

CHAPTER III

Findings and Analysis

3.1 Overview

As noted in Chapter 1, primary data was collected in Kant Panchayat, which is in Amer Block of Jaipur District of Rajasthan. It is an arid zone with a barren, Aravali hill, landscape. The land at many places showed Gully formation. The Gram Panchayat has six habitations i.e Kant, Sangawala, Kiritpura, Rampura, Shaayri and Kalwad. MGNREGA work was underway in only one work site in the Panchayat. Therefore the sample of MGNREGA workers was drawn from the ongoing worksite at Kiritpura.

Data was also collected from the Assistant Engineer, the Overseer Engineering personnel and the Officiating Panchayat Secretary. It was mentioned by the engineering personnel that the Water related structures are the main community assets built in the Panchayat and amongst the Water related structures, Renovated Traditional Water Bodies(RTWB) are the most useful structures.

The questionnaire attempted to collect data to evaluate the functioning of the MGNREGA in the village in order to understand whether livelihood security had been enhanced through MGNREGA, the challenges that need to be addressed to achieve livelihood security and the factors constraining productivity and durability of Assets.

A questionnaire was administered to all the 30 sample workers. There was only one MGNREGA work under way in the Panchayat. The muster roll at the work site contained 43 names and the sample was drawn from this work site. Data was collected at the work site from the sample. Data was also collected from an old worker who is now not active and also from the Mates.

Interviews with Key Personnel also provided both quantitative and qualitative data. Perceptions on the usefulness of community assets were collected from the Households living near community assets. Perceptions on the usefulness of one kind of individual asset, that is, Farm Bunding, were collected from the beneficiary Households.

Data on shelf of works and the work expenditure on MGNREGA since 2009, was collected from Panchayat office. Secondary data on MGNREGA official website was also used for analysis.

The questionnaire focused on the data pertaining to the awareness levels about the Act, its rights based framework, the wage rate, the right to unemployment allowance, facilities for women workers, the delay in payments, the seasonwise work pattern of the workers, the need for the scheme in providing marginal income and the capacity of the Gram Sabha in planning the shelf of works.

Analysis of data collected through field work in the village and from the secondary data revealed important aspects on the issues and these are presented in the sections below.

3.2 Occupational profile of the MGNREGA workers

The Occupational profile of the sample MGNREGA workers, is shown in the Table 1 below:

Table 1: Occupational profile of the sample workers

| Land Holding | Irrigation by Bore Well or Functional Open Well | Number of Respondents | Possessing Land Less Than or Equal To | Agricultural Labour as Main Occupation | Own Farming As Supplementary Occupation | Live stock farming |
|------------------|---|-----------------------|---------------------------------------|--|---|--------------------|
| Land Less | NA | 3 | 3 | Yes | NA | 2 |
| 1 Bigha | Not Irrigated | 9 | 12 | Yes | 4 | 1 |
| 2 Bigha | Only one HH has a Well | 5 | 17 | Yes | 5 | |
| 3 Bigha | Not Irrigated | 6 | 23 | Yes | 5 | 1 |
| 4 Bigha | Not Irrigated | 1 | 24 | Yes | 1 | 1 |
| 5 Bigha | Not Irrigated | 1 | 25 | Yes | 1 | |
| 6 Bigha | Not Irrigated | 1 | 26 | Yes | 1 | |
| 7 Bigha | NA | - | 26 | Yes | NA | |
| 8 Bigha | Not Irrigated | 2 | 28 | Yes | 2 | |
| 9 Bigha | NA | - | 28 | Yes | NA | |
| 10 Bigha | Not Irrigated | 2 | 30 | Yes | 2 | |
| Total | | 30 | 30 | 30 | 21 | 5 |

Source: Field work

The data above, reveals that each of the 30 workers in the sample depends on Agricultural Labour. Most of the Households have land ranging from half a bigha to 10 bighas. Three households are landless. The median household has 2 bighas; they primarily depend on agricultural labour but cultivate their own farm for some sustenance. They primarily cultivate Bajra as a Kharif crop. Their yield depends on the amount of rainfall.

3.3 APL/ BPL Profile

The social group wise poverty profile of the respondents is shown in Table 2 below:

Table 2 : APL/ BPL Profile of the sample workers

| Social Group | No of respondents | Number of APL | Number of BPL |
|---------------------|--------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| SC | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| ST | 8 | 7 | 1 |
| OBC | 21 | 17 | 4 |
| Total | 30 | 24 | 6 |

Source: Field Work

It is surprising that 25 Households have been placed as APL households. The basis for considering these households as APL, is reportedly because of possession of some artifacts such as a Television, quantity of clothes, two wheeler, nature of construction of house, etc. The workers in some cases did not know their APL/BPL status and it was the Mate who seemed to know the families of the workers closely, who had clarified the APL/BPL profile of the particular worker. The data is based on the responses given. About 7 ST households with 1-2 Bighas of dry land and depending on casual labour and rainfed marginal farming have been considered as APL category. Be that as it may, a Household dependent mainly on casual labour or rainfed marginal farming are in the span of APL category. The Mate mentioned that in the case of certain respondents, the households have submitted a representation as per stipulated procedure but the appeal is still pending. Evidently the basis for making a APL/ BPL distinction needs attention and rethinking.

3.4 Work demand pattern of the workers

Twenty one respondents mentioned that they cultivate their own land holding depending on the summer monsoon rains. A few days of good rains is also becoming a rare occurrence according to them. They generally cultivate Bajra, for their own food requirement. Generally the women cultivate the land. According to the GP Sarpanch, the men water the land in case of irrigated land or guard the crop from animals, during the night. The women take part in the agricultural activities in the day time. Since there is no agricultural activity in the months after the Kharif they are enthusiastic to take up MGNREGA work in the post Kharif season.

