

Report No. 136

**IMPACT OF MGNREGA ON WAGE RATES, FOOD
SECURITY AND RURAL URBAN MIGRATION IN
ANDHRA PRADESH**

*PROF. G. GANGADHARA RAO, Ph.D.,
Dr. K. ADISESHU, Ph.D.,*



**Agro-Economic Research Centre
Andhra University
Visakhapatnam**

May, 2012

PREFACE

In the annals of rural employment generation schemes after independence, MGNREGA stands as the grandest one. It has provided 'right to work' to rural population in India. Having with abundant manual workforce, it has opened new portals across nation in general and in particular for women.

There has been an endeavour in this study to know the impact of this programme on wages, food security and migration in Andhra Pradesh (A.P.) and estimated verily very positive affect and effect on them. It is found that the levels of incomes of the participants are increased and particularly, the women wages are much stabilized for a long period in a year. They are able to receive good wages. A significant fact appears that the migration has been in operation with higher wages compared to MGNREGA wage, as this scheme is acting as buffer wage to the labour force either from local demand or from non local demand (proximate urban area and other works from different sources).

It will be good to give unemployment allowance for the workforce who hails from high poverty class. Though there is lot of censure for the scheme from the side of farming activity, it is good to accomplish 100 days in A.P. through the execution of programme in non-agricultural seasons. And at the same time keeping in view national interest and peasant community interest, it is urgent to relieve the cultivators from the routine use of manual labour and to make them to substitute machines and methods fitting for farming activity to reduce, dependence on labour and cost of cultivation.

High inevitability is there to smarten up the local administrative set up to mobilize the Village Monitoring committees (VMCs), Gram Sabhas and Social Audit. These are not found in appropriate way in agriculturally developed districts though these are found for good awareness. Many women workers and higher-middle aged depend on MGNREGA, as such it would be much apt to render works to be localized. The programme has demonstrated incredibly impressive influence on empowerment of women.

Workforce is to become habitual to saving and its future use. Therefore the scheme may be designed in those lines by the availability of bank or some saving means at their behest in the village. These habits may lead them to consider/plan for insurance and other security aspects of life.

All this study has become perceptible and worthy because of the good co-operation of the officials of MGNREGA at all levels viz. state, district, mandal and village of A.P. They gave good support for this project work. Especially I thank Sri Murali, Director, Employment Guarantee Scheme-MGNREGA, Ministry of Rural Development, A.P.

I appreciate the services rendered by Dr. K. Adishesu who has been much instrumental to bring out this report to this shape as co-author of this study. I admire the services of Mr. K.V. Giri Babu for field work and tables' generation and Mr. K. Ramesh and Smt. P. Malathi for decent word processing.

(Dr. G. GANGADHARA RAO)

PROJECT TEAM

- | | | |
|------------------------------------|---|--|
| 1. Project Leader | : | Prof. G. Gangadhara Rao |
| 2. Drafting | : | Prof. G. Gangadhara Rao
Dr. K. Adishesu |
| 3. Field Work & Statistical Tables | : | Sri K.V. Giribabu |
| 4. Word Processing | : | Sri K. Ramesh
Smt. P. Malathi |

CONTENTS

	Preface	i
	Project Team	iii
	Contents	iv
	List of Tables	viii
	List of Box	ix
Chapter – I:	Introduction	1
1.1	Introduction	1
1.2A	Historical Background	1
	a) National Rural Employment Programme (NREP)	1
	b) Rural Landless Employment Guarantee Programme (RLEGP)	2
	c) Jawahar Rozgar Yojana (JRY)	2
	d) Employment Assurance Scheme (EAS)	3
	e) Jawahar Gram Samridhi Yojana (JGSY)	3
	f) Sampoorna Grameena Rozgar Yojana (SGRY)	4
	g) National Food for Work Programme (NFFWP)	4
	h) National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (MGNREGA)	5
1.2B	Review of Literature	6
1.2C	Studies of MGNREGA in A.P.	9
	The Problem	11
1.3	Objectives of the Study	12
1.4	Data base and Methodology	12
1.5	An Overview	13
	References	14
Chapter – II:	Manpower Employment Generated under MGNREGA and its Socio-Economic Characteristics	16
2.1	The Functioning of MGNREGA	16
	2.1.A. Functioning of MGNREGA in Andhra Pradesh	16
	2.1.B. The Functioning of MGNREGA (in three phases)	17
2.2	Total Employment Generated – their Socio-Economic Characteristics	19
2.3	Number of Projects completed and total amount spent	24
	2.3.1. Percentage distribution of number of works by completed and on-going works	24
	a) Rural Connectivity works	24
	b) Flood Control and Protection	24
	c) Water Conservation and Water Harvesting	25
	d) Drought Proofing	25
	e) Micro-Irrigation works	25
	f) Irrigation facility to land owned by SCs, STs Beneficiaries of land reforms and others	25
	g) Renovation of Traditional Water Bodies	26
	h) Land Development	26
	i) B.N.R.G.S.K. works	31
	j) Total works	31
	2.3.3. Amount spent on completed projects	32
	2.3.3.1. Percentage distribution of Amount spent on works by completed and on-going works	32
	a) Rural Connectivity works	32
	b) Flood Control and Protection	32
	c) Water Conservation and Water Harvesting	32
	d) Drought Proofing	33
	e) Micro-Irrigation works	33

	f) Provision of Irrigation facility to land owned by SCs, STs Beneficiaries of land reforms and others	38
	g) Renovation of Traditional Water Bodies	38
	h) Land Development works	38
	i) B.N.R.G.S.K. works	39
	j) Total works	39
2.4	Performance of MGNREGA – Some Quantitative Indicators	40
	2.4.1. Verification of Muster rolls	40
	2.4.2a. Social Audit	40
	2.4.2b. Social Audit held in Grampanchayats	43
	2.4.2c. Inspections Conducted	43
	2.4.2d. Gramsabhas held	44
	2.4.2e. Complaints	45
	2.4.3. Bank Accounts & Post Office Accounts	46
	2.4.4. Un-employment Allowance	49
	2.4.5. Work Projection for 2010-11	50
2.5	Summing Up	53
Chapter – III:	Household Characteristics and their Income and Consumption Pattern	56
3.1	Household Profile of the respondents	56
	Adilabad District	59
	Chittoor District	60
	Mahboobnagar District	60
	Srikakulam District	61
	Krishna District	62
3.2	Main Occupation	63
3.3	Household Net Income	66
3.4	Household Consumption	72
	3.4.1. Monthly Per Capita Consumption of Food Items	72
	3.4.2. Consumption Expenditure of Households	75
3.5	Variability (CV) and Gini Ratios of Income and Consumption	80
	Adilabad	81
	Chittoor	81
	Mahboobnagar	83
	Srikakulam	83
	Krishna	83
3.6	Determinants of Participation in MGNREGA:	83
	3.6.1. Discussion of the Regression Results	85
3.7	Summing Up	87
Chapter – IV:	Work Profile under MGNREGA, Wage Structure and Migration Issues	88
4.1	Work Profile under MGNREGA	88
	4.1.1. Characteristics of the sample households in the selected districts	89
4.2	How successful has been MGNREGA providing 100 days employment (to the registered families at their door steps)	90
4.3	Nature of Assets created and their Durability	91
4.4	Wage Differentials under MGNREGA and its comparison with Minimum Wage Act	93
4.5	Wage differentials in different activities, among beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries	94
4.6	How has MGNREGA affected Labour Migration (Labour Migrating back into village and Migrated out of village), Direction of Migration (Rural to Urban and Vice-versa)	99
4.7	Summing Up	102

Chapter – V:	The Functioning of MGNREGA Qualitative Aspects	104
5.1	Household Assets Holdings	104
5.2.a	Household Status on Borrowings and their Financial Vulnerability	105
5.2.b	Household Strength on borrowing and other Household Aspects of Sample Villages	106
5.3	Qualitative Functioning of MGNREGA from Villages	107
5.4	Some Quantitative Aspects of MGNREGA	113
5.5	Potential benefits of MGNREGA in A.P.	113
5.6	Quantitative Aspects of Food Security of Sample Villages of A.P.	115
5.7	Summary	116
Chapter – VI:	MGNREGA Impact on Village Economy	117
6.1	Infrastructure Available in the Sample Villages in A.P.	117
6.2	Occupational Structure in Sample Villages	118
6.3	Wage Rates of Labour in all sample villages: (State level/Overall)	119
6.4	Average Prevailing labour charges for Agricultural Operations in Sample Villages by Overall/State	119
6.5	Qualitative changes in sample villages during last one year in A.P.	120
6.6	Qualitative Functioning of MGNREGA in A.P.	122
	Summary	123
Chapter – VII:	Summary and Conclusions	125
7.1	Introduction	125
	a) National Rural Employment Programme (NREP)	125
	b) Rural Landless Employment Guarantee Programme (RLEGP)	125
	c) Jawahar Rozgar Yojana (JRY)	126
	d) Employment Assurance Scheme (EAS)	126
	e) Jawahar Gram Samridhi Yojana (JGSY)	126
	f) Sampoorna Grameena Rozgar Yojana (SGRY)	127
	g) National Food for Work Programme (NFFWP)	127
	h) National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (MGNREGA)	127
	i) The Problem	129
	j) Objectives of the study	129
	k) Data base and Methodology	130
	l) An Overview	131
7.2	Man Power Employment Generated under MGNREGA and its Socio-Economic Characteristics	131
7.3	Household Characteristics and their Income and Consumption Pattern	133
7.4	Work Profile under MGNREGA, Wage Structure and Migration issues	135
7.5.1	Household Assets Holdings	137
7.5.2	Household Status on Borrowings and their Financial Vulnerability	137
	7.5.2.B. Household Strength on Borrowing and other Household Assets of Sample Villages	138
7.5.3	Qualitative Functioning of MGNREGA from Sample Villages	138
7.5.4	Some Qualitative Aspects of MGNREGA in A.P.	138
7.5.5	Potential Benefits of MGNREGA in A.P.	139
7.5.6.	Quantitative Aspects of Food Security of Sample Villages in A.P.	139
7.6.1	Infrastructure Available in the Sample Villages in A.P.	139
7.6.2	Occupational Structure in Sample Villages	140
7.6.3	Wage Rates of Labour in all sample villages: (State level/Overall)	140
7.6.4	Average Prevailing labour charges for Agricultural Operations in Sample Villages by Overall/State	140
7.6.5	Qualitative changes in sample villages during last one year in A.P.	140
7.6.6	Qualitative Functioning of MGNREGA in A.P.	141

Policy Suggestions	142
1. 100 Days Employment Norm	142
2. Long term works	142
3. Un-employment Allowance	142
4. Gram Sabhas VMCs and Social Audit	143
5. Alternative Payment Channel	143
6. Mobilization of Savings	143
7. Location of works	143
8. MGNREGA: A Custodian for Higher Wage from Vicinity and Migration	143
9. Impact on Agriculture and the Alternative	144
Annexure Tables	1-15

List of Tables

No.	Title	Page
A	Year-wise Progress (2006-07 to 2010-11)	16
B	Performance of MGNREGA – Phase-wise 2008-09, 2009-10 and 2010-11	18
2.1	Employment Generated through MGNREGA and its Socio-Economic Characteristics 2010-2011	21
	Employment Generated through MGNREGA and its Socio-Economic Characteristics 2009-2010	22
	Employment Generated through MGNREGA and its Socio-Economic Characteristics 2008-2009	23
2.2	Distribution of number of works by completed/on-going works District-wise in A.P. – 2011-08	27
2.3	District-wise works completed/progress under MGNREGA (Amount spent) (2010-11, 2009-10, 2008-09)	34
C	Execution of Social Audit	41
2.4	Social auditing and inspection of MGNREGA Work (2010-11, 2009-10 and 2008-09)	42
2.5	The MGNREGA payment processed through Banks/Post Office (2010-11, 2009-10 and 2008-09)	47
2.6	Un-employment Allowance paid in lieu of not providing employment (2010-11)	50
2.7	Work Projection under MGNREGA for 2010-11 – Andhra Pradesh	51
3.1	Demographic Profile of the Respondents (% of Households for Selected Districts - 2009	57
3.2	Main occupation - (% of total man – days) of sample households in sample villages of selected districts - 2009	64
3.3	Annual household net income of sample villages of selected districts – 2009	68
3.4	Household Consumption Of Food Items (Kgs. Per Capita Per Month)	74
3.5	Monthly Consumption Expenditure of Households	73
3.6	Variability in Consumption and Income of Sample Villages of Selected Districts – 2009	82
3.7	Determinants of Participation in MGNREGA (Logit)	85
4.1	The work profile under MGNREGA (Reference period – January to December 2009)	88
4.2	Work-wise employed in MGNREGA and the Quality of Assets created – 2009	92
4.3	Wage Differentials among different activities in selected villages in selected districts – 2009	96
4.4	Migration incidence in selected districts in MGNREGA - 2009	101
5.1	Level of Asset Holding of Sample Households	104
5.2	Borrowings by Sample Households of Villages in Andhra Pradesh	105
5.3	Household Strength on Borrowing and other Household Assets of sample villages in Andhra Pradesh - 2011	106
5.4	Qualitative questions related to Functioning of MGNREGA from Sample Villages in Andhra Pradesh - 2011	108
5.5	Quantitative questions related to MGNREGA functioning Sample Villages of	114

	Andhra Pradesh - 2011	
5.6	Provide details on the following potential benefits of MGNREGA of sample villages in Andhra Pradesh - 2011	114
5.7	Qualitative questions related to Food Security of sample villages of Andhra Pradesh – 2011.	115
6.1	Infrastructure Availability in sample Villages : 2009	117
6.2	Occupational Structure (Per cent of households)	118
6.3	Wage rates for different activities	119
6.4	Prevailing labour charges for agricultural operations (Average of all villages)	120
6.5	Qualitative questions of changes in the villages during last one year	121
6.6	Quantitative questions about the functioning of MGNREGA	123

List of Box

No.	Title	Page
A	Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme in Andhra Pradesh	16

IMPACT OF MGNREGA ON WAGE RATES, FOOD SECURITY AND RURAL URBAN MIGRATION IN ANDHAPRADESH

CHAPTER – I

1.1. Introduction:

“Jobless growth is joy less growth for those impacted by Globalization. We have to provide meaningful employment in the agricultural sector to address these Concerns” - M.S. Swaminathan (2007). Since Independence, concerted efforts have been made to ameliorate the living standard of rural people. Several schemes and programmes were implemented by the Ministry of Rural Development, with the Principal objective of enabling rural people to improve the quality of their lives. In the Annals of Rural Employment Generation Schemes after Independence MGNREGS stands as the grandest one. It has provided a strong “right to work” to rural population. India is abundant with manual workforce, which is the only source to eke-out livelihood for it. It is the sustained effort of the policy makers, academics and social activists for the reduction of poverty among marginal groups. Though there is much poverty and demographic pressure across some states, there is lag in the generation of employment at required levels. Hence, the situation compels to envisage a sustainable programme.

1.2 A. Historical Background:

It was realized that a sustainable strategy of poverty alleviation has to be based on increasing the productive employment opportunities in the process of growth itself. As a result, the stress was laid on employment and poverty alleviation in the sixth five Year Plan onwards.

a) National Rural Employment Programme (NREP):

The Ministry of Rural Development, Government of India launched National Rural Employment Programme (NREP) in October 1980 to generate additional gainful employment in rural areas with an outlay of Rs. 1620 crores, which was to be shared equally between the Central government and state governments. The important objective of this programme was creation of durable assets. However, this programme was not rightly and what targeted and

therefore, it is not known as to how much of the employment generation has been directed towards those who are landless and the poorest among the poor. This programme apparently lacked a direct focus on the target-group for whom it was meant. However, the programme had a substantial impact in terms of stabilization of wages in the rural areas, containing prices of foodgrains and the creation of a wide variety of community assets which could be expected to help in raising the levels of living of the rural population.

b) Rural Landless Employment Guarantee Programme (RLEGP):

This programme was introduced by the Ministry of Rural Development, Government of India on 15th August, 1983, to supplement NREP with the objective of improving and expanding employment opportunities for the rural landless. The prime objective of this programme was providing guarantee of employment to at least one member of every landless household upto 100 days in a year and creating durable assets for strengthening the infrastructure so as to meet the growing needs of the rural economy. An outlay of Rs. 500 crores was provided under this programme by the Central Government in Sixth Five Year Plan. The implementation of the Programme was entrusted to the States/UTs, but they were required to prepare specific projects for approval by a Central Committee. During 1985 the Central Committee approved 320 projects with an estimated cost of Rs. 906.59 crores. The target for employment generation in 1983-84 and 1984-85 was fixed at 360 million man days against which 72.27 per cent of man-days of employment was actually generated. Hence both the projects viz., NREP and RLEGP were merged as Jawahar Rozgar Yojana (JRY).

c) JAWAHAR ROZGAR YOJANA (JRY):

Jawahar Rozgar Yojana (JRY) was launched in the last year of 7th Five Year Plan with a total allocation of Rs. 2,600 crores to generate 931 million man-days of employment. The Primary objective of the programme was generation of additional employment on productive works, which would either be of sustained benefit to the poor or to contribute to the creation of rural infrastructure. The Centre and states' contribution under this programme are 80 and 20 respectively. This programme was implemented in all villages in the country.

It was reported that Panchayats were not above procedural violations, i.e., use of private contractors. Under the programme, projects were to be executed by the Government

Ministries and agencies without the contractors so that full benefit of wages should go to the workers. The payments to contractors constituted at least 10 per cent of the cost of project. Clear-cut guidelines were absent regarding the Criteria to be used by the Panchayats in selecting the rural poor.

d) Employment Assurance Scheme (EAS):

The scheme was launched on 2nd October, 1993 in 1775 identified backward blocks situated in drought prone, desert, tribal and hill areas in which the revamped public distribution system was in operation by District Rural Development Agency (DRDA). Subsequently, the scheme was extended to additional Blocks, which included the newly identified Drought Prone Area Programme (DPAP)/Desert Development Programme (DDP) Blocks, Modified Area Development Approach (MADA) Blocks having a larger concentration of tribal and Blocks in flood prone areas of Uttar Pradesh, Bihar, Assam and Jammu & Kashmir. In addition, 722 non-EAS blocks previously covered under second stream of Jawahar Rozgar Yojana (JRY) were also brought under the EAS. The EAS has since been universalized to cover all the rural blocks in the country with effect from 01.04.1997.

