unorganised sectors and for other categories of population including the unemployed youth led to a number such schemes and also to various poverty alleviation and employment generating programmes introduced and experimented in India, including the PMRY. The observations were presented in the third and fourth chapters.

The features and mode of implementation of PMRY in India and Kerala along with a brief description of Kerala state and the three identified districts involved in the survey have been presented in the fifth chapter.

Data collected through the survey, covering the randomly selected sample of three hundred and sixty seven PMRY beneficiaries, thirty three bank officials and three PMRY managers or AIDOts (Assistant Industries Development Officers) of the three concerned District Industries Centres (DICs) were analysed in the sixth and seventh chapters under four headings – three based on the responses of beneficiaries and the fourth based on the data collected from the banks and DICs. The analysis was undertaken as per the objectives set and with a view to assess the other aspects
in the implementation of the scheme. The major findings are listed below:

**8.1 Findings and Conclusions**

**8.1.1 General Findings**

Analysis of secondary data collected revealed that targets fixed at the all India level for every year had to be revised to accommodate the increased number of applicants. The number of loans sanctioned and distributed every year marked a increasing trend from 2000-01 upto 2005-06. The overall rate of total disbursements against total sanctions since its inception was above 80 per cent and cent per cent of the target could not be attained in any year. During the last three years the highest target was allocated to UP among all the states, and Kerala occupies the fifth position. PMRY assisted units in India generated additional employment to the tune of 1.5 persons per unit, on an average.

In Kerala targets, sanctions and disbursals of each year were unsteady and the rate of disbursement against target was varying from 34 per cent (2001-02) to above 84 per cent (2004-05). 100 per cent of target could not be attained in any of the past fifteen years but sanctions exceeded the targets during the past five years except 2007-08. The overall rate of total disbursal in Kerala against total sanction was less than the corresponding all India rate. The average amount of loan disbursed in the state, taking all the 15 years into account, was Rs.51,074 which is just above 10 per cent of the maximum loan that can be given to an industrial unit. Among all the districts, Palakkad is at the top in respect of loan-disbursals and Kasargod is at the bottom. Among the three districts under study, Palakkad has the highest level of target achievement and Kottayam has the lowest.

Following findings relate to the general profile of PMRY beneficiaries
• Men outnumbered women in availing PMRY assistance and in spite of preferential treatment and relaxations extended to women, many of them were not taking advantage of the opportunities.

• Majority of women beneficiaries were married before applying for PMRY assistance and they were encouraged by their spouses to have an additional source of income.

• Majority of married men got married after taking PMRY loans and ensuring a source of income for their livelihood.

• Hindus constituted majority among beneficiaries followed by Christians and then by Muslims. The extremely low number of SC/ST beneficiaries indicated the ineffective government efforts to attract more of SC/ST groups towards PMRY ventures.

• Male beneficiaries of above forty-five years of age were found within the sample and this revealed grave laxity on the part of implementing agencies in ensuring the eligibility criteria.

• Most of the beneficiaries were either SSLC passed or having higher educational qualifications.

• Majority of units assisted under PMRY were engaged in service sector activities, followed by trading activities. Other activities constituted the smallest proportion.

• More than one third of PMRY assisted units were not operating at the time of survey, as they either had not been started or had been closed down after starting.

• Misutilisation and diversion of funds through manipulations and faulty implementation of the scheme were evident in many cases.
• Inefficient appraisal by the DICs and banks of the feasibility and viability of schemes suitable for the beneficiaries and for their localities had led to change of activities or their stoppage.

• Male beneficiaries tried to utilise income-earning opportunities at the earliest after their studies, while women waited for a longer time for the same.

• A large number of beneficiaries had prior experience in the business activities for which they sought PMRY assistance.

• PMRY assistance was largely given to existing business units and not for starting new units, as indicated by many beneficiaries who were carrying on some business activities before applying for the assistance and they applied to assist the same or similar business.

• The income criterion was not strictly adhered to while granting PMRY assistance. Hence leakage of the scheme benefits to ineligible persons, with or without the knowledge of implementing agencies, was evident from the number of beneficiaries who were having very high family incomes or who were having family assets and properties of very high values while applying for PMRY assistance.

• Some beneficiaries had applied for higher amounts of loans than actually required, either due to misunderstanding the norms of the scheme or as misdirected by others.