The secondary data on month wise work pattern of households from the official website gives us the following pattern as shown in the Table 3 below :

Table 3 : Month-wise Work Pattern of Households

| Year | Apr | May | Jun | Jul | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar |
|--------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| 2012-13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2013-14 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 1 | 12 | 84 | 61 | 20 | 19 | 152 | 17 | 15 |
| 2014-15 | 27 | 16 | 20 | 9 | 3 | 4 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2015-16 | 0 | 0 | 32 | 40 | 47 | 43 | 28 | 19 | 14 | 11 | 12 | 25 |
| 2016-17 | 0 | 61 | 50 | 51 | 50 | 69 | 59 | 43 | 139 | 149 | 150 | 151 |
| 2017-18 | 147 | 81 | 68 | 69 | 0 | 19 | 39 | 42 | 40 | 59 | 22 | 0 |
| Total | 174 | 158 | 178 | 175 | 112 | 219 | 201 | 124 | 212 | 371 | 201 | 191 |

Source: MGNREGA official website accessed in Feb 2018

The above data shows that on an average from 2012-13 to 2017-18, the lean months of April, May on an average have fewer households in

MGNREGA employment than in the months of June, July, September, October, December, January, February and March. Also while employment in MGNREGA works was near absent in 2012-13, it increased in 2013-14 and then dipped in 2014-15 before rising gently since then.

3.5 Labour Days Projection Report

The data on month wise labour days projection report available on the MGNREGA website is shown in the Table 4 below:

Table 4 : Month wise Labour Days projection report

| Year Yr | Apr | May | Jun | Jul | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Total |
|----------------|-----|------|------|------|-----|-----|------|------|------|-----|-----|-----|-------|
| 2016-17 | 86 | 285 | 627 | 342 | 171 | 171 | 228 | 228 | 285 | 171 | 171 | 85 | 2850 |
| 2017-18 | 164 | 548 | 1206 | 658 | 328 | 329 | 439 | 438 | 548 | 329 | 329 | 166 | 5480 |
| 2018-19 | 131 | 437 | 961 | 524 | 263 | 262 | 349 | 350 | 437 | 262 | 262 | 131 | 4369 |
| Total | 381 | 1270 | 2794 | 1524 | 762 | 762 | 1016 | 1016 | 1270 | 762 | 762 | 382 | 12699 |

Source: MGNREGA official website accessed in Feb 2018

The labour days projection data for the Kharif sowing months (June and July) and Kharif harvesting months (October and November), in which the sample respondents are employed in Farm labour, fall in the top half of the data set of the three year average month wise labour day projections. The two highest values correspond to June and July. This aspect of planning does not address the need for lean season employment of the agricultural labour.

The issue of sync between the work pattern of the agricultural labour and the MGNREGA work is actually in the domain of the Gram Sabha and the instrument envisaged to resolve such issues is the Shelf of Works.

3.6 Awareness of the minimum wage

The respondents did not know that the wage rate for a day's work is Rs 192. The workers generally mentioned that they get around 120 rupees a day. The workers understood that the Group norm in MGNREGA results in less output and lessened average wage. The workers however did not mention or suggest any commission or wrong doing by anybody.

3.7 Group norm

All the respondents responded favourably to the group norm, though it entailed a lesser average income for the able bodied, than what is due on account of their relative efforts. The scheme definitely has a community aspect to the work group.

3.8 Schedule of Rates(SoR)

Analysis of Schedule of Rates in Rajasthan shows that the rates differed for different kinds of work. . For digging the top soil for Road work, the SoR mandates that the amount of earth removed for a day's wage is 100 cubic ft. A ten feet length by a ten feet breadth and a foot deep is what is prescribed. It emerged in the focussed group discussion that if the dugout soil is supposed to be discarded at a distance, the same is factored into the Schedule of Rates.

The workers mentioned that it took a day's work to do that job but the final amount that is given is much less than Rs 192. The Mates who were administered questionnaire, were not in any doubt that the SoR reflects

appropriate work load. They mentioned that sometimes when there is incidence of hard rock, the SoR is accordingly modified.

Most of the respondents, that is around 25 out of 30, felt that the MGNREGA labour is not considered easy labour by them. They mentioned that they don't see any significant difference between the Farm Labour and the MGNREGA labour.

3.9 Timely payment of wages

The respondents who have worked in the recent years have mentioned that payments are generally received in time. The following three different muster rolls available in the Panchayat office were analysed.

- For the work Muster Roll 645 for 19 Apr 2017 to 03 May 2017, the FTO was generated on 09 May 2017.
- For the work Muster Roll 6596 dated 08 Mar 2017 for the period 10 Mar 2017 to 18 Mar 2017, the FTO was generated on 25 Mar 2017.
- For the work Muster Roll 208 dated 03 Apr 2017 for the period 04 Apr 2017 to 18 Apr 2017, the FTO was generated on 27 Apr 2017.

The date of remittance into the bank account could not be ascertained from the bank which is about 6 kms from the Gram Panchayat. Evidently there is prompt administrative support as regards processing Muster Rolls for timely payment. The Overseer as well as the Mates mentioned that the work after the 15 day period (pakhwada) was measured by the overseer within two days and the Muster Roll is forwarded to the BDO within a day or two

thereafter. These assertions are borne out by the data seen in the aforesaid three muster rolls.

3.10 Agricultural Wages in the Village

The sample workers were not able to recall the farm labour rates in different years. Only one individual worker among the sample responded to the query. She said MGNREGA has had no effect and the rise in farm labour wages is because of the general price rise. The data on this aspect was collected from the Overseer engineering personnel, Smt Meghalata Agnihotri, who earlier had the charge of this particular Gram Panchayat. She has been associated with the MGNREGA, in her official capacity for the last several years. She recalled and filled the questionnaire as regards the farm labour wages and other wages in different years. The data provided is shown in the Table 5 below.