However, it was felt that a stage has come when the development of village infrastructure needs to be taken up in a planned manner. This could best be done by the village Panchayats who are closest to the ground realities and who can effectively determine their local needs. Accordingly, the government had restructured the existing wage employment programme namely Jawahar Rozgar Yojana (JRY) and Employment Assurance Scheme (EAS) and the new programme is named as Jawahar Gram Samridhi Yojana (JGSY).

e) Jawahar Gram Samridhi Yojana (JGSY):

This programme was dedicated entirely to the development of rural infrastructure at the village level and implemented by the village panchayats. This programme came into effect from 1st April, 1999. The primary objective of JGSY was creation of demand driven community village infrastructure including durable assets at the village level and assets to enable the rural poor to increase the opportunities for sustained employment. The secondary objective was generation of wage employment for the unemployed poor in the rural areas. JGSY was least understood by the target groups and it was seldom in its goal oriented implementation. So,

JGSY lasted only for a short time which was being merged into a new scheme, the Sampoorna Grameen Rozgar Yojana (SGRY). In practice, there was little difference between the JGSY and EAS in terms of both objectives and implementation failures, with the only substantive difference being administrative. The JGSY was implemented by village level institutions (PRIs) while the EAS relied on the State Administrative apparatus. Consequently EAS and JGSY were merged into a new scheme, the "Sampoorna Grammen Rozgar Yojana (SGRY).

f) Sampoorna Grameen Rozgar Yojana (SGRY):

The "Sampoorna Grameen Rozgar Yojana" (SGRY) was started in September, 2001. The objectives of SGRY were to provide additional wage employment in rural areas and also food security, alongside the creation of durable community, social and economic assets and infrastructure development. The SGRY also encompasses all food for work programmes in the country since it includes a special component for augmenting food security through additional wage employment in calamity affected rural areas. The Planning Commission identified 150 most backward districts of the country on the basis of prevalence of poverty indicated by SC/ST population agricultural productivity per worker and agricultural wage rate. Most of them happen to be tribal districts. There was a need for substantial additional investment in these districts to convert their surplus labour into required capital formation solving livelihood issues. Such an attempt was started on January 2000-01 by Ministry of Rural Development, Government of India, by introducing a new programme "The National Food for Work Programme".

g) National Food for Work Programme (NFFWP):

Under this programme, substantial resources in the form of cash and food grains were provided to generate additional supplementary wage employment and to create productive assets in the above mentioned 150 identified districts. An attempt was made, through the programme, to co-ordinate among different on-going schemes which had wage employment potential, so that the focused approach provides a solid base for the districts to take-off on their own. The major objective was to provide additional resources apart from the resources available under the Sampoorna Grameen Rozgar Yojana (SGRY) to 150 most backward districts of the country so that generation of supplementary wage employment and provision of food security through creation of need based economic, social and community assets in these

districts was further intensified Wages, under SGRY and NFFWP programme, were paid partly in cash and partly in the form of food grains valued at BPL rates. It was felt that there was an excess flow of food grains for the poor through the wage employment schemes.

h) National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (MGNREGA):

In the annals of employment generation schemes this programme is a mile stone. This act was passed in the year 2005. The on going programmes of Sampoorna Grameen Rozgar Yojana and National Food for work programme were subsumed within this programme in the 200 of the most backward districts of the country. First, it ensured the legal right to work for a hundred days to poor people whoever is willing to work at a minimum wage rate, particularly in the rural areas, which in turn would reduce the flow of rural to urban migration (Dreze et al. 2006). In addition to this, another important objective of the Act has been to strengthen the PRIs. Further, this act addresses mainly to rural poor and their fundamental right to work with dignity. It is noted from the above mentioned employment programmes that MGNREGA envisaged a paradigm shift from all precedent Wage Employment Programmes (WEP) operating in the country since 1980. Earlier WEP were allocation based whereas MGNREGA is demand-driven. MGNREGA has extensive in-built transparency safeguards. The act is designed to offer employment within 15 days of application of work, if the employment cannot be provided by the authorities, then daily un-employment allowance has to be paid.

Features of MGNREGA:

- i) Time bound employment guarantee and wage payment within 15 days.
- ii) Incentive-disincentive structure to the state Governments for providing employment, as 90 per cent of the cost for employment provided is borne by the Centre while payment of unemployment allowances are borne by the State Governments (at their own cost); and
- iii) Emphasis on labour intensive works prohibiting the use of contractors and machinery.
- iv) The Act mandates 33 per cent participation for women.
- v) The cost sharing is 75 per cent and 25 per cent by central and state governments respectively.

Key Processes in MGNREGA:

- a) Adult members of rural households submit their name, age and address with photo to the Gram Panchayat.
- b) The Gram Panchayat registers households after making enquiry and issues a job card which contains the details of adult member enrolled and his/her photo.
- c) Registered person can submit an application for work in writing (for at least fourteen days of continuous work) either to Panchayat or to Programme Officer.
- d) The Panchayat/Programme Officer will accept the valid application and issue dated receipt of application and the letter providing work will be sent to the applicant and also displayed at Panchayat Office.
- e) The employment will be provided within a radius of 5 kilometers and if it is above 5 kilometers extra wage will be paid.
- f) If employment under the scheme is not provided within fifteen days of receipt of the application, the daily un-employment allowance will be paid to the applicant.

Phases of MGNREGA:

- | | | |
|-----------|----|---|
| I Phase | -- | notified in 200 districts with effect from February 2 nd 2006. |
| II Phase | -- | Extended to 130 districts in the financial year 2007-08 (113 districts from April 1 st 2007 and 17 districts of UP were notified with effect from May 15 th 2007) |
| III Phase | -- | Remaining districts in all the states/UTs were notified from April, 1 st 2008. |

1.2.B. Review of Literature:

J. Krishna Murthy (2006), in his study, focused attention on rapid response mechanisms which need to be strengthened within the MGNREGA. He felt that the local administration in the tsunami-affected districts should take advantage of ongoing national programmes like Sampoorna Grameen Rozgar Yojana and expand operations in affected areas in the district. It is argued for the necessity of expediting the process in the context of sudden on set of disasters as earthquakes, tsunamis, floods tropical storms, volcanic eruptions and landslides. Further, he suggested that the limit of 100 days of work per household should be waived when

an area has been declared as disaster-affected. An emergency fund under the MGNREGA programme should be set up at the state level with clear governing rules.

P.S. Vijay Shankar Rangu Rao and others (2006) argue that the Schedules of Rates (SoRs) as presently conceived and used have an inherent pro-contractor bias, encourage (virtually necessitate) the use of machinery and make it virtually impossible for labourers to earn the statutory minimum wages. It is therefore, an imperative if MGNREGA objectives are to be achieved that the SoRs are to be revised in a truly transparent and participatory manner. It is discussed the need of revision of wage rates for earthwork and excavation.

Pinaki Chakraborty (2007) analyzes the state-wise employment demand-supply data and the use of funds released under the MGNREGA by the Central Government and the budgetary incidence and spatial dimension of the progress of implementation of the Act across States in India during 2005-06. The analysis finally indicates that the existing institutional arrangement in poorer states is not good enough to implement the MGNREGA in an effective manner and further suggests devolution of responsibilities and strict accountability norms. It would accelerate capacity building at the level of the Panchayat and the scheme can effectively function as a demand driven one. In assessing the demand for labour, Panchayat level preparation of labour budgets would go a long way for effective implementation. Finally, the analysis emphasizes that better co-ordination at all levels of Governments with the gradual expansion of the programme covering more districts would lead to increased outlays.

Chhaya Datar (2007), in her article attempts to offer explanations for why the NREGS has failed to take off in Maharashtra. She says that there is no enthusiasm among the political class as well as bureaucracy to accept the new scheme, which is more decentralized and hence likely to be more transparent and accountable to those who need work. The poor had become weary of the scheme because of lack of regularity and assurance of wages and where erring officials were neither punished and nor unemployment allowance was granted to any labourer who was not provided with work. Seasonal migration has been on the rise as a result of this situation.

In a study conducted by Indian School of Women's studies development, New Delhi, (2008), it was mentioned that when compared to preceding programmes like the NFFWP, the NREGS has generated roughly three to four times the number of work days. The programme has therefore succeeded in providing much needed wage employment in many states and in both Kerala and Karnataka there was strong demand from the workers for increasing the work days to at least 200 per household. In Kerala and Karnataka, there were few complaints regarding non-payment of minimum wages. However, in gross violation of the Act, the earnings of workers at many NREGS worksites (e.g., in Uttar Pradesh and Jharkhand) were less than the minimum wage.

Dreze and others (2008) say that there was virtually no check on the embezzlement of National Food For Work Programme (NFFWP) funds in Surguja District of Chattisgarh. The situation was so bad that it was constrained to describe NFFWP as "Loot for Work Programme". In the same district, it was interesting to hear from a wide range of sources where the enactment of MGNREGA had led to a steep decline in the incidence of corruption. This was borne out by the muster roll verification exercises. In a random sample of 9 works implemented by Gram Panchayats, it was found that 95 per cent of the wages that had been paid according to the muster rolls had actually reached the labourers concerned. In Jharkhand, there was evidence of a gradual retreat of corruption compared with earlier years when it was not uncommon to find that entire muster rolls had been manufactured from top to bottom.

Sharma et al (2009), in their study, they observed two possible outcomes of MGNREGA, Viz., i) slightly improved share of ST households in employment and ii) the Act outshines the earlier programme as far as participation of women is concerned. The range of wages realized by workers under MGNREGA varied from state to state, but in a large majority of states the average wages were little higher compared to the minimum wages. Cases of corruption, fudging in muster rolls, discrepancies in work days and payments are also reported in almost all studies. Further, results revealed that there has been considerable growth in works undertaken and irrigation related works, which include minor irrigation, tanks, wells and rural connectivity. These are the most important activities which constitute 74-80 per cent of the funds earmarked for assets. However, more than 50 per cent of the slippage in the execution of works

undertaken has also been reported. Works and their implementation have also suffered due to anomalies in the selection of works, poor execution, inflated estimates, inadequacies in measurement, cost over runs and delays in release of funds by states.

Sharma, Alakh Narain (2009), observed that due to introduction of MGNREGA programme in Rajasthan there happened reduction in migration, in 80 days or more, generation of employment increase of rural wages but on the other hand discrimination was observed. Scheduled caste families were sent to far off sites and upper caste families were engaged at near by work sites. Work was not available as per demand. All the components of NREGS were in force A.P. Weekly basis works were allotted and wages were calculated based on piece rate works. In Bihar most of the works taken up were construction of roads and water conservation. Workers primarily comprised of scheduled castes and other Backward Castes. Overall there were more positive impacts of MGNREGA on rural people except, the entitlement deficits like absence of work site facilities and delay in payments, process Deficits like lack of institutional structures in many places, mismatch between requirements and deployment of dedicated staff and lack of comprehensive planning for works.

1.2.C Studies of MGNREGA in A.P.:

Karuna and Sowmya (2007), say that in the social audits in A.P. labour take centre stage – participating enthusiastically in the verification process, listening avidly in the gram sabhas, testifying in public meetings, generous in forgiving those who have harassed them, requesting re-induction of functionaries who have taken bribes from them, querying with pass books in their hands what wages they actually got and physically protecting the social audit team members.

Raghavendra Jha and others (2008) in their analysis based on a small survey in A.P. confirm pro-poor targeting of MGNREGA, using different (proximate) indicators of deprivation – Caste/ethnic affiliation, landlessness and occupation. In contrast to Rajasthan, SC and ST participated in higher numbers in A.P., but in both states these groups participated for slightly lower spells than the residual group of 'others'. But the number of days worked on average was much higher than suggested by other assessments. Their econometric analysis further reinforces the view that not only disadvantage groups are not only more likely to participate but

also for longer spells. Although based on small samples for just two states, these results offer a more optimistic perspective on this scheme than other recent assessments.

K. Kareemulla and others (2009) analyze the impact of NREGS in A.P. that, Soil and Water Conservation (SWC) works have accounted for over 80 per cent. The share of labour wages under the scheme has been 80 per cent with only 20 per cent for material, which is well within the prescribed norm of 40 per cent for the latter. The field study in the Ananthapur district has indicated that almost two-thirds of the beneficiaries are farmers. The scheme has brought down the migration levels from about 27 per cent to only 7 per cent in the study villages. The linear regression function has brought out that the number of family members participating in the NREGS is significantly influenced by income from other sources, family size and land holding. The NREGS earnings are being used mainly for food, education and health security.

Doug Johnson (2009), in his working paper, estimates the impact of the caste, gender and party affiliation of locally elected leaders on implementation of India's new work fare programme for rural areas, MGNREGA in A.P. He says that for most castes, there is modest increase in participation by members of the same caste of the leader in the programme and no impact on a broad range of other programme outcomes or any effect of reservations for women. His analysis suggests that MGNREGA in A.P. may be less susceptible to capture than other government programmes.

CH. Ravi Kumar and Others (2008), observed that the aimed objectives were not served objective of MGNREGA is by limiting the data generation to aspects like number of households and number of days, type of works etc., many process related aspects are not being captured. The most important of these are participation of the needy households, process of works selection, saturation of the works for SC and ST, role of local panchayat bodies, functioning of programme functionaries, work application and receipts process, transparency at the local level, operationalization of grievance redressal system etc. The Rural Development Department needs to evolve appropriate information systems, on different aspects, and investment in technology development in favour of wage labourers.

Rishabh Khosla (2011), attempts to measure the effect of caste-reservation policies on the provision of public goods and services in gram panchayats in A.P. using data from the MGNREGA. His investigation finds that the effect of reservation varies tremendously in different social, political and institutional contexts, shedding light on the conflicting results of similar studies. The findings of the paper unambiguously show that the functioning of PR institutions is highly context-dependent. The results lay to rest the view that NREGS in A.P. is insulated from politics. The findings in Coastal Andhra and parts of Telangana also show that reservation unequivocally has effects on the distribution of NREGS resources in the village. Another weakness lies with the NREGS outcome metric.

Martin Ravalian (2012) says that there is corruption in the Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme but simple indices that claim to measure corruption and make an assessment of interstate levels of corruption can end up offering us a wrong understanding. He comments on Bhalla's "Corruption Index" and finally concludes that, it is not the fact that Andhra Pradesh and Rajasthan are led by the congress that leads to a high value of Bhalla's "Corruption Index", but their lack of poverty relative to other states. Ultimately, there is clearly corruption in MGNREGS, as in many public programmes and in countries at all stages of development.

The Problem:

Keeping in view several success and failure cases of earlier employment programmes, the MGNREGA was launched in the year 2005, with high expectations in terms of employment generation, alleviation of poverty, food security, halting migration and overall rural development. Though there are numerous studies, the limited studies made field studies from the beneficiaries. As the scheme is in its initial stage, it is inevitable for a study to evaluate the scheme for its impact on rural poor. How much distressed and disadvantageous sections are benefited in the form of relative wage, unseasonal wage support by MGNREGA works and the impact on the rural incomes. It is to be brought to the sharp focus to formulate policies. Hence, there is a need for the exploration of field level deficiencies across Andhra Pradesh. In this connection, the Ministry of Agriculture, Government of India asked its Agro-Economic Research Centres to take up an evaluation study on the implementation of MGNREGA in their respective states. Therefore, the Agro-Economic Research Centre, Andhra University,

Visakhapatnam has taken up the evaluation study in Andhra Pradesh, with the following objectives:

1.3. Objectives of the study:

1. To measure the extent of man power employment generated under MGNREGA, their various socio-economic characteristics and gender variability in all the districts implementing MGNREGA since its inception in A.P.,
2. To compare wage differentials between MGNREGA activities and other wage employment activities,
3. To know the effect of MGNREGA on the pattern of migration from rural to urban areas,
4. To find out the nature of assets created under MGNREGA and their durability,
5. To Identify factors determining the participation of people in MGNREGA scheme and whether MGNREGA has been successful in ensuring better food security to the beneficiaries and
6. To assess the implementation of MGNREGA, its functioning and to suggest suitable policy measures to further strengthen the programme.

1.4 Data base and Methodology:

The study is based on both primary and secondary data. For primary data, reference period is January 2009 to December 2009. Five districts namely 1) Adilabad, 2) Chittoor, 3) Mahboobnagar, 4) Srikakulam and 5) Krishna are selected for the study from the state of Andhra Pradesh. From each district, two villages are selected keeping into account their distance from the location of the district or the main city/town. One village is selected from the nearby periphery of around 5 kilometers of the district/city head quarters and the second village is selected from the farthest location of 20 kilometers or more than that. From each selected village, primary data is collected from 20 participants in MGNREGA and 5 non-participants working as wage employed. Thus 10 villages are selected and a total number of 250 households are surveyed in detail with the help of a structured questionnaire. Therefore, in A.P., 200 participants and 50 non-participants are surveyed to estimate the variations specially and temporally. For selecting participant households, a list of all beneficiaries in the village is obtained from the Gram Panchayat or programme Officer in the village along with the

information of caste and gender. After getting the list, the participant households are selected giving proportionate representation to the community i.e., i) Scheduled Castes ii) Scheduled Tribes 3) Other Backward Castes and 4) Other Castes, through a stratified Random sampling method with a due representation to gender. Since the list of non-participants of MGNREGA is not available, the non-participating households are selected with analogues design of MGNREGA workers. To analyze the incomes and consumption aspects of the participants, Gini ratio's and to analyze the determinants of participation in MGNREGA, the Logit function are adopted to find the variations across selected groups of workers and villages.

In addition to household questionnaire, a village schedule is also canvassed to capture the general changes that have taken place in the village during the last half decade and to take note of increase in labour charges for agricultural operations after the implementation of MGNREGA. The qualitative questions in the village schedule helps to know the change in standard of life. Village schedule in each village is canvassed with the help of a group discussion with Panchayat members, officials, educated and other well-informed people available in the village.

1.5 An Overview:

The present study report is divided into seven chapters. The first chapter being the introductory chapter, the second chapter presents the Man Power Employment generated under MGNREGA and its socio-economic characteristics. The third chapter deals with the household characteristics and their income and consumption pattern while the fourth chapter focuses on work profile under MGNREGA, wage structure and migration issues. The fifth chapter analyzes the functioning of MGNREGA probing the qualitative aspects and the sixth chapter discusses the impact of MGNREGA on village economy. Finally, concluding remarks and policy suggestions are presented in the seventh chapter.