• In majority of cases, DICs and banks misjudged and underestimated the capital needs of the projects of beneficiaries and hence were sanctioning smaller amounts of loans.

• Insufficiency of capital for many beneficiaries caused by the disbursement of smaller amounts of capital than the applied
amounts or due to the need for additional funds for expansion of started units after some time had led to either failure of units or their resorting to additional external debts.

- Majority of beneficiaries were opposing the idea of joint ventures in spite of the inherent advantages of such proposals.

- Fear of possible internal doubts and conflicts and unwillingness of beneficiaries to share their profits with others or even to associate with others were the major reasons for the beneficiaries to be against the idea of joint ventures.

- The district level task forces took a comparatively shorter and reasonable period for recommending loans to the applicants, whereas the banks took a much longer period for disbursal of loans and thus caused for undue delay in availing the assistance.

- Almost all the beneficiaries had undergone PMRY training except some who had earlier attended certain other stipulated training programmes, whereas the bank officials had illegally exempted certain beneficiaries from training for manipulating the scheme.

- PMRY training was assessed as beneficial and good, and thus the efforts of government in that respect had been fruitful.

- Direct marketing of products and services to the final consumers was the main marketing strategy of PMRY beneficiaries, and some of the industry sector units were marketing their products through shops and establishments.

- The overall rate of failure of PMRY units was the lowest in service sector and the highest in industry sector. All men who started hollow bricks manufacturing and all women who
took loan to produce soda and country bricks proved successful while all men engaged in country bricks manufacturing turned to be failures.

- Failure of PMRY units was higher in the case of units initiated by women in all activity sectors compared to their male counterparts, except in the other activities sector, where their rate of success was more than that of male beneficiaries.

- The rate of failure of units was the lowest in Thiruvananthapuram district and the highest rate was in Kottayam district.

- Many failed units worked for less than six months before their failure and some units worked for six to twelve months. Such a very short period of existence of PMRY units was due the intention to misutilise the PMRY assistance.

- Misutilisation of PMRY loans, lack of any experience in the selected activities, and inefficient planning and decision-making were the main reasons behind the premature closure of many PMRY firms.

- Officials of DICs, though competent and experienced, were unable to take the required time and support system to properly assess the feasibility, viability, future possible changes in technology and locational features of the proposed units, and hence they also were responsible for the closure of certain units.

**8.1.2 Findings based on the Main objectives**

Analysis of survey results in the light of the main objectives of study had led to the following important findings.

- Majority of beneficiaries earned a monthly income of more than Rs.2,000 and there were significant number of
respondents who were earning more than Rs.4,000 per month.

- The proportion of male beneficiaries earning above Rs.2,000 to Rs.10,000 or more per month was higher than that of female beneficiaries.

- Remarkable increase in family income could be seen for those who had prior family income of Rs.3,000 to 4,000, and very high increase of income was noticed among those who had still higher prior income. Beneficiaries who belonged to the higher income strata prior to availing PMRY loans, could raise their monthly family income considerably even to cross Rs. 10,000 mark.

- After availing PMRY assistance, the monthly family income of majority of beneficiaries rose to above Rs.4,000, including a large number of cases where the same was above Rs. 5,000, which revealed a remarkable increase in their family income.

- Majority of beneficiaries were not able to earn their expected income, but were likely to earn the same in the near future.

- Service related PMRY projects were yielding the expected income to maximum number of beneficiaries in that sector followed by industrial units, and very poor performance in earning the expected income was evident in other activities sector.

- Some beneficiaries got outside employment and were carrying on their jobs and PMRY units together with the help of others also, yet they were not treating PMRY activities as part time engagement.

- The success or failure of PMRY activities was greatly influenced by the period of prior experience of beneficiaries. The ratios of success to failures of PMRY beneficiaries with no
prior experience, with moderate period of prior experience, and with longer period of prior experience substantiated this aspect.

- The nature of prior experience also had its influence on the success or failure of PMRY units and the possibility for earning the expected income was the highest among beneficiaries who were well experienced in carrying on own same/similar businesses before obtaining PMRY assistance, or as trainees and employees, or in both the above two respects.

- Ability to earn expected income was higher among beneficiaries having higher qualification than those with SSLC or lower level of education and it was at the highest rate among those with ITI training or post graduation.