Table 5: Wage Rise in the Last Six Years

| Market Wages in the Last Six Years | | |
|------------------------------------|--|---|
| Year | Wage Rate For Casual Agricultural Labour For Men / Women | Wage Rate for Skilled Agricultural Labour |
| 2012-13 | 150/200 | 250 |
| 2013-14 | 170/300 | 300 |
| 2014-15 | 180/320 | 350 |
| 2015-16 | 200/350 | 400 |
| 2016-17 | 250/400 | 450 |
| 2017-18 | 300/450 | 450 |

Source : Data collected from Smt Meghlatha Agnihotri, Overseer

The data collected is from one source, therefore is not useful for making any serious assertions. However the MGNREGA rate of Rs 192, is far removed from the wages of Rs 300/450 for men/ women casual farm labour. The

actual average of wages under MGNREGA is around Rs 120, in the sample and therefore we may make a statement that the MGNREGA wage as a wage floor would have no impact on the labour market. It is pertinent to mention that the MGNREGA work in the village has not been done in any significant magnitude and therefore the rise in wages does not in any case, have any association with the existence of MGNREGA. However the moot point is that the large farmers of the area, need not be apprehensive of MGNREGA because it cannot displace any labour pool from the labour market.

3.11 Women Participation Levels

The primary data very clearly suggests that there is a complete woman bias in the scheme. All the workers at the worksite are women. The Mate at the worksite as well as the officials, mentioned that only women come for MGNREGA work. According to them, men do not come for this work because of the relatively low wages of the scheme and also because of availability of work for higher wages in the surrounding areas and also in Jaipur.

The secondary data substantiates this notion. The percentages of women as seen from the secondary data, in the last five years are: 94% in 2017-18, 94% in 2016-17, 86% in 2015-16, 71% in 2014-15, 77% in 2013-14. Though the percentages are high, the absolute numbers is low.

There are two to three respondents who mentioned that they do not work outside their farm. In the event of working outside their farm, they prefer to work in MGNREGA work only. It is surprising therefore that there is no person who has completed 100 days of work in the last five years.

Quite evidently there is an issue of participation but from the primary data it is evident too that the workers are keen but do not have the knowledge and capacities to demand work.

3.12 SC/ST Participation Levels.

As per the secondary data for STs available on the official MGNREGA website, in the last five years, the percentage of ST population in the MGNREGA work in the Kant Gram Panchayat, is 56% in 2017-18, 48% in 2016-17, 21% in 2015-16, 50% in 2014-15 and 35% in 2013-14.

As per the secondary data for SCs available on the official MGNREGA website, the percentage of SC population in the MGNREGA work in the Kant Gram Panchayat, in the last five years is 8% in 2017-18, 27% in 2016-17, 49% in 2015-16, 6% in 2014-15 and 32% in 2013-14. The Scheduled Caste population in different habitations varies and therefore the habitation where the works are carried out in a particular year may result in low or high percentages.

The participation of these weaker sections in the current ongoing work was collected from the Muster Roll at the work site. In the sample, eight workers belong to ST, one worker belongs to SC, and the rest 21 are from the OBCs. The sample is mostly from the village Kiritpura populated mostly by OBCs. The rest of the workers are from Sangawala, consisting mostly of STs. Therefore the relative numbers are very less from the SC population.

3.13 Issues relating to Registration of Job Cards

All the sample workers have stated that they did not face any issue regarding Job Card Registration. The secondary data too mentions 4306 workers have registered for work while only 328 are active workers. The sample workers also mentioned that there was no issue regarding Job Registration.

3.14 Awareness Levels about the Act

All the 30 sample workers have mentioned that they have come to know of the scheme by word of mouth. It is pertinent to mention that there is a limitation in their understanding of the scheme. While they are aware of the scheme as an existing 100 day scheme, their understanding of the scheme as a rights based scheme with enforceable provisions is limited. About twenty out of the thirty workers are from the village Kiritpura. They mentioned that they would like to do MGNREGA work but this is the first time in several years, that the MGNREGA work for rural infrastructure is being carried out in their village. Some people of the village who congregated at the work site mentioned the same, voluntarily, without even being asked for any information.

In the Focus Group Discussion held at the Panchayat Office, involving the Sarpanch, the Assistant Engineer, the Overseer personnel and the Officiating Panchayat Secretary, it was mentioned that this is not the case and the individuals are not able to recall well.

The Gram Sarpanch mentioned that the Gram Sabha does send the labour budget proposal incorporating the proposals of all ward members but not all works get approved by the district administration. He mentioned that the Gram

Sabha proposal consisted of one hundred and seventy works but only about ten works or so have been approved by the Block office.

The Assistant Engineer of the Block mentioned that it is not practical to process the huge number of the proposals. According to him the shelf of works sent by the Gram Panchayat cannot be pruned by the Block Office and therefore technically the shelf of works sent by the Gram Panchayat is deemed the approved shelf of works. He mentioned that the works which have feasibility constraints. These would be technical, legal etc. For example, disputes by affected individual land holders on proposed road work or constraints of keeping the material component within the stipulated norms are challenged that need to be addressed.

The Work Expenditure list collected from the Gram Panchayat Office, did not show any recent completed work done in Kiratpura. It mentions Road construction work in Kiratpura in 2016-17, also but there are no figures against it, implying that the work was not taken up in the last financial year.

Participants of the focus group discussion mentioned that the main challenge is the poor enthusiasm for MGNREGA work when it is actually taken up. They mentioned that sometimes the workers don't turn up and this causes them to abandon the work for that time period. It is pertinent to mention that the aforesaid Work Expenditure list contained the Kiratpura road work(which was the work underway), for the year 2016-17. Since it could not be taken up in 2016-17, the same has been taken up in 2017-18.

The data shows that the MGNREGA work did take place in other habitations in the previous years. When the women workers were asked as to why they

did not work in the other habitations they mentioned that they do not find it convenient to work at a place, other than their own habitation.