References:

1. J. Krishna Murthy (2006) - "Employment Guarantee and Crisis Response". Economic and Political Weekly, Vol. XLI No.9 March 4.
2. P.S. Vijay Shankar, Rangu Rao, Nivedita Banerji and Mihir Shah (2006) - "Revising the Schedule of Rates: An imperative for MGNREGA". Economic and Political Weekly, Vol. XLI No.17. 29th April.
3. Pinaki Chakraborty (2007) - "Implementation of Employment Guarantee: A preliminary Appraised". Economic and Political Weekly, Vol. XLII No.7, February 17.
4. Chayya Datar (2007) – "Failure of National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme in Maharashtra" – Economic and Political Weekly, Vol. XLII No.34, August 25.
5. Indian School of Women's Studies Development (2008): "Impact of National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme on the living and working conditions of Women in Rural India, Draft Report based on field visits in December – February 2007-08 in Kerala, Karnataka, Jharkhand and Uttar Pradesh. Indian School of Women's Studies Development, New Delhi.
6. Dreze, Jean, Nikhil Dev and Reetika Khera (2008): "Corruption in MGNREGA: Myths and Reality", The Hindu dated 22, January 2008.
7. Sharma Anil, Prabhu Ghate, Haxmi Joshi and Ajay Sahu (2009) – "study on Evaluating performance of National Rural Employment Guarantee Act" NCAER – PIF Publications.
8. Sharma, Alakh Narain (2009): "Institutional and Governance Challenges in Social Protection: Designing Implementation Models for the right to work programme in India," – Paper presented at National workshop on National Rural Employment Guarantee in India – Lessons from implementation, September 8-9, 2009, Bangalore, under the Social Protection in Asia (SPA) Programme Organized by Institute for Human Development (IHD) and Institute of Social Studies Trust (ISST), New Delhi.
9. Karuna Vakati Aakella, Sowmya Kadambi, (2007): "Social Audits in Andhra Pradesh: A process in Evaluation" – Economic and Political Weekly, Vol. XLII No.47, November 24.
10. Raghavendra Jha, (2008) - Australian National University, Raghav Gaiha, University of Delhi, Shylashri Shankar, Centre for Policy Research – " National Rural Employment Guarantee Programme in Andhra Pradesh – Some Recent Evidence" – Australia South Asia Research Centre (ASARC) working paper 2008/04, Revised May.

11. K. Kareemulla, K. Srinivas Reddy, C.A. Rama Rao, Shalander Kumar and B. Venkateswar (2009) - "Soil and Water Conservation Works through National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme (NREGS) in Andhra Pradesh, An analysis of Livelihood Impact – Agricultural Economics Research Review, Vol. 22 (Conference Number), pp 443-450.
12. Doug Johnson (2009): "How Do Caste, Gender and Party Affiliation of Locally Elected Leaders Affect Implementation of MGNREGA – Institute for Financial Management and Research Centre for Micro Finance, Working Paper No. 33, September.
13. Ch. Ravi Kumar, D. Rakesh Kumar and S. Seetha Lakshmi (2008): "National Rural Employment Guarantee Act in Andhra Pradesh – Claims and Questions in Operationalization" – Watershed Support Services and Activities Network (WASSAN).
14. Rishabh Khosla (2011): "Caste, Politics and Public Good Distribution in India: Evidence from NREGS in Andhra Pradesh" – Economic and Political Weekly, March 19, Vol. XLVI, No. 12.
15. Martin Ravallion (2012): "Corruption in the MGNREGS Assessing an Index", Economic & Political Weekly, Vol. XLVII No. 8, February 25, 2012, pp. 13-15.

CHAPTER – II

Man Power Employment Generated Under MGNREGA and its Socio-Economic Characteristics

The National Rural Employment Guarantee Act gives legal guarantee of providing at least 100 days of wage employment to rural households whose adult members are willing to do unskilled manual labour. This chapter analyses the performance of MGNREGA across A.P. and districts. It is estimated the completed works and progress district-wise. The important aspect and of control and evaluation by quantitative factors is examined. It enables to know the best use of finances to desired objectives. The present chapter presents the details of employment generated under *MGNREGA* and its socio-economic characteristics.

2.1. The Functioning of MGNREGA:

2.1.A. Functioning of MGNREGA in Andhra Pradesh:

The performance of Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme, since inception is presented as follows:

BOX - A

Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme in Andhra Pradesh

Total Number of Districts under Employment Guarantee Scheme	22
Total Number of Mandals	1,098
Total Number of Grampanchayats	21,858
Total Number of Habitations	68,983
Total Number of Job Cards Issued	1,19,34,068
Total Number of Adult members enrolled in Job Cards Issued	2,82,89,398

TABLE – A
YEARWISE PROGRESS

	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11
Total Expenditure (Rs. In Crores)	587.4	2009.6	2507.2	4208.4	2952.2
Households Employment provided (in Lakhs)	21.7	46.8	57.1	61.6	56.3
Individuals Employment provided (in Lakhs)	31.7	74	99.88	116.1	104.1
Total Number of person days generated (in Crores)	6.6	20.0	22.7	40.1	24.0
Average Wage rate per day per person (Rs.)	82.47	83.85	83.61	90.35	98.82
Average Number of days employment provided per household	30.13	42.68	39.86	65.1	42.6
Total No. of Households completed 100 days of wage Employment	67,242	4,10,517	4,81,004	13,93,734	4,69,482

Source: Commissioner, Rural Development, Government of Andhra Pradesh, Hyderabad.

It is observed that there was a continuous progress from 2006-07 to 2009-10 and during 2010-11 there was found a decline in the progress. On the other hand the average wage rate per day by per person has increased continuously from Rs. 82.47 in 2006-07 to Rs. 98.82 during 2010-11. There were considerable fluctuations in case of per household number of days of employment observed in every alternative years of progress.

The Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (MGNREGA) was implemented in all the 22 districts of Andhra Pradesh in Three phases. The first phase of implementation was done in 13 districts with effect from February 2006. They are: 1) Vizianagaram, 2) Chittoor, 3) Kadapa, 4) Ananthapur, 5) Mahboobnagar, 6) Medak, 7) Ranga Reddy, 8) Nizamabad, 9) Warangal, 10) Adilabad, 11) Karimnagar, 12) Khammam and 13) Nalgonda. From 1st April, 2007, the second phase of implementation was in fore in six districts namely: 1) East Godavari 2) Guntur, 3) Kurnool, 4) S.P.S. Nellore, 5) Prakasam and 6) Srikakulam. In the subsequent year i.e., from April, 2008, the third phase of implementation was done in three districts, viz., 1) West Godavari, 2) Krishna and 3) Visakhapatnam.

2.1.B. The Functioning of MGNREGA (in three phases):

The performance of MGNREGA among three phases is presented in the Table B for the years 2008-09, 2009-10 and 2010-11. It can be observed that, the percentages of households provided employment among the total number of households issued job cards are reported to be 50.23 in 2008-09, 52.45 in 2009-10 and 51.56 during 2010-11 respectively. Across the three phases, the percentages varied from 40.09 in IIIrd phase to 52.18 in IInd phase during 2008-09, 47.77 in IInd phase to 55.09 in Ist phase during 2009-10 and 49.06 in IIIrd phase to 52.92 in Ist phase during 2010-11. Glancing over three years of performance, higher percentage of households were provided employment during 2009-10 in case of districts of Ist phase. With regard to second phase of districts higher percentage of households got employment during 2008-09. Similar percentage of households got employment, in case of IIIrd phase of districts during 2009-10 and 2010-11.

TABLE - B
Performance of MGNREGA – Phase-wise 2008-09, 2009-10 and 2010-11

Phase (Districts)	Cumulative No. of Households issued job cards	Cumulative No. of Households provided Employment*	Cumulative person days generated	Cumulative No. of Households 100 days of Employment**	Expenditure (Rs. In lakhs)	
					Completed (Works)	Ongoing (works)
2010-11						
I	7167639	3793312 (52.92)	2117.24	593040 (15.63)	549664	203223
II	3322241	1651849 (49.72)	807.89	212938 (12.89)	234959	54315
III	1461031	716726 (49.06)	284.89	65742 (9.17)	73886	25469
Total	11950911	6161887 (51.56)	3210.02	871720 (14.15)	858509	283007
2009-10						
I	7120994	3922923 (55.09)	2598.2	956872 (24.39)	124688.28	119975.31
II	324847	1551932 (47.77)	987.9	333320 (21.48)	40354.04	34246.17
III	1372805	683638 (49.80)	329.1	105345 (15.41)	18676.24	13078.43
Total	11742646	6158493 (52.45)	3915.2	1395537 (22.66)	183718.56	167299.91
2008-09						
I	6924720	3543250 (51.17)	1879.17	349109 (9.85)	88823.47	80852.16
II	3168665	1653456 (52.18)	756.32	128349 (7.76)	35987.03	33354.24
III	1254430	502851 (40.09)	99.96	5600 (1.11)	5055.56	5117.90
Total	11347815	5699557 (50.23)	2735.45	483058 (8.48)	129866.06	119324.30

Source: Website – NREGS – AP

* Figures in parentheses are the percentages to the total number of Households issued job cards.

** Figures in parentheses are the percentages to total number of Households provided employment.

The scheme has succeeded in providing 100 days of employment to more number of households during 2009-10 than in the years 2008-09 and 2010-11. The expenditure on completed works are reported to be Rs. 129866.06 lakhs during 2008-09, Rs. 183718.56 lakhs in 2009-10 and Rs. 8588509 lakhs during 2010-11 respectively. The expenditure on ongoing works is reported to be higher during 2010-11 than 2008-09 and 2009-10.

2.2. Total Employment Generated – their Socio-Economic Characteristics:

The details of employment generated through MGNREGA and its socio-economic characteristics are presented for the twenty-two districts and state for the three years viz., 2010-11, 2009-10 and 2008-09 in the Table 2.1. (The basic data obtained through website are presented in Annexure Table 2.1)

Among the total number of households (11950911) issued job cards during 2010-11 in the state, 24.96 per cent are from Scheduled Caste (SC) category, 11.38 per cent from Scheduled Tribe (ST) category and 63.66 per cent are from other categories. Across the districts, the percentage of households issued job cards varied from 2.31 in Ranga Reddy district to 6.54 in Nalgonda district. During the years 2009-10 and 2008-09 much difference is not observed among the different categories of households who were issued job cards, compared to the year 2010-11. Across the districts, the percentage of households issued job cards ranged between 2.26 in Ranga Reddy and 6.44 in Nalgonda district while the percentages ranged from 2.11 in Ranga Reddy district to 6.70 in East Godavari district during 2008-09.

Out of the total number of households issued job cards, 51.56 per cent in 2010-11, 52.54 per cent in 2009-10 and 50.23 per cent in 2008-09, were provided employment in the state. Across the districts, the maximum percentage (72.67) of households provided employment is reported in Srikakulam district and a minimum (29.08) percentage of households is reported in Guntur district during the year 2010-11. Similar situation is observed during the year 2009-10. But, during 2008-09, the maximum percentage of households provided employment is reported in Nizamabad district and a minimum percentage of households is reported in Krishna district. All the households who demanded employment are provided with employment during the three years (i.e., 2010-11, 2009-10 and 2008-09).

Out of the total number of households provided with employment only 4.66 per cent of households are reported to be under MGNREGA work during the month in the State. The percentage of households working under MGNREGA work during the month ranged from 0.98 in Krishna district to 24.84 in Vizianagaram district. Moreover, during 2009-10, out of the total number of households provided with employment, about 56 per cent of households have reported to be under MGNREGA work during the month and the percentage of households

engaged in work during the month ranged from 15.95 in Prakasam to 78.23 in Adilabad district. During 2008-09, the percentage of households reported to be under work during the month is 32.09 per cent of total number of households with employment and the percentage of the households under work ranged from 4.15 in Guntur to 66.07 in Vizianagaram district.

The per household number of days of employment is reported as high as 63.57 during 2009-10, compared to 2010-11 and 2008-09. Across the districts, the maximum number of per household days of employment is reported in Nizamabad and minimum number of days of employment is reported in Krishna district during the year 2010-11. During the year 2009-10, the maximum number of days of employment per household is reported in Vizianagaram district and minimum number of days was reported in Guntur district. Moreover, the per household days of employment is reported as high as 81.08 in Chittoor and only 14.85 days in Krishna district are reported during 2008-09.

The households completed 100 days of employment are reported as 14.15 per cent during 2010-11, 22.66 per cent in 2009-10 and only 8.48 per cent in 2008-09 in the state. Across the districts, a maximum percentage (30.31) of households completed 100 days of employment is reported in Nizamabad district and a minimum percentage (3.41) of households is reported in Krishna district during 2010-11. About 37 per cent of households were reported to have completed 100 days of employment in Vizianagaram district and only a minimum of 2.80 per cent of households reported from Guntur district during 2009-10. A maximum of 21.39 per cent of households received 100 days of employment in Chittoor district while only 0.41 per cent of households are reported from Krishna district during 2008-09.

Among the households provided employment 30.22 per cent in 2010-11, 29.55 in 2009-10 and 28.23 percent during 2008-09, were benefited through land reform/Indira Aawas Yojana (IAY) schemes in the state. Across the districts, the percentage of households benefited through the schemes varied from 10.72 in Krishna district to 42.52 in Warangal district during the year 2010-11. This might be the root cause of initial starting of the scheme in Warangal district. Similar performance is observed during 2009-10 and 2008-09.

Table2.1
Employment Generated through MGNREGA and its Socio-Economic Characteristics 2010-2011

Sl.No.	Name of the District	Cumulative No. of Household issued job cards (till the reporting month)				% of Households employed among Households issued Job cards	% of Households provided employment out of demanded *	% of Households working under MGNREGA by reporting month	Days of employment per Household	% of Households completed 100 days of Employment	% Households beneficiary of Land/reform IAY among Households employed	% of disabled beneficiary individuals among Households Employed
		SC	ST	Others	Total							
1	Adilabad	22.99	28.38	48.63	100.00 (457358)	61.95	100.00	2.73	62.30	17.91	28.44	1.22
2	Ananthapur	18.51	4.62	76.87	100.00 (702352)	46.01	100.00	7.87	60.10	18.31	23.86	1.50
3	Chittoor	27.81	5.67	66.52	100.00 (600580)	35.90	100.00	6.60	53.33	16.20	33.57	1.31
4	Cuddapah	24.99	3.26	71.75	100.00 (509580)	43.55	100.00	10.87	63.37	20.44	29.51	0.74
5	Karimnagar	28.75	4.57	66.68	100.00 (590456)	59.27	100.00	1.57	39.74	6.28	29.94	1.46
6	Khammam	20.10	38.26	41.64	100.00 (520692)	53.71	100.00	0.77	46.73	10.66	25.48	1.39
7	Mahboobnagar	22.90	9.77	67.34	100.00 (747184)	47.54	100.00	2.03	56.06	15.98	34.18	0.95
8	Medak	26.80	7.82	65.38	100.00 (464233)	54.89	100.00	1.50	59.55	17.23	37.79	0.96
9	Nalgonda	22.35	13.64	64.01	100.00 (781603)	54.62	100.00	1.50	48.26	11.36	39.17	1.67
10	Nizamabad	22.41	10.95	66.64	100.00 (400089)	60.57	100.00	1.64	80.40	30.31	38.01	1.29
11	Rangareddy	29.60	9.79	60.61	100.00 (276195)	43.53	100.00	2.37	60.21	17.85	33.46	1.36
12	Vizianagaram	11.83	12.75	75.41	100.00 (491352)	63.39	100.00	24.84	66.24	20.95	28.62	1.01
13	Warangal	22.85	18.93	58.22	100.00 (625965)	65.29	100.00	2.03	46.79	10.20	42.52	1.26
14	East Godavari	29.34	10.54	60.13	100.00 (571792)	56.98	100.00	6.05	34.87	6.60	23.80	0.99
15	Guntur	33.44	7.65	58.90	100.00 (567102)	29.08	100.00	2.44	29.90	5.68	21.48	0.54
16	Kurnool	24.74	2.28	72.97	100.00 (701899)	44.14	100.00	2.22	58.74	16.57	39.46	1.02
17	Nellore	34.95	12.89	52.16	100.00 (475333)	40.72	100.00	1.48	41.46	9.35	28.47	0.82
18	Prakasam	31.58	4.46	63.96	100.00 (556376)	59.47	100.00	1.91	52.25	14.62	27.96	0.72
19	Srikakulam	11.07	8.58	80.35	100.00 (449739)	72.67	100.00	1.77	64.20	19.66	22.93	0.92
20	Krishna	40.19	4.30	55.51	100.00 (476798)	40.34	100.00	0.98	26.27	3.41	10.72	1.30
21	Visakhapatnam	7.56	34.71	57.73	100.00 (461845)	64.20	100.00	15.25	50.73	12.79	26.08	1.18
22	West Godavari	35.68	5.42	58.90	100.00 (522388)	43.63	100.00	2.34	36.83	9.33	23.86	0.82
	Andhra Pradesh	24.95	11.38	63.66	100.00 (11950911)	51.56	100.00	88.20	52.09	14.15	30.22	1.14

SOURCE: Website MGNREGA

* = 100% was met by all districts

Contd.,

Table 2.1
Employment Generated through MGNREGA and its Socio-Economic Characteristics 2009-2010