- Ability to earn expected income was considerably influenced by the proportion of loans sanctioned against the applied amounts.

- Beneficiaries with no dependents and those with more than four dependents were more prone to failure in attaining the expected income, while beneficiaries with a comparatively less number of dependents were more successful in earning the expected income.

- Rate of success in earning expected income was high among beneficiaries with small amounts of additional debts and also with very high amounts of external debts, while it was very low among those with extra external debts in between Rs. 30,000 and Rs. 1,05,000.

- PMRY had assisted many beneficiaries to attain considerable improvement in their life style and standard, which instilled in them a feeling of self-respect, responsibility and social
acceptance. Significant improvement was noticed in the living standards of beneficiaries who undertook service sector activities.

- Improvements were explicit in respect of some beneficiaries with regard to the nature of their residence, type of cooking fuel used, possession and number of household durables like fan, mixer-grinder, television, refrigerator, washing machine, oven, CD player, mobile phone etc., type and number of vehicles owned, educational and medical treatment facilities provided to family members and also in the size of their landholdings, though not very significant.

- After obtaining PMRY assistance and after starting business units, reasonable increase occurred in the number of beneficiaries having saving habits as well as the amounts of their savings. Majority of beneficiaries had started savings or improved their savings, which increased the chances of improvement in their standard of living.

- Values of family assets of a very large number of beneficiaries had increased by more than ten per cent. Increase in the asset values was at a high rate for those who had prior family assets of lower values and as the values of previously owned assets were going on increasing, the rate of increase was coming down.

- The personal opinion of beneficiaries regarding improvement in their standard of living and the increase observed in their saving habits revealed considerable improvement in the lifestyle of PMRY beneficiaries; but only less than half of the sample were seen as having improved living standard on the basis of improvements in their residence, type of fuel used for cooking, vehicles owned, consumer durables owned, size of
landholdings and especially on the basis of increase in the value of their family assets.

- The full time and part time, direct as well as indirect employment opportunities generated by PMRY units revealed that PMRY supplemented reasonably to the employment generation efforts of the government. The operating units had an average employment potential of more than two persons (2.1) and among the four activity areas, service units provided the largest number and proportion of employment opportunities.

- Ability of PMRY beneficiaries to repay their loans in instalments did not ensure that their loans were being promptly repaid.

- Among operating units beneficiaries in the service sector were more prompt in repayment of loans, and the rate of prompt repayment of loans was the lowest among other activity units.

- Among non-operating units, the rate of non-prompt payment was higher than that of prompt payment and the rate of prompt payment was the highest in the industry sector.

- All beneficiaries who were earning their expected income were not repaying the loans promptly and regularly, whereas some, earning less than their expected income, were repaying their loans promptly or occasionally.

- Even beneficiaries with sufficient balances of project income to repay their PMRY loans after meeting family expenses, were sometimes not paying the loan instalments promptly.

- Regular repayment of bank loans took place at higher rates among beneficiaries who did not use any portion of their project income for family upkeep and also among those who used a major portion of their income for family purpose.
Considerable rates of regular loan repayments as well as saving habits were observed in the service sector and the worst performance in these respects was in the other activities sector.

Higher the amount of additional external debts that the beneficiaries had, lower was the number of beneficiaries repaying the loans promptly, and when there were no additional debts, there was high incidence of regular payment.

Beneficiaries with additional external debts preferred to repay their additional debts first before repaying their PMRY loans or used the balance amount for some other purposes instead of repaying PMRY loans, even when they earned their expected income and had sufficient balance of income after meeting family expenses. Thus it was revealed that even when beneficiaries earned their anticipated income or had sufficient balance of income for loan repayment, they were not repaying their PMRY loans regularly.

Majority of PMRY beneficiaries had more than five instalments of PMRY loans in arrear, and many had more than twelve loan instalments in arrear.

The performance of service sector units was quite satisfactory in respect of regular repayment of PMRY loans and lowest level of arrear instalments.

The most important reasons for beneficiaries having sufficient balances of income but not regularly paying loan instalments were repayment of outside extra debts, the belief that such loans were not to be repaid, ploughing back of income in the businesses and other personal investments.
A good number of beneficiaries not having any or sufficient balance of project income tried to pay the PMRY loan instalments regularly or occasionally in order to prove their creditworthiness, to avoid possible legal actions, and to show their gratitude to the government and banks for their assistance.

