

## Overview and Recommendations

The **issues emerged** during the **whole process** of the study starting from data collection till analyses have been discussed here chapter-wise, and the **recommendations** are simultaneously put forward.

### Background and field experience

1. Most of the development schemes being implemented are **not effective** enough and it is urgent and crucial to make them worthwhile particularly in backward states of the country. **Huge amount of money could be re-appropriated by making necessary alterations.**
2. Every time when people go to make observations for studies or surveys in the villages they make the situation of the villagers more hopeless due to the fact that no change in the situations at village level comes even after a few months / a year of the visit. **Their needs**, which are **urgent** from their angle, remain **unfulfilled years after years**. The eagerness to get the help is so intense, as obvious from the fact that the interviewers in the present study were offered **bribe by a woman** in the village asking for getting her work done by them. **Irony of the situation is** that **eagerness to get help is intense**, but **trust on implementers is just not there (Box 7.1)**. Hence, **Corrective measures as concrete actions to step up impact** of development schemes need be adopted on a **priority** basis.

### Box 7.1 Lack of Trust in Effectiveness of Schemes and on implementers

**Abhay Tiwari of Barakhar Khurd village tried to convince through his logical arguments that all the government schemes were on the paper and nothing was on the ground. He believed if anyone wants to progress then its better not depend on the government schemes but to make effort on his own.**

*He said that the officials' visit to the Panchayat and villages, is only **a kind of formality**, they come here, have tea and **write** about our problems saying - they can **only send** these problems **to higher officials** in the government and **cannot do any thing more** then this. Nothing happens beyond this.*

Source: Case study 21

3. A **greater sensitivity** of implementers at all levels seems essential here, in terms of understanding, the **urgency** of the situations, from villagers' perspective too and **not taking** developmental work as a **routine work** to be gradually finished. Rather, a feeling full approach with **more concern and commitment** is required.

### Development Schemes

4. Various schemes at all the levels National, State, District and Village need a **thorough investigation** about there **worth**. A **large expenditure** of money by **the Governments** and

time by people involved in implementation, is a sheer **wastage if the schemes are not much effective.**

#### **Development Schemes: benefits and patterns of distribution on ground**

5. Out of 14 development schemes of district Panchayat studied here in villages **not more than 6** schemes are known well, whether it is a **village functionary or the beneficiary.**

Hence, **proper propaganda** about different development schemes providing all kinds of possible help needs, to be done many times more effectively than what is going on at present. For that, **firstly, implementation process** for every schemes is suggested to have an **in- built awareness** and **sensitization programme** to be conducted **every year** to make more and more people know about the development schemes in **exact** sense of their availability and purpose. **Secondly**, more involvement of **NGOs or Voluntary Organizations** in **awareness and sensitization** through participation of beneficiaries could serve the purpose to a greater extent.

6. Even the better known and more in demand scheme like **IAY** has also been **availed of only by around 42 per cent** of respondents, (Table 5.11) **because of lesser than needed targets set.** To overcome the **limitation** of resources **part of funds** from the schemes of **doubtful utility (that is unsuccessful ones)** like **IRDP** could be diverted to the schemes more in demand, like **IAY and Rashtriya Bridhawastha Pension.**
7. More **women** need to be involved through awareness and sensitization programmes in the schemes related to land or any other natural resource in the village to have **many fold impact** of the scheme. **None** of the women knew about **Jeevan Dhara**, 3<sup>rd</sup> in order out of the 8 schemes known to the respondents (Fig. 5.1).
8. Involvement of more number of people, in the development schemes with **collective action** is known better and by **more number** of people and is **more successful** compared to the schemes targeted at individual groups (SC, ST only) or people. This was found in **Rajiv Gandhi Jal Mission**, where scheme was very well known by all irrespective of their **caste, religion, age and sex** and hence, the scheme was successful (case study 8 and 9).
9. Similarly, if the scheme fulfills the **felt need** of the people it is accepted well and is successful e.g. **IAY, Rashtria Bridhawastha Pension, Rashtriya Parivar Sahayata Yojana** etc. (case studies 3, 14, 16). In **Jeevan Dhara** the distribution pattern showed **wherever, it was needed** it was known by respondents and *vice versa*. Similarly, the **Rajiv Gandhi Jal Mission** was also successful as it fulfilled the **felt need** of people, that is **better self sustaining irrigation** facilities.