Sl.No.	Name of the District	Cumulative No. of Household issued job cards (till the reporting month)				% of Households employed among Households issued Job cards	% of Households provided employment out of demanded *	% of Households working under MGNREGA by reporting month	Days of employment per Household	% of Households completed 100 days of Employment	% Households beneficiary of Land/reform IAY among Households employed	% of disabled beneficiary individuals among Households Employed
		SC	ST	Others	Total							
1	Adilabad	23.94	28.63	47.43	100.00 (449283)	61.31	100.00	78.23	78.12	28.68	26.94	1.21
2	Ananthapur	18.22	4.66	77.12	100.00 (739440)	46.65	100.00	53.21	69.98	24.54	23.32	1.51
3	Chittoor	27.65	6.09	66.26	100.00 (602564)	42.16	100.00	42.60	80.59	31.12	33.38	1.39
4	Cuddapah	25.51	3.55	70.94	100.00 (504913)	46.25	100.00	54.21	82.56	31.43	28.97	0.72
5	Karimnagar	29.43	4.66	65.92	100.00 (570963)	66.61	100.00	66.42	62.92	21.25	29.35	1.39
6	Khammam	20.38	38.11	41.51	100.00 (518180)	59.84	100.00	40.37	65.24	22.57	25.69	1.39
7	Mahboobnagar	22.77	10.01	67.22	100.00 (727480)	52.80	100.00	48.14	62.27	19.78	33.67	0.93
8	Medak	27.42	7.53	65.05	100.00 (447831)	59.17	100.00	62.55	65.89	21.96	35.93	0.88
9	Nalgonda	22.91	13.82	63.27	100.00 (754482)	55.02	100.00	57.75	57.55	17.76	38.74	1.59
10	Nizamabad	22.71	11.05	66.23	100.00 (395379)	56.16	100.00	68.20	77.50	28.26	36.36	1.18
11	Rangareddy	29.32	9.73	60.95	100.00 (265056)	47.65	100.00	60.16	82.18	31.13	31.50	1.20
12	Vizianagaram	12.28	12.50	75.22	100.00 (491904)	62.63	100.00	76.66	91.20	37.35	28.13	1.01
13	Warangal	23.10	19.31	57.60	100.00 (633519)	63.75	100.00	66.56	23.00	16.07	40.86	1.23
14	East Godavari	28.31	9.88	61.81	100.00 (642087)	53.00	100.00	59.33	54.48	18.32	23.40	0.91
15	Guntur	33.95	7.80	58.25	100.00 (520704)	19.39	100.00	24.99	21.00	2.80	20.82	0.46
16	Kurnool	24.74	2.62	72.65	100.00 (669618)	47.23	100.00	63.21	87.77	32.05	38.45	0.97
17	Nellore	35.39	13.29	51.32	100.00 (459742)	41.44	100.00	39.24	54.48	16.41	27.99	0.78
18	Prakasam	31.86	5.62	62.52	100.00 (521311)	56.87	100.00	15.95	55.41	16.61	27.38	0.74
19	Srikakulam	10.83	8.79	80.38	100.00 (435385)	70.60	100.00	70.68	76.65	28.07	21.27	0.82
20	Krishna	41.36	4.51	54.13	100.00 (438447)	37.12	100.00	25.06	23.71	3.10	9.76	1.20
21	Visakhapatnam	7.29	36.10	56.62	100.00 (438934)	68.80	100.00	63.25	68.31	25.76	25.61	1.23
22	West Godavari	37.02	5.54	57.44	100.00 (495424)	44.18	100.00	62.81	38.47	10.28	22.11	0.78
	Andhra Pradesh	25.11	11.62	63.27	100.00 (11722646)	52.54	100.00	56.35	63.57	22.66	29.55	1.11

SOURCE: Website MGNREGA

* = 100% was met by all districts

Contd.,

Table 2.1
Employment Generated through MGNREGA and its Socio-Economic Characteristics 2008-2009

Sl.No.	Name of the District	Cumulative No. of Household issued job cards (till the reporting month)				% of Households employed among Households issued Job cards	% of Households provided employment out of demanded *	% of Households working under MGNREGA by reporting month	Days of employment per Household	% of Households completed 100 days of Employment	% Households beneficiary of Land/reform IAY among Households employed	% of disabled beneficiary individuals among Households Employed
		SC	ST	Others	Total							
1	Adilabad	24.76	29.39	45.86	100.00 (452926)	59.40	100.00	35.31	54.30	9.16	25.87	1.16
2	Ananthapur	18.09	4.58	77.33	100.00 (752893)	41.76	100.00	37.07	53.37	8.28	22.39	1.43
3	Chittoor	27.34	6.21	66.45	100.00 (618998)	38.25	100.00	39.10	81.08	21.39	32.93	1.40
4	Cuddapah	25.97	3.81	70.22	100.00 (481248)	48.75	100.00	36.81	53.47	11.93	29.66	0.72
5	Karimnagar	30.65	4.89	64.46	100.00 (514403)	61.09	100.00	48.95	45.61	7.49	27.09	0.90
6	Khammam	20.74	35.72	43.55	100.00 (575493)	60.47	100.00	22.06	54.31	10.86	26.97	1.46
7	Mahboobnagar	23.95	9.56	66.49	100.00 (719391)	43.26	100.00	32.01	57.27	10.98	31.24	0.92
8	Medak	29.11	7.71	53.18	100.00 (418956)	47.69	100.00	35.92	52.42	8.99	33.96	0.83
9	Nalgonda	23.75	14.17	62.09	100.00 (699546)	50.42	100.00	30.66	40.53	4.49	37.78	1.58
10	Nizamabad	23.66	11.29	65.05	100.00 (364700)	61.42	100.00	23.99	55.57	10.15	35.88	1.23
11	Rangareddy	29.66	9.80	60.54	100.00 (239008)	42.58	100.00	41.64	65.83	15.91	28.67	1.12
12	Vizianagaram	12.56	12.83	74.61	100.00 (461457)	58.80	100.00	66.07	58.05	12.66	27.42	1.02
13	Warangal	23.17	19.73	57.10	100.00 (625701)	58.41	100.00	47.76	38.50	4.72	39.42	1.18
14	East Godavari	26.87	8.44	64.70	100.00 (760690)	51.14	100.00	18.25	41.29	5.21	23.98	0.91
15	Guntur	34.43	7.33	58.23	100.00 (501079)	38.15	100.00	4.15	27.71	2.53	18.91	0.54
16	Kurnool	25.83	2.46	71.71	100.00 (543662)	59.07	100.00	24.85	69.79	18.09	38.00	0.99
17	Nellore	35.90	13.44	50.66	100.00 (436147)	51.57	100.00	17.04	41.93	5.86	26.69	0.79
18	Prakasam	33.54	4.76	61.70	100.00 (450922)	54.64	100.00	27.20	40.70	5.93	25.74	0.75
19	Srikakulam	10.36	8.27	81.37	100.00 (476165)	58.98	100.00	36.99	44.16	6.18	21.34	0.83
20	Krishna	41.85	4.50	53.65	100.00 (392092)	33.23	100.00	8.91	14.85	0.41	8.41	1.38
21	Visakhapatnam	7.81	35.52	56.67	100.00 (421034)	49.24	100.00	39.43	24.13	1.52	22.49	1.36
22	West Godavari	36.73	5.55	57.72	100.00 (441304)	37.45	100.00	10.37	18.52	1.16	14.34	0.94
	Andhra Pradesh	25.32	11.70	62.97	100.00 (11347815)	50.23	100.00	32.09	47.99	8.48	28.23	1.08

SOURCE: Website MGNREGA

* = 100% was met by all districts.

The percentages of disabled beneficiary individuals among the employed households are 1.14, 1.11 and 1.08 respectively during 2010-11, 2009-10 and 2008-09 in the state. Across the districts, the percentage of disabled beneficiaries ranged from 0.54 in Guntur to 1.67 in Nalgonda districts during 2010-11 and similar situation is observed in previous two years i.e., 2009-10 and 2008-09. The disability persons participation differences maybe due to health level of those districts.

Viewing over the three years at a glance, the scheme showed a better performance during 2009-10 than 2010-11 and 2008-09. A gradual improvement is observed in case of beneficiaries of land reform/IAY and disabled beneficiary households during the three years. However the basic objective of the Act in providing at least 100 days of guaranteed wage employment is not achieved as expected.

2.3. Number of Projects completed and total amount spent:

2.3.1 Percentage distribution of Number of works By completed and on-going works:

a) Rural Connectivity works:

There are different works to be executed under the scheme and it is presented the picture Completed and On-going works for 22 districts in Andhra Pradesh. In the Completion, Rural Connectivity works reported high percentages during 2010-2008 compared to other two years (as many as 13 districts). During the study period Srikakulam, Vizianagaram, Rangareddy and Visakhapatnam districts are identified as quite low in completion of Rural Connectivity works, while Prakasam, Nellore and Chittoor displayed at the highest across A.P. It is observed a gradual increase in works completion in all the districts and the state in the study period (2010-2008). The foregoing discussion indicates the other side picture of on-going works in the area in Question. Therefore, the on-going works progress is not analyzed to all the composition.

b) Flood Control and Protection:

For "Flood Control and Protection", Adilabad, Medak and Rangareddy districts have accomplished 100 per cent completion followed by Nalgonda, Nizamabad, Karimnagar and Khammam in 2010-2011. A good level of completion of works could be observed at 75% and above by 2010-2011 across all districts, though the very low ebb of completed works reflected in 2008-2009 for all the districts.

c) Water Conservation and Water Harvesting:

All the districts except Vizianagaram and Visakhapatnam districts achieved 70 % above completion during 2010-2011 for Water Conservation and Water harvesting in A.P., whereas Vizianagaram and Visakhapatnam districts did not cross 30 per cent in the completion of works during the three years period 2011-2008 except one year (2009-2010) for Visakhapatnam district. Many districts displayed three times increase in the performance from 2008-2009 to 2010-2011. For state also analogous trend is traced for these works. The on-going works trend was high in 2008-2009 compared to 2009-2010 and 2010-2011 years for all districts and it shows declining trend by year to year.

d) Drought Proofing:

In Drought Proofing, many districts (50%) have shown the works completion below 40% in 2010-2011 and these do not show significance in completion during 2011-2008. Out of 22 districts 13 districts completed 10% only in 2008-2009 and this was very slow changed by 2011-2010. Drought Proofing has not achieved the higher levels of completion during 2011-2008 for all the 22 districts and A.P. and it shows below 60% completion at state level during 2011-2009. Ananthapur, Kadapa and Karimnagar completed above 80% in 2011-2010, while Guntur shows zero per cent followed by Kurnool and Nellore. On-going works under this head has been at great deal during three years period (2011-2008) ranging 42% to 79%.

e) Micro-irrigation works:

The micro-irrigation works reported much compared to the previous one. As many as 13 districts divulge 90% above completion of works by 2011-2010, though the works were below 35% in 2009-2008. Much acceleration in success of works is found for micro-irrigation works, since it is largely supported by the local community or by the concerned department. Khammam, Rangareddy and Kurnool districts reported the highest completion of works, whereas Chittoor and Vizianagaram showed the lowest as 60% and 71% respectively in 2011-2010. Therefore, the on-going works stood as 11% below in 2011-2010, though it was 65% in 2009-2008 at state level.

f) Irrigation facility to land owned by SCs, STs, Beneficiaries of land reforms and others:

Irrigation facility to land owned by Scheduled Castes (SCs) and Scheduled Tribes (STs), Beneficiaries of land reforms and others exhibit very low completion at state and districts during

2011-2008. Chittoor and Srikakulam districts reported the lowest completion of works in 2011-2010 and it was declined from 2009-2008 to 2011-2010. At state level the works completion was 37% in 2011-2010 and it was only 29% in 2009-2008. Though the aim of works is to arrange good irrigation to Weaker Sections, it has appeared as stagnant in the completion of works across all 22 districts in Andhra Pradesh. But there is slow increase by year to year. Eight districts crossed 50% completion and the other districts display very meager success in completion, whereas Prakasam, Khammam and Kurnool districts present good picture in the works completion. The other side of the picture of On-going works reports the highest works under execution of the study period.

g) Renovation of Traditional Water Bodies:

Renovation of Traditional Water Bodies reports a worthy picture by 2011-2010 at state and district levels, in spite of the bleak side existed during 2010-2008. A rapid sea change took place in the completion of works by 2011-2010. All the districts, except West Godavari, Guntur, Rangareddy, Prakasam and Krishna, the remaining displayed 97% and above completion of works, since these works had been under long pending due to lack of funds in rural Andhra Pradesh by 2011-2010. It is a good element to the rural water storage capacity, as it could be enhanced due to these works under MGNREGA. It is observed that these works success or completion was very limited in 2009-2008. Agriculturally backward districts viz., Ananthapur and Adilabad have shown 100% completion. It indicates the need of renovation of traditional Water bodies in rural areas across districts in A.P. The 'On-going works show much in 2009-2008 and 2010-2009 and later it declined to very low levels for all districts in Andhra Pradesh during 2011-2008.

h) Land Development works:

Land Development works also exhibits the above analogous trend in the districts. At state level 32% works were completed by 2011-2010. The 14 districts out of 22 districts reported 90% and above completion of works and it indicate the proper use or interest of the community in this type of works. It is observed the lower level of works completion in 2009-2008 across all districts, but this was totally changed by 2011-2010. The on-going works show much during 2010-2008 and later this was reduced. Any other activity approved by Mandal Revenue Officer has not shown any works done across districts in Andhra Pradesh.

Table 2.2 – Distribution of Number of works by Completed/On-going Works District-wise in A.P. - 2011-08

(in Percentages)

Sl. No	Name of the District	Rural Connectivity						Flood Control and Protection						Water Conservation and Water Harvesting					
		Completed			On Going			Completed			On Going			Completed			On Going		
		2010-11	2009-10	2008-09	2010-11	2009-10	2008-09	2010-11	2009-10	2008-09	2010-11	2009-10	2008-09	2010-11	2009-10	2008-09	2010-11	2009-10	2008-09
1	Adilabad	40.26	62.64	28.18	59.74	37.36	71.82	100.00	85.88	38.16	0.00	14.12	61.84	94.81	62.33	21.60	5.19	37.67	78.40
2	Ananthapur	46.88	60.76	70.97	53.12	39.24	29.03	89.61	40.00	34.78	10.39	60.00	65.22	88.92	48.57	33.14	11.08	51.43	66.86
3	Chittoor	52.19	76.27	81.59	47.81	23.73	18.41	80.68	73.81	19.23	19.32	26.19	80.77	72.76	80.34	28.06	27.24	19.66	71.94
4	Kadapa	80.87	36.69	56.54	19.13	63.31	43.46	93.37	48.63	34.52	6.63	51.37	65.48	78.14	46.39	39.47	21.86	53.61	60.53
5	Karimnagar	70.26	15.96	26.88	29.74	84.04	73.12	98.14	22.64	23.53	1.86	77.36	76.47	92.95	48.69	19.35	7.05	51.31	80.65
6	Khammam	71.39	26.87	36.46	28.61	73.13	63.54	98.58	34.71	20.00	1.42	65.29	80.00	98.15	42.03	29.02	1.85	57.97	70.98
7	Mahbubnagar	69.94	28.84	30.16	30.06	71.16	69.84	96.59	68.52	30.83	3.41	31.48	69.17	93.92	48.83	18.47	6.08	51.17	81.53
8	Medak	69.26	45.70	37.00	30.74	54.30	63.00	100.00	69.97	13.95	0.00	30.03	86.05	91.27	61.96	18.31	8.73	38.04	81.69
9	Nalgonda	62.99	24.41	46.71	37.01	75.59	53.29	99.38	88.44	16.37	0.62	11.56	83.63	86.11	70.59	16.51	13.89	29.41	83.49
10	Nizamabad	55.48	45.38	18.82	44.52	54.62	81.18	99.40	76.81	14.34	0.60	23.19	85.66	78.57	48.87	31.28	21.43	51.13	68.72
11	Rangareddy	23.70	33.06	0.00	76.30	66.94	100.00	100.00	62.96	92.64	0.00	37.04	7.36	92.10	42.75	38.90	7.90	57.25	61.10
12	Vizianagaram	41.21	33.51	48.74	58.79	66.49	51.26	75.00	16.67	0.00	25.00	83.33	100.00	39.30	36.27	20.72	60.70	63.73	79.28
13	Warangal	71.91	36.68	31.66	28.09	63.32	68.34	96.63	69.39	49.02	3.37	30.61	50.98	92.39	45.01	29.82	7.61	54.99	70.18
14	East Godavari	58.22	59.48	44.25	41.78	40.52	55.75	89.75	78.08	21.23	10.25	21.92	78.77	83.13	66.62	33.42	16.87	33.38	66.58
15	Guntur	73.50	32.93	56.96	26.50	67.07	43.04	75.18	29.73	29.17	24.82	70.27	70.83	70.74	69.64	53.35	29.26	30.36	46.65
16	Kurnool	64.58	13.64	74.51	35.42	86.36	25.49	96.70	66.67	13.95	3.30	33.33	86.05	92.41	55.15	21.72	7.59	44.85	78.28
17	Nellore	70.10	43.99	75.50	29.90	56.01	24.50	94.15	45.41	32.90	5.85	54.59	67.10	94.82	33.89	26.90	5.18	66.11	73.10
18	Prakasam	71.18	34.55	71.23	28.82	65.45	28.77	92.09	32.00	44.26	7.91	68.00	55.74	94.89	36.63	23.45	5.11	63.37	76.55
19	Srikakulam	18.41	35.47	21.69	81.59	64.53	78.31	94.74	34.85	25.93	5.26	65.15	74.07	86.16	66.14	8.96	13.84	33.86	91.04
20	Krishna	64.49	16.29	88.89	35.51	83.71	11.11	97.01	11.11	0.00	2.99	88.89	100.00	87.46	51.91	67.92	12.54	48.09	32.08
21	Visakhapatnam	40.46	23.96	4.35	59.54	76.04	95.65	73.17	14.29	#DIV/0!	26.83	85.71	#DIV/0!	38.75	47.51	19.39	61.25	52.49	80.61
22	West Godavari	56.40	30.49	28.18	43.60	69.51	#DIV/0!	97.26	4.35	100.00	2.74	95.65	0.00	88.48	43.83	20.78	11.52	56.17	79.22
	Andhra Pradesh	62.38	35.95	44.58	37.62	64.05	55.42	94.70	67.79	29.29	5.30	32.21	70.71	83.63	54.52	27.41	16.37	45.48	72.59