PMRY beneficiaries were greatly satisfied with the encouraging attitude of DIC officials, shorter period of time taken by them in recommending loans, usefulness of PMRY training, amounts of loans recommended against applications, and the rate of subsidy whereas they were quite unhappy upon the discouraging attitude of bank officials, high rates of interest, longer time delay for disbursal of loans, and lower amounts of loans disbursed and that too mainly as fixed capital.

Beneficiaries were not so satisfied with the regularity and nature of follow up activities by either the industries department or banks.

8.1.3 Findings based on other Objectives and Aspects

Analysis of data collected on other aspects and other objectives have led to the following revelations.

Friends and relatives constituted the most important source of information about PMRY and hence the efforts of the implementing agencies in giving wide publicity about the scheme to attract unemployed youth were either ineffective or remained unnoticed.

Majority of beneficiaries with operating PMRY units were happy to continue their projects.

Almost all beneficiaries with operating units and earning expected income, had plans for expansion of their units, while
beneficiaries not earning the expected income from their running projects or who had closed down their projects were having no plans for expansion or revival of their units in the immediate or distant future.

- As far as the expected income were earned from their units, no beneficiaries, with rare exceptions, were going for employment by closing down their PMRY units, but as long as the earnings were less than the expected, many were not there to refuse any offers of employment opportunities.

- Possibility for more fixed and regular income, better status and availability of more leisure time were the important reasons for certain beneficiaries behind preferring employment opportunities.

- Independence, autonomy and increased income for more hard work were the major reasons that motivated the beneficiaries to refuse job offers and to continue their self-employment activities.

- Lack of any occupation and regular income forced many PMRY beneficiaries, who had already closed their units, to accept or to try for employment opportunities.

- In addition to the problems connected with unreasonable time taken by DICs or banks in sanctioning loans, reduced loan amounts, unsatisfactory rates of interest/subsidy, attitude and behaviour of implementing officials, follow up, and training, PMRY beneficiaries had certain other problems including the difficulties in procuring the intended scheme benefits, insistence for collateral securities or sureties and loss of money on documentation.

- Intense competition from similar units in the locality especially from margin free shops, units run by self-help
groups, shops of civil supplies corporation etc. and the consequent lower volume of business were the main marketing problems confronted by PMRY beneficiaries.

- Lack of any or sufficient experience, insufficiency of capital due to various reasons, use of extra external loans with heavy rates of interest and functioning of many similar units in the same locality causing for lower volumes of business were the reasons for not earning the expected income or closing down of PMRY units.

- Insufficiency of PMRY assistance, low ceiling of family income for eligibility for assistance, hasty and improper judgements and implementation of the programme were the other important problems confronted by PMRY beneficiaries.

- Intentional misutilisation of loan amounts and manipulations in the scheme implementation for attaining targets were the reasons behind not yet starting the PMRY assisted projects.

- Majority of beneficiaries rated the scheme as useful to unemployed youth of low income as an initial source of income and as a reason to come into contact with the industries department and banks.

- External influence, political interference and personal hold were decisive elements in obtaining assistance under the scheme for some beneficiaries

- Many beneficiaries were of opinion that PMRY was much useful if it were used as a supplementary source of income or as a part time assignment, and not as the single and only source of income.

- The main suggestions for improving the scheme performance were to increase the amount of assistance, disburse the full amount of required capital, raise the income limit for
eligibility, provide extra loans to successful beneficiaries as needed disregarding the ceiling on maximum amount, and to reduce the rate of interest.

- Making the selection of beneficiaries fool proof, taking strict legal actions against willful defaulters, asking to furnish something as collateral security and making some others as guarantors for the loans were suggestions for ensuring prompt repayment of loans.

- Arrangements by the financial institutions to collect money directly from the workplaces of beneficiaries on daily or weekly basis will reduce the burden of lump sum monthly payments.

- Sanction loans to those who are well experienced in the selected field of operation, avoid lending very small amounts to very poor persons with more number of dependents, and avoid charging interest in the initial years were other strong recommendations.