#### **Factors affecting Implementation :**

10. The **strategies** adopted at **higher** level can also influence **the total impact** of the scheme at ground level to a greater extent. Hence, that is also a very **crucial** stage affecting

- implementation for example, people felt that the **latest BPL census criteria** were **not set carefully** (case study- 3, 6, 11, 16, 38).
11. State to District and District to Block and Block to village **lesser communication should be required**. However, whatever **minimum communication needed**, should be **effective** from upper tiers to lower tiers of administration. **Interdepartmental dependence** also should be **lesser** for **fast flow** of the process of implementation, then what is the state of affairs at present.
  12. **Corruption** at all levels of district, block (Case Study 5, 19, 22, 27, 28, 29, 35) and Panchayat (Case Study 14, 19, 28, 31, 32) needs to be **curbed** for making schemes practically successful (Case Study 30, 36).
  14. **Panchayat** at village level could be more potent and could have **more funds and power to decision** (Case Study 9, 26). Even after more power delegation to the **Panchayati Raj Institution** by making it money disbursement and scheme implementation authority, the village Panchayat still depends on block for 1) final approval of beneficiary selection and 2) guidelines for spending money. Hence, the decision making power still remains with the block. There is no clear-cut division of powers between village Panchayat and block. Reminders need to be sent to the block for the above-referred decisions, which delay implementation process, even after Panchayati Raj.
  15. There was divided opinion about having trust in functioning of Panchayati Raj Institution in different Panchayat/villages where some people felt that even if done at gram Panchayat, the selection process still has lacunae (Case Studies, 32, 36), the others felt it was yet ineffective (Case Studies 16, 27, 28). The third kind of people believed that even after shortcomings the Panchayati Raj is better than the previous system since it is lesser corrupt, more approachable and transparent (Case Studies 22, 26).
  15. Even if, money disbursement is now village panchayat's activity, the village Secretaries in the Panchayati Raj Institutions are acting as middle men and are taking the money back (as bribe) to the blocks for block officials, by manipulating the beneficiaries and mostly, even the Sarpanch (Case Studies, 16, 20, 26,29). At times even the Sarpanch is similarly corrupt (Case Study 14). However, in former category of cases an educated strong and honest Sarpanch could help by being more assertive. Broadening the base of the stakeholders through effective village committees with more number of people in Panchayati Raj Institutions could be of great help.
  16. Since the launch of Panchayati Raj in the Madhya Pradesh, the officials (even district collectors) have a feeling that their powers are snatched. Their attitude seems to be hostile towards Panchayati Raj Institutions. To counter this, **orientation and sensitization of officials** towards the role and relevance of **P.R.I.** is urgently required.

## Box 7.2 Hostile attitude of District Officials towards Panchayati Raj Institutions

Champa Lal Mina, an ex-member of the Panchayat from Khelara was eager to share facts about the functioning of the ex-Panchayat due to the corrupt ex-Sarpanch. He said that so many ineligible people were given the benefit of Indira Awas Yojna (IAY). Even some farmers (non-SC) had been given the benefit of IAY. These farmers did not make houses, only took money, after giving bribe. On asking whether he had reported this matter anywhere or not, he said **they complained about these irregularities to the District Collector on his visit to Panchayat. The Collector told them that he was only on the official duty and due to the Panchayati Raj System he was forced to come for the visit otherwise he would have avoided it.** He rejected the villagers' demand to look into the matter, by saying that whatever the Pradhan was doing, was right.

Source : Case study13

17. **Lack of right perspective** about scheme leads to **attitudinal aberrations amongst beneficiaries**, where they either **don't utilize** the facility in the right manner so as to benefit them (as has been happening in case of **IRDP, Rashtriya Parivar Sahayata Yojana, Rashtriya Matratave Sahayata Yojana**) or start offering **bribe (IAY)** or **hide facts (RBP)**. All **ultimately** leads to total failure or at least **qualitative failure** of the scheme. Since, the **objective** with which the schemes are prepared or implemented are **not fulfilled**.
18. **Targeting** the schemes to a **particular community** is also a kind of hurdle in making the scheme more effective as lesser number of people in the whole village feel concerned about functioning of the scheme (Case Study 6, 9, 21, 25) and this **affects the overall accountability of implementers** in terms of their performance. Since people **above poverty line and upper castes** are not taking any interest in such activities.
19. **Effective Sarpanch** and **sensitive secretary** have **major roles** in making the **schemes work** and **overall environment** in villages **conducive** for better development (Case Study 25, 26).