Contd2.,

Contd....2.,

Sl. No	Name of the District	Drought Proofing						Micro Irrigation Works						Provision of Irrigation Facility to Land owned by					
		Completed			On Going			Completed			On Going			Completed			On Going		
		2010-11	2009-10	2008-09	2010-11	2009-10	2008-09	2010-11	2009-10	2008-09	2010-11	2009-10	2008-09	2010-11	2009-10	2008-09	2010-11	2009-10	2008-09
1	Adilabad	55.74	86.75	30.78	44.26	13.25	69.22	95.11	44.69	25.53	4.89	55.31	74.47	50.73	47.05	26.93	49.27	52.95	73.07
2	Ananthapur	86.50	43.63	8.93	13.50	56.37	91.07	92.67	41.56	38.65	7.33	58.44	61.35	33.77	35.42	19.36	66.23	64.58	80.64
3	Chittoor	38.55	50.09	47.06	61.45	49.91	52.94	60.31	90.89	14.39	39.69	9.11	85.61	7.89	28.30	30.74	92.11	71.70	69.26
4	Kadapa	81.89	39.21	11.76	18.11	60.79	88.24	89.90	59.67	24.83	10.10	40.33	75.17	36.28	20.32	28.90	63.72	79.68	71.10
5	Karimnagar	87.95	58.39	6.54	12.05	41.61	93.46	90.91	35.65	18.57	9.09	64.35	81.43	46.70	41.23	52.69	53.30	58.77	47.31
6	Khammam	51.15	72.60	13.09	48.85	27.40	86.91	99.52	48.86	34.61	0.48	51.14	65.39	63.66	35.85	14.29	36.34	64.15	85.71
7	Mahbubnagar	45.43	42.71	3.67	54.57	57.29	96.33	88.93	42.04	17.68	11.07	57.96	82.32	38.52	23.47	32.84	61.48	76.53	67.16
8	Medak	34.74	61.57	10.17	65.26	38.43	89.83	93.91	53.18	19.77	6.09	46.82	80.23	22.58	46.02	20.55	77.42	53.98	79.45
9	Nalgonda	38.83	68.48	5.11	61.17	31.52	94.89	81.85	78.86	13.78	18.15	21.14	86.22	55.55	19.91	23.36	44.45	80.09	76.64
10	Nizamabad	70.12	73.07	29.90	29.88	26.93	70.10	82.40	60.80	25.96	17.60	39.20	74.04	36.03	36.96	22.92	63.97	63.04	77.08
11	Rangareddy	34.90	32.79	20.52	65.10	67.21	79.48	98.53	35.71	45.71	1.47	64.29	54.29	47.90	34.13	37.02	52.10	65.87	62.98
12	Vizianagaram	23.38	33.14	9.61	76.62	66.86	90.39	71.26	24.69	10.62	28.74	75.31	89.38	38.99	18.01	29.26	61.01	81.99	70.74
13	Warangal	67.83	64.12	46.20	32.17	35.88	53.80	90.24	44.23	28.04	9.76	55.77	71.96	22.07	21.61	11.68	77.93	78.39	88.32
14	East Godavari	52.94	91.85	2.18	47.06	8.15	97.82	85.65	69.48	38.01	14.35	30.52	61.99	59.81	45.82	21.90	40.19	54.18	78.10
15	Guntur	0.69	91.77	6.74	99.31	8.23	93.26	90.51	75.22	62.10	9.49	24.78	37.90	46.33	41.06	32.26	53.67	58.94	67.74
16	Kurnool	15.04	8.45	22.22	84.96	91.55	77.78	95.63	62.85	19.95	4.37	37.15	80.05	63.23	36.31	15.50	36.77	63.69	84.50
17	Nellore	17.92	41.63	1.95	82.08	58.37	98.05	91.18	57.00	30.53	8.82	43.00	69.47	60.22	27.49	7.35	39.78	72.51	92.65
18	Prakasam	48.57	21.74	1.01	51.43	78.26	98.99	90.70	47.34	24.89	9.30	52.66	75.11	66.56	32.31	36.72	33.44	67.69	63.28
19	Srikakulam	23.15	14.15	44.44	76.85	85.85	55.56	87.36	71.10	15.84	12.64	28.90	84.16	10.54	34.82	30.84	89.46	65.18	69.16
20	Krishna	27.40	20.90	6.90	72.60	79.10	93.10	93.63	62.96	75.37	6.37	37.04	24.63	56.90	48.51	16.14	43.10	51.49	83.86
21	Visakhapatnam	40.26	2.87	0.00	59.74	97.13	100.00	82.55	61.28	28.76	17.45	38.72	71.24	45.43	37.74	4.03	54.57	62.26	95.97
22	West Godavari	25.55	17.44	0.00	74.45	82.56	100.00	90.50	47.32	48.25	9.50	52.68	51.75	29.07	41.26	20.94	70.93	58.74	79.06
	Andhra Pradesh	57.58	56.68	20.71	42.42	43.32	79.29	89.24	57.83	34.59	10.76	42.17	65.41	37.41	32.25	29.27	62.59	67.75	70.73

Contd3

Contd....3.,

Sl. No	Name of the District	Renovation of Traditional Water bodies						Land Development						Any other Activity approved by MRO					
		Completed			On Going			Completed			On Going			Completed			On Going		
		2010-11	2009-10	2008-09	2010-11	2009-10	2008-09	2010-11	2009-10	2008-09	2010-11	2009-10	2008-09	2010-11	2009-10	2008-09	2010-11	2009-10	2008-09
1	Adilabad	99.82	57.22	19.15	0.18	42.78	80.85	96.55	66.00	27.25	3.45	34.00	72.75	--	--	--	--	--	--
2	Ananthapur	100.00	35.15	53.55	0.00	64.85	46.45	96.85	59.71	48.96	3.15	40.29	51.04	--	--	--	--	--	--
3	Chittoor	98.60	50.15	21.95	1.40	49.85	78.05	83.05	83.96	40.84	16.95	16.04	59.16	--	--	--	--	--	--
4	Kadapa	99.20	35.69	26.17	0.80	64.31	73.83	94.05	56.38	30.37	5.95	43.62	69.63	--	--	--	--	--	--
5	Karimnagar	99.65	29.53	24.94	0.35	70.47	75.06	95.58	68.97	49.04	4.42	31.03	50.96	--	--	--	--	--	--
6	Khammam	99.92	37.73	22.44	0.08	62.27	77.56	99.19	61.96	45.36	0.81	38.04	54.64	--	--	--	--	--	--
7	Mahbubnagar	98.22	45.44	16.08	1.78	54.56	83.92	93.05	52.46	29.89	6.95	47.54	70.11	--	--	--	--	--	--
8	Medak	99.88	34.00	17.12	0.12	66.00	82.88	94.33	70.60	38.95	5.67	29.40	61.05	--	--	--	--	--	--
9	Nalgonda	97.18	72.50	18.80	2.82	27.50	81.20	85.61	84.16	26.89	14.39	15.84	73.11	--	--	--	--	--	--
10	Nizamabad	98.83	35.59	38.81	1.17	64.41	61.19	92.24	50.45	38.63	7.76	49.55	61.37	--	--	--	--	--	--
11	Rangareddy	93.22	12.96	13.52	6.78	87.04	86.48	94.29	48.19	55.77	5.71	51.81	44.23	--	--	--	--	--	--
12	Vizianagaram	99.04	31.93	27.10	0.96	68.07	72.90	93.36	43.62	48.88	6.64	56.38	51.12	--	--	--	--	--	--
13	Warangal	98.98	37.69	35.94	1.02	62.31	64.06	88.45	55.22	48.49	11.55	44.78	51.51	--	--	--	--	--	--
14	East Godavari	97.48	48.87	24.41	2.52	51.13	75.59	88.25	86.43	45.21	11.75	13.57	54.79	--	--	--	--	--	--
15	Guntur	92.64	45.48	35.05	7.36	54.52	64.95	73.32	46.43	76.75	26.68	53.57	23.25	--	--	--	--	--	--
16	Kurnool	99.68	76.88	26.33	0.32	23.12	73.67	83.18	65.72	25.66	16.82	34.28	74.34	--	--	--	--	--	--
17	Nellore	99.32	33.48	32.88	0.68	66.52	67.12	92.00	43.67	42.98	8.00	56.33	57.02	--	--	--	--	--	--
18	Prakasam	94.58	43.64	39.03	5.42	56.36	60.97	86.51	35.48	44.19	13.49	64.52	55.81	--	--	--	--	--	--
19	Srikakulam	99.36	40.95	15.13	0.64	59.05	84.87	89.10	81.10	86.69	10.90	18.90	13.31	--	--	--	--	--	--
20	Krishna	95.30	33.22	45.70	4.70	66.78	54.30	94.48	22.51	80.17	5.52	77.49	19.83	--	--	--	--	--	--
21	Visakhapatnam	98.79	38.46	12.54	1.21	61.54	87.46	90.08	45.05	51.38	9.92	54.95	48.62	--	--	--	--	--	--
22	West Godavari	92.01	31.83	25.94	7.99	68.17	74.06	93.52	29.67	53.47	6.48	70.33	46.53	--	--	--	--	--	--
	Andhra Pradesh	98.43	40.10	25.39	1.57	59.90	74.61	92.36	64.48	39.36	7.64	35.52	60.64	--	--	--	--	--	--

Contd4.,

Contd....4.,

Sl. No	Name of the District	Bharat Nirman Rajeev Gandhi Sewa Kendra						Total					
		Completed			On Going			Completed			On Going		
		2010-11	2009-10	2008-09	2010-11	2009-10	2008-09	2010-11	2009-10	2008-09	2010-11	2009-10	2008-09
1	Adilabad	--	--	--	0.00	--	--	83.03	62.52	24.90	16.97	37.48	75.10
2	Ananthapur	--	--	--	28.00	--	--	76.47	47.70	31.18	23.53	52.30	68.82
3	Chittoor	--	--	--	117.00	--	--	42.56	58.12	33.53	57.44	41.88	66.47
4	Kadapa	--	--	--	21.00	--	--	75.27	44.45	33.03	24.73	55.55	66.97
5	Karimnagar	--	--	--	1.00	--	--	83.56	47.12	33.24	16.44	52.88	66.76
6	Khammam	--	--	--	11.00	--	--	90.51	50.82	34.53	9.49	49.18	65.47
7	Mahbubnagar	--	--	--	2.00	--	--	79.79	47.47	25.11	20.21	52.53	74.89
8	Medak	--	--	--	0.00	--	--	66.20	56.36	23.83	33.80	43.64	76.17
9	Nalgonda	--	--	--	0.00	--	--	71.73	67.74	20.69	28.27	32.26	79.31
10	Nizamabad	--	--	--	13.00	--	--	74.20	47.90	31.30	25.80	52.10	68.70
11	Rangareddy	--	--	--	4.00	--	--	68.86	39.95	39.95	31.14	60.05	60.05
12	Vizianagaram	--	--	--	4.00	--	--	61.47	31.75	27.50	38.53	68.25	72.50
13	Warangal	--	--	--	8.00	--	--	75.31	44.24	35.11	24.69	55.76	64.89
14	East Godavari	--	--	--	20.00	--	--	79.75	68.41	33.92	20.25	31.59	66.08
15	Guntur	--	--	--	1.00	--	--	75.88	62.12	56.13	24.12	37.88	43.87
16	Kurnool	--	--	--	13.00	--	--	84.22	52.86	21.56	15.78	47.14	78.44
17	Nellore	--	--	--	0.00	--	--	86.43	43.84	31.12	13.57	56.16	68.88
18	Prakasam	--	--	--	0.00	--	--	85.80	38.43	31.83	14.20	61.57	68.17
19	Srikakulam	--	--	--	1.00	--	--	68.95	56.87	24.42	31.05	43.13	75.58
20	Krishna	--	--	--	1.00	--	--	88.60	53.45	66.57	11.40	46.55	33.43
21	Visakhapatnam	--	--	--	7.00	--	--	54.18	45.32	19.60	45.82	54.68	80.40
22	West Godavari	--	--	--	0.00	--	--	82.18	42.60	40.69	17.82	57.40	59.31
	Andhra Pradesh	--	--	--	252.00	--	--	75.21	51.96	31.24	24.79	48.04	68.76

i) B.N.R.G. S.K. works:

Bharat Nirman Rajeev Gandhi Sewa Kendra works are referred for only 2011-10 to 'On-going' for the number of projects. There is no data to all other years/aspects. All the districts in A.P. showed 100% by number of the projects under 'On-going' works for this composition, since it was started as new type in 2011-10.

J) Total works:

The total works completed reported 75% in 2011-2010 at state level, though it was 52% and 31% for 2010-2009 and 2009-2008 respectively. There is acceleration in the works completion rate from 2009-2008 to 2011-2010. Chittoor (43%) and Visakhapatnam (54%) districts have lagged out of all districts during 2011-2010. Khammam (90%) and Krishna (89%) displayed the highest completion of total works among 22 districts in 2011-2010. In the total works completion, nine districts reported 80% or above and the remaining districts divulged a good picture by ranging in between 69% to 80% in 2011-2010. But this scenario grossly differs from that of 2010-2009 and 2009-2008. The works completion has much accelerated in 2011-2010 only.

Among the total number of works completed during 2008-09 in the state, 30.61 per cent of works under water conservation and water harvesting, 30.92 per cent under Land Development, 12.74 per cent under provision of irrigation facilities, 10.64 per cent under Micro Irrigation and the remaining 15.09 per cent of works under Rural connectivity, Renovation of traditional water bodies, Drought Proofing works and Flood Control and protection works were undertaken. Observing the performance in the districts, it is noted that major proportion of the thrust activities were executed in Chittoor, Khammam, Ananthapur, Cuddapah and Mahboobnagar districts.

On the whole, the number of projects undertaken in the state was increased from year to year. Among the projects major thrust was given in the case of works under water conservation and water harvesting, Micro Irrigation, provision of Irrigation facilities and Land Development. Increase in the number of works from 2008-09 to 2010-11 is observed in case of water conservation and water harvesting and Micro Irrigation works while a decrease is noticed in case of Land Development works and provision of Irrigation facilities.

2.3.3. Amount spent on completed projects:

2.3.3.1 Percentage distribution of Amount Spent on works By completed and on-going works:

a) Rural Connectivity:

The percentage distribution by amount spent for completed and on-going works for 22 districts and Andhra Pradesh is presented in Table 1.3. In case of Rural Connectivity, a declining trend for amount spent is observed in the study period for Andhra Pradesh and for many districts. The amount spent decelerated from 55% to 29% at state level during 2008-2011 and all the 22 districts demonstrated similar trend. And the opposite took place for on-going works for Rural Connectivity during 2011-2008 for districts and state. Nellore and Krishna fared well compared to other districts across this falling trend. Thus amount spent on completed works is higher than that of on-going works.

b) Flood Control and Protection:

Flood Control and Protection has shown acceleration in amount spent during 2011-2008 for Andhra Pradesh and its districts. As many as seven districts reported amount spent 100% on completed projects and seven districts showed 70% or more on amount spent for completion of works. A down trend for on-going works is observed at district level and state level during 2011-2008 as against the other side of amount spent on completed works. The other side, On-going becomes declined in the study period. Amount spent on completed works shows a favourable trend for Flood Control and Protection, though some decline appeared in 2010-2009 for districts and state.

c) Water Conservation and Water Harvesting:

Water Conservation and Water Harvesting reports less amount spent on completed projects when compared to Flood Control and Protection. A near stagnancy (by 54% and 52%) appears for Water Conservation and Water Harvesting by amount spent on completed works at state level during 2010-2008. Khammam and Rangareddy districts displayed 97% and 93% respectively, while all other districts fall below 90%. Vizianagaram and Visakhapatnam districts reported the lowest by 52% and 55% respectively out of all districts. The spent amount of on-going works came down by 2011-2010, but there was no change during 2010-2008. There appears oscillation in amount spent on completed projects during 2011-2010 for all districts.

d) Drought Proofing:

Based on the existence of drought across districts in Andhra Pradesh, the amount spent on completed works of Drought Proofing fluctuates with higher deviation for all the districts during 2011-2008. It reflects at state level as 11% in 2011-2010, 97% in 2010-2009 and 15% in 2009-2008. Thus the similar variations for districts could be traced for all 22 districts during 2011-2008. Due to requirement levels of amount spent on completed projects may vary at large across the study area. In the opposite way, the amount spent On-going works appear for the study period for all districts and state. Kadapa (51%), Karimnagar (37%) and Visakhapatnam (22%) reported high amount spent on completed works of Drought Proofing. Many districts show higher percentage in 2010-2009, it may be due to the dire need of the hour of those districts in Question.

e) Micro-Irrigation works:

The amount spent on Micro-Irrigation works for completed projects indicates allocation during 2011-2008 at state level and for districts also. Rangareddy and Khammam districts show 100%, while six districts report 90% and above for the completed works of Micro Irrigation. All the districts crossed 65% in amount spending under this head, though it was very less in 2009-2008 for many districts. An increment took place at state level by 29% during 2008-2011, as such there had been down trend for on-going works during 2011-08.