3.15 Livelihood security through MGNREGA

The sample workers mentioned that they wanted work for the full 100 day period. It is therefore surprising that not many works were approved for the village. The sample workers did not understand this question in the first instance. The Mate had to explain the process of their affixing their thumb impression on a document that was given to them. Evidently the sample workers did not understand the demand driven aspect of the programme. They do not comprehend the application process which also includes the dated receipt. From the questionnaire, it is seen that there are educated young children among the sample Households. Despite this the awareness levels are still low.

The dynamics which are important are Gram Sabha participation to make the shelf of works but most importantly it is giving the application and taking the dated receipt that are crucial. This is the provision for empowerment for demanding their work but the workers are not aware of its significance. The reasons for this inability to demand work could be that they are not sufficiently mobilized to demand from the administration.

With the caste composition that is existing in the GP, it is unlikely that it is shackled by the feudal structure. By this what we mean is that the potential workers are not demanding work not because of any socially and physically oppressive rural society but merely because of their lack of initiative and mobilization.

3.16 Participation of Workers in Gram Sabha

Out of the sample of 30 workers, only one worker has mentioned that she participates in the Gram Sabha. In fact she is an elected ward member. This lack of participation of the workers results in the kind of Shelf of Works which does not reflect the people's true needs. The provision of written application with a dated receipt and also the provision of grass root planning in the form of Shelf of Works, give the required empowerment to people. In the case of this village the provisions do not seem to be adequately invoked by the people.

3.17 Participation in SHGs

None of the thirty respondents are members of any SHGs. With a rain fed agricultural economy the SHGs could be of considerable use to the women. Live stock farming has considerable significance as supplementary income. Many other avenues of income generation exist through the SHG mode and are being popularized all over the country but in the case of this GP, it seems that the SHG capacity has not been built. These are the groups that act as mobilization channels to generate awareness of one's rights and also demand for those rights. The empowerment that the SHGs bring into the rural households is probably missing and this reflects in the lower participation of workers in the Gram Sabha and the resultant shelf of works that do not seem to reflect their needs.

3.18 Shelf of Works

The Shelf of Works is the plan of works prepared by the Gram Sabha, that is approved by the district administration after its due consideration. In the case of this GP, it was mentioned by the Officiating Panchayat Secretary, that the GP has approved a list of over one hundred and seventy works and this was forwarded to the Panchayat Samiti. The Assistant engineer of the Block, then mentioned that the district administration approves the list of works for the district as a whole. The document was not available at the GP.

It was clarified later by the Assistant Engineer of the Block, that the plan of works sent by the GP is not pruned by the Samiti office. It was mentioned that the plan of works is examined for any technical and legal constraints and only the works that could be taken up for implementation are processed for financial sanction during the year. The factor that is mainly considered subject to clearance from all constraints, is the number of active workers. It was further mentioned that the active workers sometimes migrate and their actual availability is lesser than what the data on the website indicates. In fact the definition of active workers too, is not reflective of the true position. The active workers are those who have worked in the last three years even if it was for only a day.

In the Focus Group Discussion, the Assistant Engineer of the Block mentioned that the works which are taken up for financial sanction in the year constitute their plan of action for the year. The list of such works for 2016-17 and also for 2015-16 have been collected from the Block Office. The Work

Expenditure list (works since inception of the scheme in 2008-09 in the Panchayat) collected from the Gram Panchayat Office mentions nineteen works in the year 2016-17 and nine works in the year 2017-18. As against this, the Gram Sabha approved list is approximately 170 in the year 2017-18. The reason for the mismatch emerged in the Focus Group Discussion, wherein technical, legal and labour to material ratio constraints were mentioned.

The shelf of works for the Gram Panchayat submitted to the Block Office/ Programme officer, for year 2016-17 is shown below in Table 6.

Table 6: Shelf of Works 2016-17 with estimate of expenditure

| S No. | Work Expenditure Work Name(Work Code) | Gp- KANT | | | | Expenditure On: | | | | |
|-------|---|----------------|-----------------|---|----------------------------|-----------------|--------------|---------|----------|-------|
| | | Financial Year | Agency Category | Work Category | Registration No | Labour | | | Material | Total |
| | | | | | | Unskilled | Semi-Skilled | Skilled | | |
| 23 | अणवी कँवर /रघुनाथ सिंह पशु आश्रय मय नैरेप कम्पोस्ट पिट निर्माण | 2016-2017 | Gram Panchayat | Works on Individuals Land (Category IV) | RJ-2712010025201575600/575 | 0.1327 | 0 | 0.12 | 0 | 0.25 |
| 24 | सुन्दरी बुनकर / गोमा पशु आश्रय मय नैरेप कम्पोस्ट पिट निर्माण 512234 | 2016-2017 | Gram Panchayat | Works on Individuals Land (Category IV) | RJ-271201004301575300/568 | 0.0616 | 0 | 0.09 | 0 | 0.17 |
| 30 | Construction of IAY House -IAY REG. NO. RJ1339397 | 2016-2017 | Gram Panchayat | Works on Individuals Land (Category IV) | RJ-271201004301575400/48 | 0.1213 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.12 |
| 31 | Construction of IAY House -IAY REG. NO. RJ2083240 | 2016-2017 | Gram Panchayat | Works on Individuals Land (Category IV) | RJ-271201004301575400/65 | 0.1448 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.14 |
| 37 | grewal sadak nirman sangawala bus stend brahmno ke bere tak | 2016-2017 | Gram Panchayat | Rural Connectivity | | 0.1135 | 0.02 | 0 | 0 | 0.13 |
| 38 | grewal sadak nirman sangawala ke khumhar mohhale tak | 2016-2017 | Gram Panchayat | Rural Connectivity | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 39 | Grewal sadak kiratpura road se bramno ki dhani tak | 2016-2017 | Gram Panchayat | Rural Connectivity | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 40 | grewal sadak nirman mataji ke mandir se samshan ghat tak | 2016-2017 | Gram Panchayat | Rural Connectivity | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 41 | grewal sadak nirman kiratpura gav se kalya ki dhani kant seema shetr tak | 2016-2017 | Gram Panchayat | Rural Connectivity | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 42 | grewal sadak nirman harshahy khumhar ke makan se bedri ki dhani tak | 2016-2017 | Gram Panchayat | Rural Connectivity | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 43 | grewal sadak nirman rampura baniyawala se kalda ki dhani tak | 2016-2017 | Gram Panchayat | Rural Connectivity | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 44 | grewal sadak nirman rampura baniyawala se samshanghat tak | 2016-2017 | Gram Panchayat | Rural Connectivity | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 45 | grewal sadak nirman kant se papadawali bandh | 2016-2017 | Gram Panchayat | Rural Connectivity | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 46 | Grewal sadak nirman N H 11 si se balyakala tak | 2016-2017 | Gram Panchayat | Rural Connectivity | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 47 | grewal sadak nirman kalda k dhani se bendada tak | 2016-2017 | Gram Panchayat | Rural Connectivity | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 48 | ग्रेवाल सड़क निर्माण सागावाला बस स्टैण्ड से ब्राह्मणों की टाणी तक 404,010 | 2016-2017 | Gram Panchayat | Rural Connectivity | | 4.0478 | 0.05 | 0.13 | 0.95 | 5.18 |
| 168 | भूमिया जी वाली तलाई कालवाड काट | 2016-2017 | Gram Panchayat | Renovtion of traditional water bodies | | 4.588 | 0.2 | 0.16 | 0 | 4.95 |
| 169 | गम तलाई मोड़िया की टानी | 2016-2017 | Gram Panchayat | Renovtion of traditional water bodies | | 4.6918 | 0.2 | 0.13 | 0 | 5.02 |
| 170 | पारावाली तलाई सागावाली | 2016-2017 | Gram Panchayat | Renovtion of traditional water bodies | | 5.5216 | 0.05 | 0.29 | 0 | 5.86 |