### Impact of Schemes :

20. The **actual impact** of a scheme could not be assessed alone in mechanical quantitative terms of targets achieved and funds utilized by scheduled dates, **but a qualitative improvement** in terms of self reliance achieved and rise in the standard of living of beneficiaries is also essential.
21. The logical identification of classes of people on ground level seems to be the criteria of being literate / illiterate, knowledgeable or not so knowledgeable, resourceful or not so resourceful, needy for some external cooperation from better equipped categories of people or not so, rather than their castes and religion.
22. **Middle age group** (36-50 years) in men and women both and women on the whole from all age groups and castes were **less participative** (table 6.3).

23. **Nuclear family** is becoming a **trend** in **rural tribal** areas even in the backward states like the state of Madhya Pradesh. The developmental **schemes** need to be **reevaluated** in terms of number of targets and funds according to **changed requirements** of people in relative sense of their demand.
24. **Impact of successful schemes** was visible in terms of number of structures / facts and also as the feeling of content in the beneficiaries (for example **IAY, Rajiv Gandhi Jal Mission**). The impact as availability of **houses** to live, **better agricultural production, raised standards of living, more money in hand, schooling** for kids, **employment** generation for even neighboring blocks and **diminished migration** from that particular block was visible.
25. **Model Panchayat** or other such successful performances are possible if people in charge (for example, Sarpanch and members Panchayat) are **educated, alert, active** and **dedicated** to work (case study 25, 26).
26. **Negative impact** of schemes as prevalence of **corrupt practices, frustration** in beneficiaries, poorly kept Panchayat and villages seen through **condition** of its **roads, health centers, schools** and other civic facilities could be seen due to laziness in implementation. **In more than 60% of the Panchayat villages** all this needs to be taken care of.

### **Bottlenecks**

27. In successful and unsuccessful both kinds of schemes there were **certain points**, which were acting as **bottlenecks**. The more prominent were viz. the stages of **selection process** of beneficiaries at various levels like **BPL census** at district Panchayat, at **gram** Panchayat and again at **block**. **Still block is having ultimate decision** making power which is **affecting** the process of implementation at village level. **Delay** in release of money, **clashes** at points of conflicts and **lack of right perspective** were other important bottlenecks in the success journey of developmental schemes. A **check on vested interests** acting at these points could be of help in making worthwhile schemes a great success.

### **Policy Implications and Alternatives**

The alternative to avoid bottlenecks is adopting a careful and more sensitive process of implementation, which is essential and **indispensable factor** in making any developmental scheme successful. Understanding regarding 'the need for having any of developmental scheme', from stage one (at policy making level) to the last stage (of implementation at target group level), and the factors which affect the process of implementation, is essential for all the people involved in the process, to make the scheme successful or effective. Any kind of carelessness can affect it adversely and may distort it or make it ineffective or totally unsuccessful. Hence, broadly we need to have:

**Change in Attitude:** The first alternative is to change the attitude **of taking the target group as 'beneficiary'**. Instead it needs to be replaced by taking them as **'participants'**. Since, implementing any of the developmental schemes is just a small effort to help the poor persons to

gain confidence (which they lose because of tolerating humiliating situations, **due to poverty**, for a long time) and identify their strengths.

This is possible, when people in little more resourceful situations, (at the National, State, District and Block levels) understand the fact that **their role is to make the participants active by orientation, motivation, awareness and sensitization**, rather than by **feeding** them with **spoon** (that too a small bite) and making them even **more dependent**.

**Wholistic Approach:** Another important alternative (or lesson to be learnt) is the fact to be realized from the long experience, of **spending large** amounts of **money** in different kinds of schemes which in return **did not give proportionately big impact**, is that the **help through money is only a small part of the whole big game of developmental efforts**. However, till now provision of **funds** has **been given undue importance** by the governments as well as others, as implementers. **Money** as resource is **not short** even at **village** level, if collective efforts are made but **proper utilization of money as resource is the bottom line**.

**More emphasis on quality of implementation :** Lastly at **all levels** of developmental programmes viz. scheme inception, its handling and implementation, it needs to be realized that the quality of implementation process is **equally important, sometimes even more** important than the **number** of target achieved, to get the objectives of these programmes really fulfilled.