Table 2.3 – District wise works completed/progress under MGNREGA (Amount Spent): (2010-11, 2009-10, 2008-09)

(in Percentages)

Sl. No	Name of the District	Rural Connectivity						Flood Control and Protection						Water Conservation and Water Harvesting					
		Completed			On Going			Completed			On Going			Completed			On Going		
		2010-11	2009-10	2008-09	2010-11	2009-10	2008-09	2010-11	2009-10	2008-09	2010-11	2009-10	2008-09	2010-11	2009-10	2008-09	2010-11	2009-10	2008-09
1	Adilabad	17.41	57.20	48.60	82.59	42.80	51.40	100.00	97.72	61.21	0.00	2.28	38.79	89.63	94.79	40.61	10.37	5.21	59.39
2	Ananthapur	17.23	47.90	79.30	82.77	52.10	20.70	85.69	72.69	55.46	14.31	27.31	44.54	85.32	54.17	59.61	14.68	45.83	40.39
3	Chittoor	49.11	90.63	91.56	50.89	9.37	8.44	72.21	51.22	23.21	27.79	48.78	76.79	68.70	19.76	61.26	31.30	80.24	38.74
4	Kadapa	43.28	47.65	36.35	56.72	52.35	63.65	94.55	63.23	29.46	5.45	36.77	70.54	81.59	11.98	59.81	18.41	88.02	40.19
5	Karimnagar	20.72	79.14	30.33	79.28	20.86	69.67	74.26	37.08	62.31	25.74	62.92	37.69	83.67	48.60	42.82	16.33	51.40	57.18
6	Khammam	26.71	37.88	49.41	73.29	62.12	50.59	99.51	53.51	47.52	0.49	46.49	52.48	97.39	10.53	54.60	2.61	89.47	45.40
7	Mahbubnagar	31.59	43.53	48.36	68.41	56.47	51.64	70.34	56.27	64.55	29.66	43.73	35.45	87.53	8.85	49.44	12.47	91.15	50.56
8	Medak	30.76	37.76	58.03	69.24	62.24	41.97	100.00	71.98	46.40	0.00	28.02	53.60	85.21	19.79	52.92	14.79	80.21	47.08
9	Nalgonda	18.36	37.97	46.14	81.64	62.03	53.86	61.92	76.76	41.80	38.08	23.24	58.20	82.03	58.22	40.54	17.97	41.78	59.46
10	Nizamabad	41.69	34.43	23.08	58.31	65.57	76.92	99.64	34.54	36.66	0.36	65.46	63.34	83.59	58.64	50.59	16.41	41.36	49.41
11	Rangareddy	10.84	43.14	0.00	89.16	56.86	100.00	100.00	87.69	92.36	0.00	12.31	7.64	93.06	55.73	67.50	6.94	44.27	32.50
12	Vizianagaram	22.91	39.80	48.92	77.09	60.20	51.08	81.22	0.00	0.00	18.78	100.00	100.00	52.30	49.75	40.55	47.70	50.25	59.45
13	Warangal	23.33	43.33	47.65	76.67	56.67	52.35	63.52	83.47	71.83	36.48	16.53	28.17	88.88	47.38	50.35	11.12	52.62	49.65
14	East Godavari	32.19	69.55	92.38	67.81	30.45	7.62	96.76	67.21	34.91	3.24	32.79	65.09	74.37	62.44	55.88	25.63	37.56	44.12
15	Guntur	33.83	28.70	59.82	66.17	71.30	40.18	61.24	89.32	38.99	38.76	10.68	61.01	75.99	65.90	60.13	24.01	34.10	39.87
16	Kurnool	23.51	24.78	72.91	76.49	75.22	27.09	96.65	23.96	49.77	3.35	76.04	50.23	85.49	53.99	51.15	14.51	46.01	48.85
17	Nellore	51.76	64.68	79.55	48.24	35.32	20.45	82.85	50.94	70.72	17.15	49.06	29.28	85.48	55.79	60.03	14.52	44.21	39.97
18	Prakasam	40.85	57.85	71.37	59.15	42.15	28.63	78.49	48.41	66.50	21.51	51.59	33.50	80.52	50.57	47.23	19.48	49.43	52.77
19	Srikakulam	9.27	25.10	40.57	90.73	74.90	59.43	89.83	69.31	71.66	10.17	30.69	28.34	89.57	19.47	35.58	10.43	80.53	64.42
20	Krishna	54.07	40.51	89.87	45.93	59.49	10.13	99.49	1.13	0.00	0.51	98.87	100.00	88.20	63.07	72.88	11.80	36.93	27.12
21	Visakhapatnam	14.05	33.88	33.25	85.95	66.12	66.75	94.99	34.55		5.01	65.45		55.03	57.59	33.78	44.97	42.41	66.22
22	West Godavari	29.88	44.35		70.12	55.65		99.83	13.17	100.00	0.17	86.83	0.00	71.60	50.39	27.72	28.40	49.61	72.28
	Andhra Pradesh	29.47	44.63	55.06	70.53	55.37	44.94	89.73	56.55	61.05	10.27	43.45	38.95	83.49	53.98	52.37	16.51	46.02	47.63

Contd2.,

Contd....2.,

Sl. No	Name of the District	Drought Proofing						Micro Irrigation Works						Provision of Irrigation Facility to Land owned by					
		Completed			On Going			Completed			On Going			Completed			On Going		
		2010-11	2009-10	2008-09	2010-11	2009-10	2008-09	2010-11	2009-10	2008-09	2010-11	2009-10	2008-09	2010-11	2009-10	2008-09	2010-11	2009-10	2008-09
1	Adilabad	4.10	13.00	14.84	95.90	87.00	85.16	93.66	62.93	52.18	6.34	37.07	47.82	59.83	13.29	20.24	40.17	86.71	79.76
2	Ananthapur	30.51	34.42	17.81	69.49	65.58	82.19	88.61	54.62	66.32	11.39	45.38	33.68	30.90	54.85	17.35	69.10	45.15	82.65
3	Chittoor	18.18	35.55	52.39	81.82	64.45	47.61	65.61	88.82	43.22	34.39	11.18	56.78	34.30	38.17	39.85	65.70	61.83	60.15
4	Kadapa	50.66	39.98	8.79	49.34	60.02	91.21	91.92	70.80	55.98	8.08	29.20	44.02	58.30	4.45	23.46	41.70	95.55	76.54
5	Karimnagar	37.27	23.66	10.28	62.73	76.34	89.72	81.15	45.45	43.50	18.85	54.55	56.50	55.91	81.89	30.67	44.09	18.11	69.33
6	Khammam	3.80	75.79	64.73	96.20	24.21	35.27	99.23	67.48	58.47	0.77	32.52	41.53	82.39	8.51	23.16	17.61	91.49	76.84
7	Mahbubnagar	1.02	9.30	10.15	98.98	90.70	89.85	67.14	56.04	64.31	32.86	43.96	35.69	68.53	38.25	45.55	31.47	61.75	54.45
8	Medak	0.69	26.34	22.29	99.31	73.66	77.71	90.66	68.10	69.67	9.34	31.90	30.33	47.59	15.91	24.41	52.41	84.09	75.59
9	Nalgonda	1.81	20.64	19.47	98.19	79.36	80.53	70.29	74.69	26.88	29.71	25.31	73.12	68.92	30.30	39.25	31.08	69.70	60.75
10	Nizamabad	8.93	4.39	20.00	91.07	95.61	80.00	77.90	56.10	42.06	22.10	43.90	57.94	50.83	56.92	30.97	49.17	43.08	69.03
11	Rangareddy	0.17	1.75	5.21	99.83	98.25	94.79	100.00	61.70	78.10	0.00	38.30	21.90	80.87	11.35	39.13	19.13	88.65	60.87
12	Vizianagaram	0.32	99.97	79.71	99.68	0.03	20.29	74.71	38.99	27.50	25.29	61.01	72.50	53.95	54.25	41.49	46.05	45.75	58.51
13	Warangal	1.14	0.08	28.35	98.86	99.92	71.65	83.93	48.59	53.16	16.07	51.41	46.84	52.51	40.05	17.46	47.49	59.95	82.54
14	East Godavari	1.02	35.13	10.03	98.98	64.87	89.97	87.87	71.72	54.28	12.13	28.28	45.72	48.25	43.99	36.85	51.75	56.01	63.15
15	Guntur	0.04	95.59	4.64	99.96	4.41	95.36	89.15	81.85	68.00	10.85	18.15	32.00	59.28	56.09	30.52	40.72	43.91	69.48
16	Kurnool	1.06	0.00	96.12	98.94	100.00	3.88	66.41	66.42	47.47	33.59	33.58	52.53	68.25	48.34	26.21	31.75	51.66	73.79
17	Nellore	0.20	66.40	3.51	99.80	33.60	96.49	79.67	65.01	60.07	20.33	34.99	39.93	50.34	45.27	12.98	49.66	54.73	87.02
18	Prakasam	1.38	17.69	2.67	98.62	82.31	97.33	83.66	62.32	51.05	16.34	37.68	48.95	66.13	44.68	16.99	33.87	55.32	83.01
19	Srikakulam	4.18	38.92	65.13	95.82	61.08	34.87	85.36	73.85	41.85	14.64	26.15	58.15	12.84	62.78	22.79	87.16	37.22	77.21
20	Krishna	1.07	0.70	3.06	98.93	99.30	96.94	94.76	75.56	79.28	5.24	24.44	20.72	73.21	62.62	63.76	26.79	37.38	36.24
21	Visakhapatnam	22.35	2.60	0.00	77.65	97.40	100.00	91.28	67.22	45.25	8.72	32.78	54.75	54.47	62.95	5.60	45.53	37.05	94.40
22	West Godavari	11.58	16.02	0.00	88.42	83.98	100.00	90.71	57.13	56.71	9.29	42.87	43.29	62.44	62.12	25.05	37.56	37.88	74.95
	Andhra Pradesh	10.56	96.89	15.46	89.44	3.11	84.54	83.64	62.89	54.70	16.36	37.11	45.30	59.10	37.53	30.14	40.90	62.47	69.86

Contd3

Contd....3.,

Sl. No	Name of the District	Renovation of Traditional Water bodies						Land Development						Any other Activity approved by MRO					
		Completed			On Going			Completed			On Going			Completed			On Going		
		2010-11	2009-10	2008-09	2010-11	2009-10	2008-09	2010-11	2009-10	2008-09	2010-11	2009-10	2008-09	2010-11	2009-10	2008-09	2010-11	2009-10	2008-09
1	Adilabad	99.92	44.92	52.06	0.08	55.08	47.94	94.29	54.41	49.75	5.71	45.59	50.25	--	--	--	--	--	--
2	Ananthapur	100.00	51.64	74.16	0.00	48.36	25.84	93.34	44.91	59.94	6.66	55.09	40.06	--	--	--	--	--	--
3	Chittoor	98.99	60.11	47.34	1.01	39.89	52.66	66.03	55.44	65.84	33.97	44.56	34.16	--	--	--	--	--	--
4	Kadapa	99.69	61.30	48.44	0.31	38.70	51.56	87.15	44.75	50.41	12.85	55.25	49.59	--	--	--	--	--	--
5	Karimnagar	99.43	37.44	49.36	0.57	62.56	50.64	91.78	52.69	71.94	8.22	47.31	28.06	--	--	--	--	--	--
6	Khammam	99.26	37.19	54.68	0.74	62.81	45.32	97.60	51.67	65.65	2.40	48.33	34.35	--	--	--	--	--	--
7	Mahbubnagar	99.25	53.55	46.00	0.75	46.45	54.00	88.56	44.35	57.62	11.44	55.65	42.38	--	--	--	--	--	--
8	Medak	99.76	4.24	40.48	0.24	95.76	59.52	94.34	7.63	62.41	5.66	92.37	37.59	--	--	--	--	--	--
9	Nalgonda	97.31	38.52	29.83	2.69	61.48	70.17	83.51	69.08	50.30	16.49	30.92	49.70	--	--	--	--	--	--
10	Nizamabad	99.47	47.54	61.61	0.53	52.46	38.39	89.85	50.74	60.24	10.15	49.26	39.76	--	--	--	--	--	--
11	Rangareddy	98.35	6.73	33.07	1.65	93.27	66.93	98.29	46.36	70.98	1.71	53.64	29.02	--	--	--	--	--	--
12	Vizianagaram	98.10	47.13	48.58	1.90	52.87	51.42	74.36	27.90	26.13	25.64	72.10	73.87	--	--	--	--	--	--
13	Warangal	99.44	39.22	52.13	0.56	60.78	47.87	87.05	44.51	73.14	12.95	55.49	26.86	--	--	--	--	--	--
14	East Godavari	99.31	67.23	41.57	0.69	32.77	58.43	67.41	66.73	57.36	32.59	33.27	42.64	--	--	--	--	--	--
15	Guntur	92.44	41.87	42.01	7.56	58.13	57.99	61.67	47.12	88.49	38.33	52.88	11.51	--	--	--	--	--	--
16	Kurnool	100.00	71.36	63.12	0.00	28.64	36.88	83.03	35.35	52.73	16.97	64.65	47.27	--	--	--	--	--	--
17	Nellore	99.30	41.40	59.67	0.70	58.60	40.33	78.70	40.34	57.33	21.30	59.66	42.67	--	--	--	--	--	--
18	Prakasam	86.46	64.98	61.81	13.54	35.02	38.19	70.67	43.36	60.70	29.33	56.64	39.30	--	--	--	--	--	--
19	Srikakulam	99.11	53.45	34.74	0.89	46.55	65.26	87.13	60.71	93.27	12.87	39.29	6.73	--	--	--	--	--	--
20	Krishna	97.29	47.02	89.72	2.71	52.98	10.28	94.94	64.79	61.29	5.06	35.21	38.71	--	--	--	--	--	--
21	Visakhapatnam	99.23	60.55	21.40	0.77	39.45	78.60	93.96	71.36	56.62	6.04	28.64	43.38	--	--	--	--	--	--
22	West Godavari	98.79	50.26	39.85	1.21	49.74	60.15	95.11	55.78	36.41	4.89	44.22	63.59	--	--	--	--	--	--
	Andhra Pradesh	98.73	50.72	49.07	1.27	49.28	50.93	87.31	47.04	60.24	12.69	52.96	39.76	--	--	--	--	--	--

Contd4.,

Contd....4.,

Sl. No	Name of the District	Bharat Nirman Rajeev Gandhi Sewa Kendra						Total					
		Completed			On Going			Completed			On Going		
		2010-11	2009-10	2008-09	2010-11	2009-10	2008-09	2010-11	2009-10	2008-09	2010-11	2009-10	2008-09
1	Adilabad	--	--	--		--	--	68.77	70.25	43.77	31.23	29.75	56.23
2	Ananthapur	--	--	--	100.00	--	--	49.80	52.62	55.62	50.20	47.38	44.38
3	Chittoor	--	--	--	100.00	--	--	64.28	42.37	54.78	35.72	57.63	45.22
4	Kadapa	--	--	--	100.00	--	--	65.78	32.14	43.13	34.22	67.86	56.87
5	Karimnagar	--	--	--		--	--	72.86	53.61	48.36	27.14	46.39	51.64
6	Khammam	--	--	--	100.00	--	--	74.63	25.15	56.87	25.37	74.85	43.13
7	Mahbubnagar	--	--	--	100.00	--	--	66.24	39.28	52.42	33.76	60.72	47.58
8	Medak	--	--	--		--	--	69.48	15.40	53.18	30.52	84.60	46.82
9	Nalgonda	--	--	--		--	--	55.57	38.98	44.80	44.43	61.02	55.20
10	Nizamabad	--	--	--	100.00	--	--	81.76	51.61	52.10	18.24	48.39	47.90
11	Rangareddy	--	--	--	100.00	--	--	66.06	35.31	65.84	33.94	64.69	34.16
12	Vizianagaram	--	--	--	100.00	--	--	80.76	77.19	41.99	19.24	22.81	58.01
13	Warangal	--	--	--	100.00	--	--	70.13	42.58	52.15	29.87	57.42	47.85
14	East Godavari	--	--	--	100.00	--	--	63.96	64.02	55.05	36.04	35.98	44.95
15	Guntur	--	--	--	100.00	--	--	56.09	53.72	60.89	43.91	46.28	39.11
16	Kurnool	--	--	--	100.00	--	--	62.03	48.63	49.34	37.97	51.37	50.66
17	Nellore	--	--	--		--	--	62.99	50.09	52.45	37.01	49.91	47.55
18	Prakasam	--	--	--		--	--	63.51	49.35	52.88	36.49	50.65	47.12
19	Srikakulam	--	--	--	100.00	--	--	76.77	53.10	44.58	23.23	46.90	55.42
20	Krishna	--	--	--	100.00	--	--	73.56	58.22	84.78	26.44	41.78	15.22
21	Visakhapatnam	--	--	--	100.00	--	--	62.44	60.92	26.88	37.56	39.08	73.12
22	West Godavari	--	--	--		--	--	62.94	53.68	44.27	37.06	46.32	55.73
	Andhra Pradesh	--	--	--	100.00	--	--	67.11	52.34	51.50	32.89	47.66	48.50

f) Provision of Irrigation Facility to land owned by SCs and STs, Beneficiaries of land reforms and others:

Provision of Irrigation Facility to land owned by SCs and STs, beneficiaries of land reforms and others reports gradual increase in amount spent on completion of works during 2011-2008, but the spent amount show at lower level for Andhra Pradesh and all districts. Eight districts, viz., Khammam, Rangareddy, Krishna, Mahaboobnagar, Kurnool, Prakasam and Nalgonda divulge impressive spending on completion of works, whereas all the remaining districts show bottom level in completion in 2011-2010. Though this picture is not inspiring, but compared to other years, it is better. The on-going works are appeared on the other side of the above picture referred.

g) Renovation of Traditional Water bodies:

As well as in the numbers of works completed, the amount spent in completed works of Renovation of Traditional Water bodies is estimated as much successful in all districts across Andhra Pradesh in 2011-2008. It has reached 98% in amount spent in completed works in 18 districts out of 22 in Andhra Pradesh in 2011-2010 and five districts reported 100%. The Community interest will also be the cause of the highest completion of works, as these are neglected for a long period. Hence, the on-going works by amount spent became 1.27% by 2011-2010, despite it stood for 49% and 51% in 2010-2009 and 2009-2008 respectively at state level and the similar situation appears for all the districts.

h) Land Development:

Land Development is the key factor to reduce wastage in inputs and to enhance the irrigation availability to fields. Land Development works completed by amount spent exhibits the similar trend of the previous component with a little lower level by state and districts. Rangareddy (98%), Khammam (98%), West Godavari (95%) and Krishna (94%) districts are in frontline across districts in completed works by amount spent. Guntur (62%), Chittoor (66%) and East Godavari (67%) stand in last line in the completion of works in 2011-2010. There was high completion in 2010-2009 compared to 2009-2008 for many districts. Therefore, on-going works by amount spent has shown deceleration during 2011-2009. Thus Land development works by amount spent occupied important position in the completed aspect.

i) B.N.R.G.S.K. works:

Bharat Nirman Rajeev Gandhi Sewa Kendra works are referred for only 2011-10 to 'On-going'. There is no data to all other years/aspects. All the districts in A.P. reported 100% amount spent for On-going works for this head, since it was started anew in 2011-10.

j) Total works:

The 'Total' works amount spent for completion of works is observed as acceleration during 2011-08 for districts and A.P. Nizambad and Vizianagaram achieved 82% and 81% respectively in 2011-10 followed by Srikakulam (77%) and Khamam (75%) districts, while the lowest completed districts are Ananthapur (50%), Nalgonda (56%) Guntur (56%) districts. The remaining districts performed 62% or above in the Completed districts by amount spent. Nevertheless the districts in A.P. reported at lower level in 2010-08, there was dramatic change by 2011-10 in performance of works Completion. In case of On-going works, there were many districts with many On-going works by amount spent during 2010-08. It indicates that the on-time completion was not resulted for these 'Total' works during the early study period.

Of the total amount (Rs. 183718.54 Lakhs) spent on projects during 2009-10 in the state, major proportion of amounts were spent on Renovation of Traditional Water Bodies followed by provision of Irrigation facilities, Drought proofing and Water Conservation and Water harvesting works. Comparatively lesser amounts were spent on Land Development, Micro Irrigation and Rural Connectivity activities. Across districts, major portion of amounts were spent on the above works in the districts in order Vizianagaram, Ananthapur, Visakhapatnam, Srikakulam and East Godavari. Among the three years, lower amount was spent on Drought Proofing only in the year 2009-10.

Importance was given to Water Conservation and Water Harvesting structures, Land Development works, Renovation of Traditional Water bodies and Rural Connectivity activities during 2008-09. Of the total amount of Rs. 137872.65 Lakhs spent on the projects during 2008-09 27.86 per cent and 27.75 per cent of amounts were spent on water conservation and water harvesting and land development works respectively. About 17.85 per cent of the total amount on Renovation of traditional water bodies and 13.45 per cent of the amount on Rural Connectivity works were spent. Of the total amount spent across districts, major proportions of

the amount were spent in the districts of Ananthapur, Khammam Chittoor, Kurnool and Mahboobnagar in the order of ranking.