- In addition to monetary incentives like reduced interest, avoiding part of interest and increased subsidy, non-monetary incentives like appreciation, awards, counseling and guidance should be provided to units with excellent performance.

8.1.4 Findings based on Officials’ Responses

Major findings on analysing the data collected from officials of the implementing agencies including financial institutions included the following.

- Targets attained during recent years were showing an increasing and satisfactory trend even though disbursal of loans has not gone beyond 80 to 90 per cent.
- Repayment of PMRY loans was at a very low rate and many were not paying even the initial instalments. Beneficiaries with even very high monthly income also were not showing an attitude of prompt payment of loan instalments.

- Improper identification of beneficiaries, consequent misutilisation of funds, association with defaulters that created a misconception that PMRY loans need not be repaid, waiting for PMRY loans to be written off as being done in the case of certain loans and lack of proper follow up activities by the implementing agencies and strict actions for recovery of loans were cited as the important reasons for non or irregular payment of PMRY loan instalments.

- Fixing very large targets and forcing the banks to attain the same was one reason behind leakage of funds and their misutilisation by ineligible persons.

- Lack of interest on the part of banks to finance centrally sponsored programmes and the consequent demotivating attitude that they were showing to the loan applicants have created a sense of antagonism among the beneficiaries, which restricts the repayment habit of such beneficiaries.

- Extending PMRY assistance to self-motivated and experienced persons only, taking strict exemplary legal actions against some willful defaulters, frequent and regular visits and other effective follow up activities by both DICs and banks, and interlinking target with recovery were the important suggestions recommended by the officials for improving the loan repayment habits of beneficiaries.

- Stoppage of all centrally sponsored subsidy linked programmes and entrusting the task of identifying the beneficiaries to the banks were the suggestions made by certain bank managers, whereas there were a few bank
managers who strongly felt that the attitude of bank managers towards the scheme and beneficiaries was the decisive factor in ensuring maximum repayment of PMRY loans.

- Assigning preference to recently started existing business units while granting PMRY assistance and that too in instalments and forming a managerial committee to encourage those applicants, who are the heads of very large and poor families with no extra sources of income but all applying for same or similar activities, to start one business unit with the loans of all, under the supervision of the managerial committee, instead of sanctioning separate loans to each of them, and making all of them to be active in the activities of that unit were some other suggestions given by banks.

- Formation of a recovery committee consisting of representatives of the implementing agencies entrusted with the sole responsibility of follow up activities and recovery proceedings would ensure timely repayment of PMRY loans.

- Concurrent evaluation on regular basis to assess the performance and other aspects of the scheme at the government level would disclose the merits and limitations of the scheme, which in turn would help in effecting the necessary actions and amendments.

- Banks demanded the inclusion of new generation banks and co-operative banks also in the financing activities under the scheme to improve coverage, repayment and performance of the scheme.

- General opinion of many officials about the scheme was good as it provided a major initiating force to a number of educated youth in their livelihood efforts and in that way it avoided the
tendency of talented latent youth to turn to paths of undesirable activities.

- Banks expressed happiness or relief about the discussions on stoppage of the scheme but DIC officials wanted to continue such a scheme under the same or different name, but with modifications in the scheme-stipulations suitable to the modern requirements, especially since the scheme is now 15 years old.

### 8.2 Recommendations

Based on the findings of the study and incorporating the views of PMRY beneficiaries, officials of DICs as well as the financing institutions, the following measures are being recommended for the improved functioning of the scheme.

- The first preference of all agencies involved in the implementation of PMRY should be for attaining targets upto the maximum possible level. Banks should be encouraged to disburse loans in tune with their targets. The policy makers for PMRY, Industries Department and banks should work with a common mind and strategy. The objective of inclusive growth and the merits for the nation should be kept at heart. Conceiving at one point and directing delivery of schemes with banks often creates problems where banks see this as an extra government business. PMRY should be professionally managed as any other scheme.

- Wide publicity of the scheme is essential. Only then creative youth with viable projects will turn out as potential applicants.

- Identification of individuals eligible for financial assistance under the scheme should be more rigid and rigorous to
ensure that wealthy and well off persons are not cornering the lion’s share of the scheme-benefits, leaving truly eligible persons unassisted.