On the basis of our study, we found possibility of following points to be reviewed as **Policy Implications and Alternatives** after adopting above referred changes in the overall approach::

1. **Simpler and smaller schemes can be better effective than the complicated** ones, with involvement of too many departments (even if provision for huge amount of money is kept in the latter). In the present study all the **schemes** found **better known** were those which were **simple and easily -understood** by the people who were to adopt these as well as by the people who were to implement these at ground level. For example **IAY, Rashtriya Bridhawastha Pension, Matratva Sahayata and Parivar Sahayata Yojana** all were simple, in understanding and procedure of implementation both.
2. **Preparation of programme or scheme at policy level should, in fact, be a need felt at the ground level and suggested by the target group itself**. Since a **top down** approach at the inception of the scheme, which might be highly technically prepared by skilled people (in towns), could be a **failure (like IRDP)**.
3. **Minimum need for departmental coordination – vertically as well as horizontally:** Schemes should demand minimum departmental coordination at various levels of administration e.g. **State to District and District to block and Block to village Panchayat**. Coordination between different levels of administration has been observed as the biggest hurdle in most of the programmes. In other words to a certain extent **in-built autonomy is essential at every level**, since **transfer of instructions dilutes the effectiveness** of implementation process. Hence, it's important to have lesser number of the tiers. The happening of district governance now should be utilized at the maximum, to this effect. Similarly, at higher level of administration (at State and District levels) **coordination among large number of departments** causes unbearable **delay** in every activity e.g., meetings to

decide targets, deadlines, release of money and other such activities. It is main factor in creating the situation of mess, where every body's baby turns out to be nobody's baby.

4. **Better communication through commitment rather than command** : Whatever levels of administrative formalities a scheme has to cross (**from above to down**), should be accompanied with total commitment and involvement rather than execution of power alone. The **communication** should be such that the **perspective** of the scheme goes **intact** with the scheme. This part can be taken care of better by **sensitization** of people involved in the implementation process **district and onwards** levels of **administration**.
5. The above (step 4) is possible when the **handling agency** for the project (from whatever level, State / district) has an essential self-contained but **not too large group** of people sharing the responsibility. **Every scheme needs not to be passed on to the huge system of the government**. At **higher level of programme-implementation** a **well knitted** team of self-sufficient people only should be the handling agency e.g. in case of Rajiv Gandhi Foundation separate groups are handling their Jal Mission, Credit Scheme and Primary Education programmes in the State of Madhya Pradesh.
6. **Sensitization of Panchayati Raj Institution members, Sarpanch and village secretaries** for having better perspective of the scheme, is again a very **crucial** step, since these institutions would be the **implementing agencies** at ground level. Particularly, in the present context of **District Governance** where Panchayat (supposed to be stronger) have been entrusted with lots of **power** and **autonomy**. At this stage their level of **awareness and sensitivity** would give them right perspective to the people concerned with regards to the scheme implementation, which in accordance would affect the performance of the scheme. Hence if **functionaries** at this level **not only know** the exact purpose of the scheme but **also feel** about it and **own it** too, **rather than just** aiming at **target achievement** in terms of number of participants benefited and fund utilization by scheduled dates, the **whole scenario of problems related to implementation would be different**.
7. **Community resource related developmental programmes** with **collective action** at ground level also could prove successful if total **commitment** is observed from **implementing agency** as well as the **target group**. A **collective action** with **equal participation** by all castes, religions, age groups and sex would result in **harmony**, which in turn will lead to **better participation** e.g. RGJM is example of equal participation by a larger group.
8. The **training organisations** for such sensitization programmes referred above at point 4 and 6, should be **Voluntary Organisations** or **NGOs** or some other **skilled ones** rather than the **routine government** aided training institutes, with more theoretical and **mechanical** approach. Majority of the routine (government training Institutes) is too **strictly structured** to leave any **space** for **inducting real sensitivity** and **creativity** in the functionaries. The sensitization of implementers at every level is a very crucial step, to make them realize that the **quality of implementation** process is **equally** important, and at times perhaps more, as the number of targets achieved.

9. **Experience sharing** at regular intervals in its real sense could be a great help. It could be participatory between members of **Panchayati Raj Institutions, NGOs, Block officials and a large number of 'participants'** from the target groups. This would add to experience in **better handling** of developmental programmes as well as **transparency** in the system.