Source: Collected from Block Office

The shelf of works for the Gram Panchayat submitted to the Block Office/ Programme officer, for year 2017-18, is shown below in Table 7 below.

Table no 7: Title : Shelf of Works 2017-18 with estimate of expenditure

| Work Expenditure | | Gp- KANT | | | | Expenditure On: | | | | |
|------------------|---|----------------|-----------------|---|----------------------------|-----------------|--------------|---------|----------|-------|
| S No. | Work Name(Work Code) | Financial Year | Agency Category | Work Category | Registration No | Labour | | | | Total |
| | | | | | | Unskilled | Semi-Skilled | Skilled | Material | |
| 32 | Construction of IAY House -IAY REG. NO. RJ2926356 | 2017-2018 | Gram Panchayat | Works on Individuals Land (Category IV) | RJ-273203024301575400/498 | 0.152 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.15 |
| 33 | Construction of IAY House -IAY REG. NO. RJ2974683 | 2017-2018 | Gram Panchayat | Works on Individuals Land (Category IV) | RJ-273203024301578200/1038 | 0.1321 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.13 |
| 49 | grewal sadak nirman kiratpura roas se bharmano ki dani tam | 2017-2018 | Gram Panchayat | Rural Connectivity | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 50 | grewal sadak nirman kiratpura gav se kalva ki dani kant seema tak | 2017-2018 | Gram Panchayat | Rural Connectivity | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 51 | grewal sadak nirman harshay khumhar ke makan se badi dani tak | 2017-2018 | Gram Panchayat | Rural Connectivity | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 52 | grewal sadak nirman mata ji ke mandir se smashan ghati tak | 2017-2018 | Gram Panchayat | Rural Connectivity | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 53 | Gewal sadak kirtpura road se bokana ki dani ko or | 2017-2018 | Gram Panchayat | Rural Connectivity | | 0.6173 | 0.02 | 0 | 0 | 0.63 |
| 162 | bhomiyaji ki talai khudai nirman kary | 2017-2018 | Gram Panchayat | Water Conservation and Water Harvesting | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 163 | parawali talai khudai kary v pal nirman kary | 2017-2018 | Gram Panchayat | Water Conservation and Water Harvesting | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Source: Collected from Block Office

Out of the nine works that the work expenditure sheet mentions for 2017-18, five pertain to internal roads under rural connectivity but it is pertinent to mention that four of these works have been a part of the preceding year's plan of works as the 2016-17 plan of works reveal. Again two works on renovation of water bodies were part of the 2016-17 plan of works.

It was mentioned in the Focus Group Discussion that the works could not be taken up in the year 2016-17, because of the constraints of finding labour and also because the road construction entailed issues of disputes raised by people who would lose their landed property on account of construction.

It emerged from the Focus Group Discussion that the two works on 'renovation of water bodies' are actually continuing works that have spilled over into this year and since Muster Roll cannot be raised without financial sanction, the same has been included this year.

The following issues emerge from the analysis of the shelf of works.

First, the works planned by the Gram Sabha run into a long unrealistic list both from the point of view of the aspiration of the Gram Sabha and also from the point of view of demand of labour that is brought to its notice. The MGNREGA plan of works ought not to be, solely, an aspirational document of the Gram Sabha. It is primarily to provide work for the people of the village who need or desire to work under MGNREGA. In the Focus Group Discussion the Officiating Panchayat Secretary as well as the Gram Sarpanch mentioned that the people have avenues to work in the nearby places in the Industrial area and educational institutions and therefore they are not inclined to work under MGNREGA wage regime, that is significantly below market wages. The essence of their observation is that the MGNREGA wage is not attractive.

Second, the Samiti office and the Zilla Parishad too, are not pruning the plan of works proposed by the Gram Sabha. The reasons apparently are that the list under consideration is too long and the same is considered more seriously at the time of examination for financial sanction. It is also very unrealistic to analyse approximately hundred works from each Panchayat at the time of preparing labour budget. The officials also believe that they are not permitted to prune the Gram Sabha approved plans but what ultimately is

sanctioned is not the Gram Sabha proposed plan per se. Only a tiny fraction of the proposal has found sanction in the year 2017-18.