- Two major problems encountered with PMRY are non-viability of projects and inadequacy of capital. These issues can be addressed through forming a panel of experts in the financial, technical and management aspects of micro enterprises at the panchayat/block level to properly assess the feasibility, viability, future prospects due to changing environment and also the exact cost of the projects in a realistic manner so that required assistance is provided to the eligible applicants for viable projects fully and on time. The committee may be made responsible for proper follow up of units, recovery procedures, and selection of best performing units for awards and incentives.

- Loans should not be sanctioned to many firms in the same locality for doing the same business without considering the business potential of that locality and viability of additional units. The herd mentality in availing loans could be disastrous.

- Scheme conditions regarding income limits for eligibility, maximum amounts of loans, additional loans for expansion, rates of interest and subsidy, and term of loan should be suitably relaxed and revised so that more amounts may be available to more persons.

- A potential identification campaign should be undertaken locally. Self-motivated persons having reasonable training and experience and with viable innovative ideas should be identified and assisted. This could be done with the involvement of local bodies.
There should be separate schemes for beginners and for on-going small projects for their development. In the second category, preference should be given to those who have some viable and promising business units of their own, started earlier on a small scale but requiring support for strengthening.

Assistance including subsidy should be distributed to selected applicants in many instalments instead of lump sum payments. Initially, twenty five per cent of the total required capital can be given to the beneficiary including the subsidy portion, and he should start the unit by raising the balance amount somehow by himself. After six to twelve months of satisfactory performance, the second instalment covering 25 to 50 per cent of the originally required amount can be released and the remaining 50 to 25 per cent of loan amount should be disbursed at the end of another 12 to 24 months of successful performance. Bridge Loans may be provided to meet urgent genuine needs intervening.

Banks shall give due importance to security of loans disbursed; but for its sake they should not overlook working capital needs of PMRY projects.

Co-operative banks as well as new generation banks also should be included in the implementation activities of the scheme.

Additional advanced training programmes or refresher courses of a shorter duration may be conducted for beneficiaries so that the beneficiaries may get a forum for sharing their success and failure stories and to seek remedies for problems and failures.

Strict legal actions should be taken against willful defaulters and intentional misutilisers of the scheme, and giving wide
propaganda about them will discourage non-genuine applicants from seeking PMRY assistance and encourage genuine beneficiaries to pay the loan instalments regularly.

- Arrangements could be made by banks for collecting payments directly from the workplaces of PMRY beneficiaries towards their loans on daily or monthly basis.

- Sick PMRY units should be assisted to revive their businesses, if possible, so that the assets acquired with the loans may not lie idle or to settle their debts by realising the PMRY assets in such a manner as to ensure least loss to the beneficiaries.

- The assets of sick PMRY units should be allowed to be acquired by newly starting PMRY units, at the option of new units at a mutually agreed price, having consideration to the original cost of the assets and the period of their use, as approved by the task force and the financiers, which will ensure fair price for the assets of sick units, reduced investment in fixed capital of new firms, utilisation of idle assets and reduction in the overall loss to the economy.

PMRY has found success in its operations as many have benefited from it. There are problems to be addressed, but if carefully viewed and courageously implemented it will certainly serve the nation. The Scheme was launched to mark the improved vision of the government’s commitment towards social security strategies. Youth, the prime movers of the nation’s human resources, need timely support systems to enable them to be creative, productive and self sustaining.

PMRY is an improved package for solving the problem of excessive unemployment among educated youth and it had a definite initial impact upon the lower income groups. The programme reduced aggregate unemployment. But the
administrative drawbacks and structural constraints have caused some leakage of assistance to formally ineligible persons and incomplete coverage of those who were eligible. Yet the general performance of the scheme as a measure of providing employment to educated youth is satisfactory.

PMRY broke open the hard shut doors of employment avenues, broke open the doors of financing agencies to co-operate with the government directives to achieve generating income and employment through formal employment programmes. Unemployed youth were empowered through PMRY to ‘grind-fit’ their talents and needs to creative income generation and nation building.

More co-ordination between the different agencies involved in the implementation of PMRY and a bit more sincere as well as careful and rigorous enforcement of the scheme criteria would enthuse the unemployed educated masses to realise their dreams and to give their best for the development of their own and their nation.

There is no doubt that the unorganised sector of this nation needs better income and livelihood for the nation to progress and hence social security measures like PMRY are always relevant.