2.4. Performance of MGNREGA – Some Quantitative Indicators:

The district-wise performance of social auditing and inspection of MGNREGA works during three years i.e., 2010-11, 2009-10, and 2008-09, is presented in Table 2.4. (The basic data obtained through website are presented in Annexure Table 2.4)

2.4.1. Verification of Muster rolls:

The Social audit starts with verifying the muster rolls used in each district. Of the total number of muster rolls (56.14 lakh) used, 91.71 per cent of the muster rolls are verified during 2010-11 in the state. Observing across the districts, 8 districts viz., Chittoor, Manboobnagar, Medak, Nalgonda, Nizamabad, Rangareddy, Vizianagaram and Srikakulam have reported around 92 per cent of verified muster rolls. The percentage of verification of muster rolls ranged from 90.25 in Prakasam district to 92.80 in Mahboobnagar district. During 2009-10, a total number of 69.98 lakh muster rolls were used in the state, of which 91.71 per cent of muster rolls were verified. Glancing across the districts similar performance is observed during 2009-10 and 2010-11. Of the total number of 23.75 lakh muster rolls used in 2008-09 in the state 88.16 per cent of them were verified. The percentage of muster rolls verified ranged between 70.17 in Kurnool and 92.95 in Vizianagaram across the districts. Six districts have reported to have got the muster rolls verified below 80 per cent.

2.4.2a. Social Audit:

Social audit is to make the planning implementation and evaluation of Employment Guarantee Scheme more participatory, transparent and accountable. Social audit is not retrospective but an ongoing process of participation to ensure that legal guarantees and entitlements flow to the workers in a legitimate way. Social audit will be done in three stages – Pre, during and post implementation. Social audit shall be integrated into the critical activities of Employment Guarantee Scheme.

Andhra Pradesh is the only state, which established a full-fledged Social audit at the state level with exclusive staff. The unit works independently and reports to the Government. So far Social audit has been conducted in 1077 mandals in 22 districts in the 1st round; 655

mandals covered in 2nd round and 156 mandals in 3rd round. This is an effective tool to check corruption and to enhance the accountability to people. So far more than 3991 functionaries have been either terminated from their services or disciplinary actions have been initiated. FIR was booked against 639 Functionaries and Departmental enquiry initiated against 1433 Functionaries. The details of execution of social audit in Andhra Pradesh are furnished in the Table C.

Table C – Execution of Social Audit

Sl.No.	Cadre	Dismissed	Suspended	FIR	Departmental Enquiry
1	Post MPDOs	0	28	5	24
2	Additional Pos	29	15	7	3
3	TAs	188	35	46	3
4	Computer Operators	26	7	5	1
5	FAs	2251	73	188	24
6	Panchayat Secretary	0	2	11	6
7	AEs	1	8	4	34
8	WIS	11	1	3	91
9	BPMs	3	2	61	1053
10	Group Leaders	1326	36	35	28
11	Others	156	1	274	166
	Total	3991	208	639	1433

Source: Office of the Commissioner, Rural Development, Hyderabad.

Legend: PO= Programme Officer, MPDO= Mandal Parishad Development Officer,
TA = Technical Assistant, FA= Field Assistant, AE = Assistant Engineer, WI = Work Inspector
BPM = Branch Post Master.

Table 2.4 – Social auditing and inspection of MGNREGA Work (2010-11, 2009-10 and 2008-09)

Sl. No	Name of the District	Muster Roll Verified			Social Audit			Inspections conducted						Gram Sabhas held						Complaints		
		% of verified in No. of Muster rolls used			% of No. of GPs where social audit held in total Gram Panchayats			% of works inspected at district level in total works taken up			% of works inspected at block level in total works taken up			% of gram Sabhas held in Total Panchayats			% of VMC meetings held in Gram Panchayats			% of Complaints disposed in Complaints received		
		2010-11	2009-10	2008-09	2010-11	2009-10	2008-09	2010-11	2009-10	2008-09	2010-11	2009-10	2008-09	2010-11	2009-10	2008-09	2010-11	2009-10	2008-09	2010-11	2009-10	2008-09
1	Adilabad	91.90	91.90	92.40	99.77	100.00	100.00	9.15	9.25	9.20	92.45	91.45	90.45	78.06	99.34	100.00	1.26	13.64	90.83	99.73	84.62	98.21
2	Ananthapur	91.35	91.35	90.35	96.92	100.00	100.00	9.25	9.25	9.18	91.10	91.10	90.10	84.39	98.72	99.21	0.80	10.41	94.60	100.00	87.50	91.11
3	Chittoor	92.30	92.30	91.55	81.30	100.00	91.41	9.10	9.00	8.90	92.00	92.00	89.45	90.80	98.08	99.43	0.87	9.79	86.87	95.48	84.62	97.92
4	Kadapa	90.85	90.85	90.35	98.78	100.00	98.59	9.30	9.30	9.30	91.00	90.91	90.91	98.41	97.17	97.53	1.22	12.96	86.57	99.70	90.00	95.56
5	Karimnagar	91.30	91.30	92.35	85.75	100.00	100.00	9.28	9.38	9.16	91.60	91.60	92.60	91.95	98.10	95.78	1.09	7.86	86.19	99.17	83.33	93.48
6	Khammam	90.50	90.50	89.85	90.69	100.00	100.00	9.18	9.18	9.25	92.00	92.00	92.00	94.95	99.62	100.00	1.42	10.34	91.17	98.34	90.91	93.75
7	Mahbubnagar	92.80	92.80	92.35	85.41	100.00	100.00	9.20	9.18	9.18	92.00	90.15	90.15	95.26	99.34	100.00	1.41	7.42	78.99	100.00	92.31	98.53
8	Medak	92.60	92.60	76.40	96.88	100.00	100.00	9.20	9.20	9.30	91.40	91.40	91.00	93.19	95.58	93.89	1.42	8.00	76.95	98.77	100.00	98.39
9	Nalgonda	92.00	92.00	90.95	81.32	100.00	100.00	9.20	9.20	9.00	91.60	91.60	90.60	87.61	93.07	91.39	1.02	10.39	77.96	99.44	90.91	96.36
10	Nizamabad	92.00	92.00	77.35	91.23	100.00	100.00	9.23	9.23	9.23	91.50	91.18	90.18	96.38	98.75	100.00	1.39	14.56	84.88	97.68	100.00	96.92
11	Rangareddy	92.35	92.35	92.35	64.77	100.00	98.74	9.19	9.19	9.19	91.30	90.85	90.35	62.93	99.44	100.00	1.56	13.43	82.94	100.00	90.91	98.21
12	Vizianagaram	92.55	92.55	92.95	88.74	100.00	97.40	9.14	9.14	9.24	91.50	91.52	90.50	88.42	99.27	95.10	0.96	12.40	82.60	91.13	93.33	94.74
13	Warangal	91.85	91.85	91.35	93.80	100.00	100.00	9.21	9.19	9.19	93.00	91.60	91.10	96.85	98.53	100.00	0.79	10.39	88.73	99.39	91.67	98.11
14	East Godavari	91.50	91.50	79.76	81.42	90.61	55.73	9.19	9.19	8.69	92.30	91.30	91.30	94.47	99.70	100.00	0.99	9.39	78.36	97.39	90.00	98.04
15	Guntur	90.50	90.50	90.35	71.78	59.59	40.12	9.07	9.07	8.96	93.00	91.70	91.70	96.39	98.64	96.51	0.78	10.56	83.62	97.22	100.00	95.45
16	Kurnool	91.50	91.50	70.17	88.52	97.67	70.95	8.90	8.90	8.73	91.00	90.81	90.31	92.75	99.33	100.00	1.34	10.42	88.14	99.63	100.00	100.00
17	Nellore	91.35	91.35	90.35	72.56	91.99	50.43	9.20	9.20	9.20	91.50	91.32	91.32	95.11	99.48	100.00	1.14	10.19	86.90	98.87	90.00	95.65
18	Prakasam	90.25	90.25	73.05	81.30	77.86	37.84	9.00	9.00	8.79	90.60	90.60	89.10	92.33	98.67	96.47	1.05	9.06	79.31	96.73	90.00	93.33
19	Srikakulam	92.65	92.65	92.35	89.31	93.75	46.20	9.14	9.14	9.14	90.70	90.30	89.10	79.35	98.37	98.37	0.91	9.24	77.26	93.31	88.89	93.62
20	Krishna	90.55	90.55	73.91	85.82	67.82	7.56	9.10	9.10	8.78	93.00	90.51	90.10	99.90	98.88	100.00		10.93	88.36	100.00	88.89	97.44
21	Visakhapatnam	91.50	91.50	92.35	90.06	73.22	10.77	9.20	9.20	9.30	91.00	89.61	89.09	94.61	99.16	100.00	1.06	11.30	95.40	95.85	100.00	92.86
22	West Godavari	91.35	91.35	93.35	89.30	82.79	6.59	8.90	8.90	8.90	91.30	91.30	91.00	99.32	99.55	100.00	1.01	12.85	88.60	98.89	100.00	97.06
	Andhra Pradesh	91.71	91.71	88.16	86.47	92.65	73.76	9.15	9.15	9.08	91.65	91.25	90.58	91.28	98.41	98.22	1.11	10.47	84.94	98.17	91.70	96.26

2.4.2b. Social Audit held in Grampanchayats:

The social audit was held in 18900 Grampanchayats in the state consisting of 86.47 per cent of total Grampanchayats during 2010-11. Across the districts, the percentage of Grampanchayats in which Social audit was held ranged between 64.77 in Rangareddy and 99.77 in Adilabad districts.

About 92.65 per cent of gram panchayats of the total gram panchayats in the state have got social audit during 2009-10. The social audit was held in all the Grampanchayats of 13 districts of 1st phase of MGNREGA. The percentage of number of Panchayats among the 2nd and 3rd phase of districts in which social audit was held ranged from 59.59 in Guntur to 97.67 in Kurnool district.

The social audit was completed in all the panchayats of nine districts out of 13 districts of 1st Phase, during 2008-09. On an average, about 73.76 per cent of panchayats reported to have completed social audit during the year in the state. Across the districts, the percentage of panchayats in which the social audit was held ranged from 7.56 in Krishna district to 98.74 in Rangareddy district. Meager percentage of GP's has reported to have conducted social audit in the districts of Visakhapatnam, Krishna and West Godavari. This indicates the irresponsibility in conducting social audit by the GP staff in the respective district.

2.4.2c. Inspections Conducted:

About 11.41 lakh number of works were taken up in the state during 2010-11, of which 9 per cent of works were inspected at district level and about 91 per cent of works at block level. Across the districts, the percentage of works inspected ranged between 8.90 in Kurnool and West Godavari and 9.30 in kadapa districts. On the other hand, the percentage of number of works inspected at block level varied from 90.60 in Prakasam district to 93.00 in Warangal, Guntur and Krishna districts.

During 2009-10, similar performance of inspections is observed as in the year 2010-11 at district level. But the percentage of inspections done at block level varied from 89.61 in Visakhapatnam district to 92.00 in Chittoor and Khammam districts.

Out of the total number of works (6.70 lakhs) taken up during 2008-09 about 9 per cent of works were inspected at district level and around 90 per cent of works at block level. Observing across districts, the percentage of works inspected at district level varied from 8.69 in East Godavari to 9.30 in kadapa, Medak and Visakhapatnam districts. On the other hand the percentage of works inspected at block level ranged from 89.09 in Visakhapatnam to 92.60 in Karimnagar district.

2.4.2d. Gramsabhas Held:

Every year the Gram Panchayat shall convene a meeting of the Gramsabha to estimate the demand for labour and to propose the number and priority of works to be taken up in the next financial year. The timing of the meeting will take into consideration of the work season and the migration time, in case the workforce in that area tends to migrate for work. Participation of likely beneficiaries should be ensured in the Gramsabha so that their priorities and needs shape the Annual Plan. The time and date of the Gramsabha meeting should be fixed well in advance and should be widely publicized so that people can participate in large number. In Andhra Pradesh, out of a total number of 21857 Gram Panchayats, Gramsabhas were held in 91.28 per cent of Panchayats during 2010-11. The percentage of Gramsabhas held across districts varied from 62.93 in Rangareddy to 99.90 in Krishna district. On the other hand, the percentage of VMC meetings held in Gram Panchayats is reported to be 1.11 in the state. Across the districts the percentage varied from 0.78 in Guntur district to 1.56 in Rangareddy district. Moreover, among the districts, Vizianagaram, Nalgonda, Ananthapur, Srikakulam and Adilabad districts reported to have held Gram sabhas below 90 per cent. On the other hand, seven districts viz., Ananthapur, Chittoor, Vizianagaram, Warangal, East Godavari, Guntur and Srikakulam have reported to have held VMC meetings below one per cent.

During 2009-10, of the total of 22109 Gram Panchayats in the state 98.41 per cent of the Panchayats held Gramsabhas and about 10.47 per cent Village Monthly Co-ordination Committee (VMC) meetings were held. Across districts, the percentage of Gramsabhas held ranged from 93.07 in Nalgonda to 99.55 in West Godavari district. On the other hand the percentage of VMC meetings held ranged from 7.42 in Mahboobnagar district to 14.56 in Nizamabad district. Seven districts, viz., Chittoor, Karimnagar, Mahboobnagar, Medak, East

Godavari Prakasam and Srikakulam have reported to have conducted VMC meetings below 10 per cent of total panchayats. Of the total number of 22109 Gram Panchayats, 98.22 per cent of Panchayats held Gramsabhas in the state during 2008-09. All the Panchayats of 12 districts in the state have conducted Gramsabhas. These districts are: Adilabad, Khammam, Mahboobnagar, Nizamabad, Rangareddy, Warangal, East Godavari, Kurnool, Nellore, Krishna, Visakhapatnam and West Godavari. On the other hand, of the total Panchayats in the state, 84.94 per cent of Panchayats have conducted VMC meetings. The percentage of VMC meetings held ranged from 76.95 in Medak district to 95.40 in Visakhapatnam district. Only six districts viz., Mahboobnagar, Medak, Nalgonda, East Godavari, Prakasam and Srikakulam have reported to have conducted VMC meetings below 80 per cent. Glancing over the percentage of VMC meetings conducted across districts during the three years, best performance was recorded in all districts during 2008-09. Observing the three years, more attention is paid to Gramsabhas than VMC meetings by the executives. Where the socio-economic awareness of the level of development is high, there the rigidity of political dynamism appears much. As the Krishna, Guntur and Nellore districts show much lower representation of the Gramsabhas held, it indicates the people participation or mobilization in the local administration at lower level.

2.4.2e. Complaints:

As per the guidelines in the Act of MGNREGA, any grievance shall be enquired and action initiated within seven days by the Panchayat Secretary/Field Assistant at village level, Programme Officer at the mandal level and District Programme Co-ordinator at the district level. Details of all the grievances received and disposed at each level should be maintained in the Grievance Register. Acknowledgement shall be given for any grievance received. In Andhra Pradesh, the grievance Redressal Mechanism showed a significant performance in disposing the grievances during the years 2010-11, 2009-10 and 2008-09. Out of the total complaints received in each year 98.17 per cent in 2010-11, 91.70 per cent in 2009-10 and 96.26 per cent in 2008-09, were disposed.

Across the districts during 2010-11, in four districts viz., Ananthapur, Mahboobnagar, Rangareddy and Krishna Cent percent of received complaints were disposed. In the remaining districts, the percentage of complaints disposed ranged between 91.13 in Vizianagaram and 99.73 in Adilabad district. During 2009-10, out of 229 complaints received in the state 91.70

per cent of complaints were disposed. Among the 22 districts, six districts have reported cent percent disposal of the complaints, they are Medak, Nizamabad, Guntur, Kurnool, Visakhapatnam and West Godavari. Across the remaining districts, the percentage of complaints disposed ranged between 84.62 in Adilabad and Chittoor districts and 93.33 in Vizianagaram district. Out of the total of 1097 complaints received in the state during 2008-09, 96.26 per cent of the complaints were disposed. Glancing over the districts, it is observed that only in Kurnool district cent percent of the complaints were disposed. The percentage of complaints disposed among the other districts varied from 91.11 in Ananthapur district to 98.53 in Mahboobnagar district.

During the three years of execution, the department could succeed in disposing around 90 per cent of the received complaints.

2.4.3. Bank Accounts & Post Office Accounts:

Individual Savings Accounts of the wage seekers of a village will be opened in a Bank or Post Office located in that village or within 2 kilometers distance. Every wage seeker of a family will have an Individual Savings Account in a Bank or Post Office. If there are 4 adult wage seekers in a family, each one of them will have a separate savings Account. There can be about 500 Savings Accounts in a Bank or Post Office. If these two (Bank or Post Office) are located in a village, the labourers will be given option to choose any one of it. There should be one Disbursing Agency for any village. Whenever the Bank or Post Office is not located, such labourers will be given an option to go to nearest Bank or Post Office. In ITDA areas, labourers will be given the option to have a common account for the village in the name of Grampanchayat or Voluntary Organization (VO) or any other agency as many be opted by them. The amount will be deposited to this Common Account by the Mandal Parishad Development Officer and the person authorized by them shall draw and disburse the amount to the wage seekers in the presence of Community in the village. The district-wise details of payments towards MGNREGA works processed through banks/Post Offices during 2010-11, 2009-10 and 2008-09 are presented in the Table 2.5. (The basic data obtained through Website are presented in the Annexure Table 2.5).