Third, the Gram Sabha unknowingly impedes and clutters the whole process by being unrealistic and delegating its responsibility to the higher echelons that are removed from the place of action. The GP Sarpanch has mentioned that the reason that the shelf of works is unduly long is because of the need to accommodate the requests of every ward member. The dynamics at the village level make it very difficult to achieve consensus and to set a realistic goal. However this lack of clarity and articulation of priorities by the Gram Sabha, is virtually leading to a still born shelf of works.

Fourth the administration should articulate to the Gram Sabha that the process of preparing the shelf of works deserves seriousness. In fact taking a contrarian view to what the Gram Sabha has been doing, and arguing that had the Gram Sabha forwarded, say, twenty community works, it would have rallied for those works quite seriously and vehemently. Any laxity by the administration could have been taken to the notice of higher authorities, for a remedy. The Gram Sabha should work for feasible solutions and not for grand unworkable plans.

The administration too while it is not expected to handle such a unrealistic magnitude of plans, still could have implemented the plan of work that it finalises. The constraints of unavailability of labour especially in the context of a shortened plan of action, could certainly be overcome with some coordination.

Be that as it may, this village has been witnessing a turn around in MGNREGA work since two years, and this is encouraging.

3.19 Works implemented in the Panchayat

Data on the Works implemented in the Panchayat, since the commencement of the scheme in the year 2008 was collected from the Panchayat Office. The number of works are approximately 170. These works are spread over different categories and they give the yearwise pattern of works. The pattern that emerges from the data is shown below in Table 8.

**Table 8 : Year wise Work Category of implemented Works
(2008-09 to 2017-18)**

| Work category | 2008-09 | 09-10 | 10-11 | 11-12 | 12-13 | 13-14 | 14-15 | 15-16 | 16-17 | 2017-18 | Total |
|---|---------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|---------|-------|
| Water Conservation & Harvesting | 4 | 5 | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 2 | 12 |
| Category IV Individual Works | 2 | - | - | - | 3 | - | - | 2 | 4 | 2 | 13 |
| Renovation of Traditional Water Bodies | 4 | 2 | - | - | 1 | - | - | - | 3 | - | 10 |
| Land Development | - | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 |
| Rural Connectivity | 1 | 2 | 2 | - | 1 | - | - | 1 | 12 | 5 | 24 |
| Drought Proofing | - | - | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 |
| Rural Sanitation | - | - | - | - | - | 103 | - | - | - | - | 103 |
| Others | - | - | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 |
| Total works | 11 | 10 | 5 | - | 5 | 103 | - | 3 | 19 | 9 | 165 |

Source: Work Expenditure List collected from Gram Panchayat Office

The data above reveals that there was an initial enthusiasm during 2008-10 and a weak existence of the scheme, thereafter, till 2016-17. The year 2013-14 has seen significant effort and sole focus in Rural Sanitation, but that remained a one off year for sanitation works.

In terms of the number of works (excluding the convergence works in rural sanitation), while the individual works total to 14, the community works number 48. The benefits of community works reach larger numbers.

From the data provided in the form of work expenditure list it was not feasible to calculate the amount spent on the community works as against the individual works as in approximately 25 to 30 works, the expenditure has been shown as zero. As regards some of these entries, it was mentioned in the Focus Group Discussion, that if some sanctioned works could not be implemented for some technical, legal or any other such reason, the expenditure in that year is shown as zero. However as regards some assets, the works have been mentioned as complete but the expenditure columns have been left unfilled inadvertently. The details for two such works have been seen in the physical work register maintained at GP office and it was seen that these works indeed were completed but inadvertently not fed into the data base (corresponding to item 17 & 18, of the work expenditure list out taken from database at the Gram Panchayat Office). The aforesaid sheet has not been filled accurately but there could be clerical errors that could be disregarded. It also emerged in the Focus Group Discussion that sometimes a work takes a number of years to get completed and it also takes completion of a few more formalities before payments are made to the suppliers. It is only then that a completion certificate is generated. It may happen that completion certificate takes time to be issued in a few cases and this might result in not filling some columns. Delayed payments may lead to poor response from suppliers in the future.

Among the community assets, the main work that predominates is the water related community works. The focus in this area is on construction and renovation of harvesting structures. There are several ponds in the area and works are carried out to deepen the ponds, increase the surface area and strengthening the bunds. These are expected to lead to retention and harvest of the erratic rainfall.

The Agricultural works such as NADEP composting, Vermi composting and Livestock related works such as poultry and goat shelter are absent. The Rural drinking water related works such as Soak pits and Recharge pits are also not found under MGNREGA in this Gram Panchayat. The Solid and Liquid Waste Management works, too, such as Compost pits are also not found. Therefore it seems from the above that the assets are generally one dimensional and the planning for the shelf of works does not promise any holistic perspective that aims to create synergies.

3.20 Work Category Analysis

Evidence could be drawn, from the year wise data on the Work Category analysis, available on the MGNREGA website, on the proportion of community assets.

Table no 9 : Year Wise Expenditure on different Work Categories in Kant GP

| Work Category Analysis Data from the MGNREGA Web Site(exp in lakhs) | | | | | | |
|---|---|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Category | Description of Works | 2013-14 | 2014-15 | 2015-16 | 2016-17 | 2017-18 |
| A | Public works relating to Natural Resources Management | - | - | - | 13.86 | 3.98 |
| B | Individual assets for Vulnerable sections | 0.42 | - | 0.74 | 0.69 | 0.55 |
| C | Common Infrastructure for NRLM compliant SHGs | - | - | - | - | - |
| D | Rural Infrastructure | 3.78 | 0.94 | 2.77 | 3.55 | 3.99 |
| A+B+C+D | Total Expenditure | 4.2 | 0.94 | 3.51 | 18.1 | 8.52 |
| (A+C+D) | Community Assets (A+C+D) | 3.78 | 0.94 | 2.77 | 17.41 | 7.97 |
| | Proportion of Community Assets (B) to total Assets | 90% | 100% | 79% | 96% | 93.5% |
| (B) | Individual Assets (B) | .42 | - | 0.74 | 0.69 | 0.55 |
| | Proportion of Individual Assets (B) to total Assets | 10% | - | 21% | 4% | 6.5% |

Source: Work Category analysis available on MGNREGA website accessed in Feb 2018.

As seen in the Table above, expenditure on MGNREGA works is primarily on community assets and is also above 90% of total expenditure. They range from 79% to 100%.

The actual expenditure on these works in the various years shows an erratic pattern and range from Rs 0.94 lakh to Rs 18.1 lakh.

The SHG movement is yet to take root in the study villages. It emerged from the Focus Discussion, that the women continue to be guided closely by the men folk of the family and do not exercise their independent enterprise.

There seems to be a correlation between the inactivity of MGNREGA in general on one hand, and the lack of Gram Sabha participation by women and the lack of SHG movement, on the other.

3.21 Outlays & Outcomes

Data on the 'Outlays & Outcomes' available on the website was also analysed to understand how the Outlay is connected to the Outcome in terms of Person Days.

Table 10 : Yearwise distribution of labour/ material expenditure and person days

| Year | Un Skilled exp | Material Exp | Adm exp | Total Exp | % of unskilled exp component | % of material exp component | Employment provided in Person Days | Number of Persons provided | Avg days to one HH |
|---------|----------------|--------------|---------|-----------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------|
| 2012-13 | - | - | - | - | - | | - | - | - |
| 2013-14 | 2.92 | 1.28 | - | 4.2 | 70% | 30% | 2094 | 157 | 16 |
| 2014-15 | 0.64 | 0.31 | - | 0.95 | 67% | 33% | 340 | 30 | 12 |
| 2015-16 | 3.08 | 0.42 | 1.53 | 5.03 | 61% | 39% | 2746 | 58 | 54 |
| 2016-17 | 17.44 | 0.66 | 2.21 | 20.31 | 86% | 14% | 13676 | 238 | 61 |
| 2017-18 | 6.05 | 2.47 | - | 8.52 | 71% | 29% | 3892 | 202 | 20 |

Source: MGNREGA website accessed in Feb 2018

A few salient points emerge from the data above.

- The unskilled component of the expenditure is much higher than the material component as per the stipulation.
- The person days in an year is very low and it shows erratic pattern. The highest number of days is recorded for 2016-17 (13676 days),

which is approx 40 times more than the person days recorded in 2014-15. In 2012-13 the person days is shown as zero.

- The average days of employment given to a Household, also varies significantly from one year to the other.

It also emerged from the Focus Group Discussion, that the constraints of keeping material component lower at 30% of the cost, has meant that the shelf of works cannot include preferred water harvesting projects like Roof Top Harvesting in which the labour costs approximate Rs 11000 and material costs amount to around Rs 60000. In the discussions it was seen that MGNREGA could be a part of projects with considerable material component also, as convergence allows the planners to employ MGNREGA for the labour component of these projects in the same way that MGNREGA is associated with PMAY.

3.22 Impact of Assets/ Asset Productivity

A large number of Assets have been created under MGNREGA since 2008-09, in Kant Gram Panchayat, as given in Table 8. This section of the dissertation analyses the data collected on the perceptions of households living in the vicinity of community assets(renovated traditional water body) and also that of Key Personnel involved in planning and building these structures.

Rajasthan is a water starved State with meager & non perennial surface water resources and extremely critical state of groundwater. The dismal water sector scenario has been further aggravated and intensified by geographical, climatic and demographic vagaries. (Rajasthan CSR Report 2018)

Water related structures are the prominent type of assets that have been built. The following four structures are generally mentioned as water related structures in the official manual.

- Farm ponds
- Open wells
- Gully plugging
- Farm bunding

Relevant Water related works in the arid areas are generally the following.

- Water conservation and Harvesting
- Irrigation facilities to marginal farmers
- Renovation of traditional water bodies.

In the Focus Group Discussion it was mentioned that the water table in the Gram Panchayat area is depleted and therefore the structures like farm ponds and open wells are not taken up under MGNREGA. Farm Bunding and Gully Plugging have been prominent in the Gram Panchayat area but these works were mainly done under a different scheme called "Mukhyamantri Jal Swavlamban Abhiyan"(MJSA). The scheme aims to conserve and harvest rain water and make villages self-reliant even during drought periods. The programme has been designed in such a way that everything from planning to execution shall be followed in a participatory approach down to the village community level.

Four Waters Concept

The FGD also brought out this interesting concept. Four waters concept, which has been successful in countering drought and averting migration of labour in China, is quite relevant to the drought-prone Rajasthan. This low-cost technology can increase recharge of groundwater by four times and provide thrice the benefit than conventional modes.(Rajasthan State Government website).

The Four Waters concept revolves around the harvesting of available runoff (rain water, ground water, under-ground water & in situ soil moisture) in rural areas by treatment of catchment, proper utilization of available water harvesting structures, renovation of the non-functional water harvesting structures and creation of new water harvesting structures. It also includes development of forest, land, water & fauna keeping watershed/cluster/index as a unit for natural resource management.

It also emerged from discussion, that diligent quantification of impact of water structure/ assets built under MGNREGA, is a complex exercise because much of the water storage infrastructure has been developed under Mukhya Mantri Jal Swavlamban Abhiyan (MJSA) scheme. Also a number of departments like the Ground Water Department, the Public Health Department, the Irrigation and Agriculture Departments, besides the Rural Development Department, are involved in the water works, in various ways. In view of this limitation and also because of the time constraints, it was considered appropriate to seek the perception of the stakeholders.

Water Works

Data was collected on the two following water works

- Kiritpura Talai
- Bhowmiyaji Talai

Kiritpura Talai (pond) is a clear water shed point as evident from the picture.

Picture 1: Kiritpura Talai work



Source: Field Visit

The rationale for undertaking this work emerged during the FGD. The Sarpanch as well as the Assistant Engineer explained that the Talai is expected to collect the water gushing down the small adjoining hills thereby arresting the speed of water and its soil eroding potential.

There are a couple of houses near the Talai and perceptions of one Household were collected. The person, Smt Bhawri Devi, mentioned that they possess 8 Bighas of land in the vicinity of the Talai (pond) and towards the lower side of the Talai (pond). The household members mentioned that

whenever the tank collects water, they see a rise in the water level in their open well that is mostly dry.

They recalled that the tank used to get full in the rains, in the past, that is a decade and a half ago. The Talai was renovated with more depth and diameter and also the sides were strengthened with stone pitching in the year 2009. They also recall that the rain fall has been extremely scarce in the last decade and to the best of their knowledge there has been only one or two years wherein they received some rainfall. They recall that the water collected up to half of the Talai, roughly. They had water welling in their open well that year that helped them cultivate two crops. For them, availability of water means a better yield and a crop pattern that leads to higher returns.

The Talai, according to them also provides drinking water for the livestock of the village.

Bhowmiyaji Talai:

Picture 2: Bhowmiyaji Talai



Source: Field Visit

One could easily see from the adjoining barren hills that the Talai is a natural watershed point. The house of the Sarpanch of the Kant GP, is in the vicinity of the Talai. The 'Talai work', under MGNREGA, was done in the year 2016. Though this was renovated in 2016, one could from a visual inspection, see that the trough is a natural water shed point and people living in the vicinity could shed some light on the impact of this natural structure in the past.

In the FGD, the Sarpanch mentioned that water structures are crucial in this drought prone area. He mentioned that these Traditional Water Bodies, Medh Bandi (Farm Bunding), and Contour Bunding are very important in this area because the area gets its precipitation only for a few days of monsoon . The storm water also tends to erode the loose top soil and forms gullies, thus affecting the productive lands.

Picture 3: Gully formation in the village lands



Source: Field Visit

The above picture depicts how the land has been cut into gullies in the area at the foot of the barren hills, that send the rain water gushing down

without moderating the speed of water owing to lack of vegetation cover. This is what the water structures prevent in this area. The Sarpanch has mentioned that the lands on the downslope to the water structure benefit from this protection.

The Sarpanch, Shri Sandeep Kumar Bumkar, mentioned that his farm land of about 4 Bighas is towards the downslope to the Talai. The Sarpanch recalled that the Talai used to hold water after rains, but the rains in the last decade have been very scarce. The renovation of this water body has taken place in end 2016 and therefore the renovated structure has seen only one monsoon. The Sarpanch mentioned that the monsoon has not been so good but the water collected was useful for the livestock. He mentioned that one good monsoon could have significant impact on the surrounding water table, resulting in better agricultural productivity.

Farm Bunding

Interviews were conducted with the key stake holders. During the Interview with the with the Sarpanch, Shri Bumkar, it emerged that rainfall in general has declined after the year 2000. The Government has created a lot of water storage potential for drinking water by constructing ground level reservoirs, bore wells and hand pumps. The irrigation potential however could be created by creation of water harvesting structures.

Medh bandi (Farm Bunding), according to him has helped his land get more yield. His land produced 4-5 quintals till 2015 but in 2016 and 2017, the yield went up to 5-7 quintals. He attributes it to Farm Bunding. He explained

that what ever little precipitation falls on the land, the Farm Bunds help to hold that as moisture to help atleast one rain fed crop.

In the FGD, the Overseer engineering personnel Smt Meghlata Agnihotri mentioned that owing to the water related works, some fallow land has come into cultivation.

Farm Bunding is perceived to be very important work, by all the officials as well as the Gram Sarpanch. They mentioned that it is clearly evident to them that it is impossible to prevent gully formation without adequate bunding and the lands maintain the leveled surface because of this.

The Assistant Engineer mentioned that the State of Rajasthan has focused on creating water harvesting structures and these are being designed, in house, by the engineering personnel. He mentioned that the present structures have been built for much more strength with stone pitching on the sides. To understand this, two different Talais constructed in 2009-10 were compared by personal visits to those structures. The following pictures show that the structure without pitching(Jaganath Ji Talai) is weak at the sides and also allow seepage along the sides. The Assistant engineer mentioned that the structures built now have stone pitching on the sides and therefore more durable.

**Picture 4: Without Stone Pitching:
Jagganath ji Talai built in 2009-10**



Source: Field Visit

**Picture 5 : With Stone Pitching:
Kiritpura Talai built in 2009-10**



Source: Field Visit

It also emerged during the interview with Sarpanch that these structures are crucial in this drought prone area. Their use evidently could not be maximized because of poor rainfall in recent years, but their utility would be realized just by one good monsoon.

The causal relationship of water related works on the general water levels in the village could not be evaluated in a study of this small a scope. The baseline data, that is, water table data related to 2009 could not be gathered from the Hydrology office. What could be collected are the data points(2013 to 2017) for the Piezometer in the village. The data is as follows.

Table 11: Piezometer Data from Kant Panchyat

| Piezometer Data | | | | | |
|-----------------|------|------|-------|-------|-------|
| Year | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
| Pre monsoon | 25.8 | 25.1 | Roots | Roots | 43.2 |
| Post monsoon | 25.1 | 24 | Roots | Roots | 39.45 |

Source: Ground Water Department, Jaipur

The data is not sufficient enough to make an evaluation of the impact of any specific MGNREGA water structure, however it suggests that the prolific water works of the year 2016 and 2017 under MJSA, could have had an impact. To make a firm assertion, a serious evaluation is required and no assertions could be made with the data points from this single 'Well', maintained by the Ground Water Department in the village.