Table 2.5 – The MGNREGA payment processed through Banks/Post Office (2010-11, 2009-10 and 2008-09)

Sl. No	Name of the District	No. of Bank Accounts opened			% of Amount of wages disbursed to bank accounts			No. of Post Office Accounts opened			% of Amount of Wages disbursed through Post Office Accounts			Total Accounts			Total Amount Disbursed		
		% of District to State			% of District to State			% of District to State			% of District to State			% of District to State					
		2010-11	2009-10	2008-09	2010-11	2009-10	2008-09	2010-11	2009-10	2008-09	2010-11	2009-10	2008-09	2010-11	2009-10	2008-09	2010-11	2009-10	2008-09
1	Adilabad	1.20	1.20	2.29	2.80	0.11	4.56	5.96	5.11	5.47	6.99	7.04	5.73	5.32	4.57	5.21	5.86	5.66	5.42
2	Ananthapur	2.74	2.74	5.25	6.88	0.12	0.98	7.87	7.42	6.82	6.21	8.06	8.39	7.18	6.77	6.69	6.39	6.48	6.41
3	Chittoor	9.98	9.98	8.29	3.20	5.29	1.43	5.40	5.58	4.87	3.59	4.92	8.60	6.01	6.20	5.16	3.48	4.99	6.68
4	Kadapa	1.51	1.51	2.89	2.28	5.86	5.35	4.29	4.44	4.75	4.85	4.15	4.04	3.92	4.02	4.59	4.15	4.50	4.39
5	Karimnagar	11.50	11.50	11.19	5.81	11.09	5.28	5.50	5.58	5.13	3.96	4.92	5.30	6.30	6.41	5.63	4.46	6.15	5.29
6	Khammam	1.02	1.02	1.94	2.47	2.71	11.31	6.83	7.23	7.74	4.50	5.28	5.13	6.05	6.36	7.25	3.95	4.76	6.78
7	Mahbubnagar	3.17	3.17	4.30	3.72	3.89	2.09	6.81	6.77	6.80	7.20	6.52	8.04	6.32	6.26	6.59	6.26	5.99	6.45
8	Medak	8.56	8.56	6.23	4.85	5.54	1.87	3.84	3.83	3.69	5.09	4.42	4.86	4.47	4.50	3.90	5.02	4.64	4.06
9	Nalgonda	0.49	0.49	0.89	1.26	0.04	1.28	8.20	8.47	7.78	7.69	7.26	6.50	7.17	7.35	7.20	5.95	5.82	5.10
10	Nizamabad	0.01	0.01	0.01	1.65	0.34	5.69	4.32	4.46	4.44	8.28	5.64	4.47	3.74	3.83	4.07	6.49	4.58	4.80
11	Rangareddy	4.04	4.04	2.49	4.33	5.49	1.28	1.90	2.01	2.15	1.71	2.31	3.31	2.18	2.29	2.18	2.42	2.95	2.77
12	Vizianagaram	0.72	0.72	1.36	1.53	0.18	3.38	5.88	4.44	4.75	7.60	8.09	6.07	5.19	3.92	4.47	5.96	6.51	5.35
13	Warangal	17.69	17.69	28.09	7.65	7.86	2.70	5.56	5.61	5.57	5.09	4.77	5.86	7.19	7.30	7.45	5.78	5.38	5.01
14	East Godavari	8.92	8.92	6.34	6.57	9.77	7.70	5.81	5.97	6.29	2.26	2.98	5.16	6.22	6.38	6.29	3.42	4.33	5.84
15	Guntur	2.83	2.83	5.44	1.24	0.08	2.27	2.84	2.59	2.46	1.86	0.68	2.01	2.84	2.63	2.71	1.69	0.56	2.08
16	Kurnool	2.07	2.07	3.96	2.20	0.22	17.66	4.60	6.54	6.99	6.42	7.94	5.36	4.26	5.91	6.74	5.28	6.40	8.65
17	Nellore	2.32	2.32	4.46	1.28	0.01	9.53	4.08	3.17	2.09	2.76	3.08	1.11	3.85	3.05	2.28	2.36	2.46	3.36
18	Prakasam	2.34	2.34	4.49	2.31	0.54	0.69	3.19	3.69	3.95	6.14	4.73	4.75	3.08	3.50	4.00	5.11	3.89	3.67
19	Srikakulam	0.05	0.05	0.07	4.09	0.12	2.61	4.65	4.48	4.57	7.82	7.22	4.97	4.03	3.86	4.20	6.81	5.80	4.34
20	Krishna	5.74	5.74	0.01	5.78	4.56	2.43	1.03	1.09	1.17	0.00	0.00	0.06	1.66	1.74	1.07	1.56	0.91	0.70
21	Visakhapatnam	6.35	6.35	0.00	18.48	26.39	6.16	1.29	1.36	1.46	0.00	0.01	0.21	1.97	2.06	1.34	5.00	5.28	1.80
22	West Godavari	6.75	6.75	0.00	9.65	9.77	3.76	0.16	0.16	1.06	0.00	0.00	0.07	1.04	1.09	0.98	2.61	1.95	1.06
	Andhra Pradesh	100.00 (1957469)	100.00 (1957469)	100.00 (1019153)	100.00 (84160)	100.00 (72473)	100.00 (59997)	100.00 (12686318)	100.00 (11982641)	100.00 (1196554)	100.00 (226919.4)	100.00 (290301.9)	100.00 (164302.8)	100.00 (14643787)	100.00 (13940110)	100.00 (12215707)	100.00 (311080)	100.00 (362774)	100.00 (224300)

NOTE: No Joint Account is reported by any district in any category of accounts.

Out of 146.44 lakh number of accounts opened during 2010-11 in the state, 13.36 per cent of accounts are opened in Banks and 86.64 per cent accounts are opened in Post Offices. Across the districts, the percent of number of bank accounts varied from 0.01 in Nizamabad district to 17.69 in Warangal district. On the other hand, the percentage of number of Post Office Accounts ranged between 0.16 in West Godavari and 8.20 in Nalgonda district. Moreover, the total amount disbursed during the year through both agencies is reported to be Rs. 311080 lakhs of which 27.05 per cent of amount is from Banks and 72.95 per cent of amount is from Post Offices. Across the districts the percentage of total amount through both agencies taken together ranged from 1.56 in Krishna district to 6.81 in Srikakulam district. It is further observed that the number of Post Office accounts has increased about 5.87 per cent over the year 2009-10.

During the year 2009-10, out of total number of 1,39,40,110 accounts, 14.04 per cent from Banks and 85.96 per cent from Post Offices are reported in the state. Observing across districts the percentage of number of accounts varied from 1.09 in West Godavari to 7.35 in Nalgonda district. The total amount disbursed through Banks and Post Offices is reported to be Rs. 3,62,774 lakhs in the state, of which 19.98 per cent of the amount from banks and 80.02 per cent of the amount from Post Offices were disbursed. Across the districts, the percentage of total amount disbursed through the two agencies taken together ranged from 0.56 in Guntur district to 6.51 in Vizianagaram district. While glancing over the number of accounts and amounts disbursed through these two agencies among districts, it can be observed that out of total number of Bank Accounts in the state, the percentage of number of accounts varied from 0.01 in Nizamabad district to 17.69 in Warangal district. On the other hand, out of total number of Post Office accounts, the percentage of number of accounts opened varied from 0.16 in West Godavari to 8.47 in Nalgonda district. Moreover, the percentage of amounts disbursed through Banks ranged across the districts from 0.01 in Nellore district to 26.39 in Visakhapatnam out of the total amount of Rs. 72,473 lakhs disbursed in the state while the percentage of amounts disbursed through Post Offices among districts varied from 0.01 in Visakhapatnam to 8.09 in Vizianagaram district. However, the disbursement of amounts in Krishna and West Godavari districts is reported to be nil.

The total number of accounts opened in Banks and Post Offices together is reported to be 1,22,15,707 during 2008-09 in the state of which 8.34 per cent of accounts in Banks and 91.66 per cent of accounts in Post Offices were opened. Moreover, the total amount disbursed through these two agencies is reported as Rs. 2,24,300 lakhs, of which 26.75 per cent of the amount is disbursed through Banks and 73.25 per cent of the amount through Post Offices. Across the districts, the percentage of the total number of accounts opened in both agencies, ranged from 0.98 in West Godavari to 7.45 in Warangal district. On the other hand the percentage of amounts disbursed varied from 0.70 in Krishna district to 8.65 in Kurnool district. The percentage of number of bank accounts varied from 0.01 in Krishna district to 28.09 in Warangal district, while the percentage of Post Office accounts ranged between 1.06 in West Godavari and 7.78 in Nalgonda district. On the other hand the percentage of amount disbursed through Banks varied from 0.69 in Prakasam district to 17.66 in Kurnool district, while the percentage of amount disbursed through Post Offices ranged between 0.06 in Krishna district and 8.60 in Chittoor district. During the year no bank account was opened in Visakhapatnam and West Godavari districts. All the accounts opened in banks as well as in Post Offices are purely individual accounts and no joint account is reported by any district in any category.

2.4.4. Unemployment Allowance:

If a worker who has applied for work under Andhra Pradesh Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme (APREGS) is not provided employment within 15 days from the date on which work is requested, an un-employment allowance shall be payable by the state Government at the rate prescribed in the Act. The programme Officer shall be responsible for the prompt payment of un-employment allowances through-out the Mandal. It is recommended that un-employment allowances should be paid on a fortnightly basis at the Gram Panchayat level. The payment of un-employment allowance shall be made not later than 15 days from the date on which it becomes due for payment. In Andhra Pradesh, no district has reported to have paid un-employment allowance during 2010-11. The district-wise details are presented in the Table 2.6.

Table 2.6 – Un-employment Allowance paid in lieu of not providing employment (2010-11)

S.No.	Name of the District	Un-employment Allowance Due		Un-employment Allowance Paid	
		No. of days		No. of days	Amount paid
1	Adilabad	0		0	0
2	Ananthapur	0		0	0
3	Chittoor	0		0	0
4	Kadapa	0		0	0
5	Karimnagar	0		0	0
6	Khammam	0		0	0
7	Mahbubnagar	0		0	0
8	Medak	0		0	0
9	Nalgonda	0		0	0
10	Nizamabad	0		0	0
11	Rangareddy	0		0	0
12	Vizianagaram	0		0	0
13	Warangal	0		0	0
14	East Godavari	0		0	0
15	Guntur	0		0	0
16	Kurnool	0		0	0
17	Nellore	0		0	0
18	Prakasam	0		0	0
19	Srikakulam	0		0	0
20	Krishna	0		0	0
21	Visakhapatnam	0		0	0
22	West Godavari	0		0	0

SOURCE: www.nrega.nic.in

2.4.5. Work Projection for 2010-11:

The district-wise details of work projection under MGNREGA for the financial year 2010-11 in Andhra Pradesh are presented in Table 2.7. It can be observed from the table that the number of spill over works from the previous year is accounted to be 729387, of which 13.22 per cent in Chittoor district and 11.39 per cent of works in Karimnagar district were reported. Among the remaining districts, seven districts have reported the spill over works between 5.22 per cent and 7.86 per cent. On the whole, the percentage of spill over works ranged from 0.54 in Krishna district to 13.22 in Chittoor district. The total number of new works taken up in the current year is 847759, of which 48.51 per cent of works are taken up in Adilabad district only. The remaining 51.49 per cent works are spread over 21 districts and percentage of new works taken up in these districts varied from 0.99 in Rangareddy district to 4.03 in Kurnool district.

Table 2.7 – Work Projection under MGNREGA for 2010-11 – Andhra Pradesh**(in %)**

S.No.	Name of the District	Total No. of Spill over works from previous year	Total No. of New works taken up in Current year	No. of works likely to spill over from current Financial year to Next financial year	No. of New works proposed for next financial year	Benefit achieved unit*	Person days to be generated	Estimated Cost (Rs. In Lakhs)		
								On Unskilled wage	On material including skilled and semi-skilled wages	Total
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1	Adilabad	6.42	48.51	56.75	2.77		4.97	5.18	4.56	4.94
2	Ananthapur	7.43	3.31	2.58	17.10		6.32	6.30	6.36	6.32
3	Chittoor	13.22	3.62	3.08	44.24		5.06	4.78	5.51	5.06
4	Kadapa	3.70	2.68	1.91	1.34		4.85	4.82	4.92	4.85
5	Karimnagar	1.80	1.56	1.01	2.29		0.68	0.73	0.60	0.68
6	Khammam	6.64	2.99	2.79	1.65		4.37	4.61	3.99	4.37
7	Mahbubnagar	11.39	2.63	2.51	2.76		5.72	5.21	6.54	5.72
8	Medak	7.86	2.82	2.23	2.46		5.81	5.85	5.75	5.81
9	Nalgonda	0.54	1.73	1.25	0.64		1.26	1.26	1.25	1.26
10	Nizamabad	5.26	4.03	3.37	3.42		5.96	6.20	5.58	5.96
11	Rangareddy	7.82	2.92	2.06	4.64		6.45	6.49	6.40	6.46
12	Vizianagaram	3.62	2.28	2.22	1.22		4.55	4.55	4.55	4.55
13	Warangal	5.22	2.67	2.14	4.15		5.97	6.17	5.65	5.97
14	East Godavari	2.80	1.62	1.33	2.75		3.85	3.88	3.82	3.85
15	Guntur	2.66	2.33	1.99	1.25		4.48	4.51	4.43	6.48
16	Kurnool	1.47	0.99	0.98	0.44		2.39	2.53	2.16	2.39
17	Nellore	2.51	1.66	1.27	0.84		2.74	2.55	3.03	2.74
18	Prakasam	2.31	2.13	2.01	2.42		5.68	5.96	5.24	5.68
19	Srikakulam	0.76	2.06	1.65	1.13		5.19	5.24	5.12	5.19
20	Krishna	2.79	2.29	2.35	1.62		5.99	5.80	6.29	5.99
21	Visakhapatnam	2.98	2.45	2.24	1.85		5.75	5.31	6.46	5.75
22	West Godavari	0.80	2.72	2.26	1.02		1.96	2.08	1.79	1.96
Total		100.00 (729387)	100.00 (847759)	100.00 (708432)	100.00 (2782003)		100.00 (441862728)	100.00 (386867.09)	100.00 (244792.40)	100.00 (631659.49)

* Data is not available either from website or from concerned department.

Moreover, out of total number of works taken up in the Current year, 83.56 per cent of works are estimated to likely to be spilled over from Current Financial year to next financial year. Of the total number of likely to spill over works, 56.75 per cent of works are reported to be spilled over to next financial year in Adilabad. The remaining 43.25 per cent of works are spread over 21 districts ranging from 0.98 in Rangareddy to 3.37 in Kurnool district.

About 27.82 lakhs of new works are proposed for the next Financial year with an estimated cost of Rs. 631659.49 lakhs and the person days to be generated is about 4418.63 lakhs. Among the proposed new works, 44.24 per cent of works are allocated in Chittoor district and 17.10 per cent of works in Ananthapur district. The remaining 38.66 per cent of works spread over 20 districts ranging from 0.29 in Karimnagar district to 4.64 in Rangareddy district. The total number of person days (4418.63 lakhs) to be generated is spread over 22 districts ranging from 0.68 per cent in Karimnagar district to 6.32 per cent in Ananthapur district. However, lowest percentage of man-days expected to be generated are reported by Karimnagar, Nalgonda and West Godavari districts.

The total estimated cost during 2010-11, for the execution of works is reported as Rs. 631659.49 lakhs. The distribution of the total estimated cost across the districts ranged from 0.68 per cent in Karimnagar district to 6.46 per cent in Rangareddy district. Out of the total estimated cost in the state 61.25 per cent of the amount is expected to spend on unskilled wage and 38.75 per cent of the amount on material including skilled and semiskilled wages. The total amount expected to spend on unskilled wage spread over 22 districts ranged from 0.73 per cent in Karimnagar district to 6.49 per cent in Rangareddy district. On the other hand, the amount, which is expected to spend on material including skilled and semiskilled wages spread over districts ranged between 0.60 per cent in Karimnagar to 6.54 per cent in Mahaboobnagar district. On the whole, across districts, the larger amounts of the estimated cost are spent in the districts of Guntur, Rangareddy, Warangal, Nizamabad, Medak, Mahaboobnagar and Prakasam, while meager amounts of total estimated cost spent in the districts of West Godavari Nalgonda and Karimnagar districts. All the costs are estimated as per the basic necessity of the respective works executed in various districts.

2.5. Summing Up:

The scheme showed a better performance during 2009-10 than 2010-11 and 2008-09. A gradual improvement is observed in case of beneficiaries of Land reform/IAY and disabled beneficiary households during the three years. However, the basic objective of the Act in providing at least 100 days of guaranteed wage employment is not achieved as expected. The number of projects under taken in the state was increased from year to year. Increase in the number of works completed from 2008-09 to 2010-11 is observed in case of water conservation and water harvesting and Micro Irrigation works while a decrease is noticed in case of land development works and provision of Irrigation facilities. Viewing the performance of all ongoing projects from 2008-09 to 2010-11, a decrease in number is observed in almost all activities except in the case of Rural Connectivity activities, Harvesting works, Land Development works and provision of irrigation facilities. It is observed that about 33.25 per cent of increased amount was spent on complete projects during 2009-10 compared to the previous year. Between 2009-10, and 2010-11 the increase in the amount spent is reported around 72 per cent. Observing over the performance of the three years, larger amounts were spent on ongoing projects during 2009-10 than in the years 2010-11 and 2008-09.

Of the total number of muster rolls used 91.71 per cent of the muster rolls are verified during 2010-11 and 2009-10 and only 88.16 per cent in the year 2008-09. The percentage of verification of muster rolls ranged from 90.25 in Prakasam district to 92.80 in Mahaboobnagar district during 2010-11. Glancing across the districts similar performance is observed during 2009-10 and 2010-11. Six districts have reported to have got the muster rolls verified below 80 per cent during 2008-09. The social audit was held in 86.47 per cent of Gram Panchayats in 2010-11 92.65 per cent of Panchayats in 2009-10 and only in 73.76 per cent of Gram Panchayats during 2008-09 in the state. The percentage of number of panchayats held social audit ranged from 59.95 in Guntur to 97.67 in Kurnool district during 2009-10, from 64.77 in Rangareddy to 99.77 in Adilabad during 2010-11 and from 7.56 in Krishna district to 98.74 in Rangareddy during 2008-09. Meager percentages of GPs have reported to have conducted social audit in the districts of Visakhapatnam, Krishna and West Godavari. This is to due to irresponsibility and negligence by the GP staff in the respective districts. Out of the total works taken up, during the three years, 9.15 per cent of district level and 91.65 per cent of block level works during 2010-11, 9.15 per cent at district level and 91.25 per cent at block level during

2009-10 and 9.08 per cent at district level and 90.88 per cent at block level during 2008-09 were inspected. Out of the total number of Gram Panchayats in the state 91.28 per cent of Gram Panchayats held Gram Sabhas and the VMC meetings were held in 1.11 per cent of Panchayats during 2010-11, Gram Sabhas in 98.41 Panchayats and VMC meeting in 10.47 per cent of Panchayats during 2009-10 and 98.22 per cent of Gram Sabhas and 84.94 per cent of VMC meetings were held during 2008-09. Where the socio-economic awareness is high, there the rigidity of political dynamism appears much. As the Krishna, Guntur and Nellore districts show much lower representation of the Gram sabhas held, it indicates the people's participation or mobilization in the local administration at lower level. Out of the total number of complaints received in the state during the three years, 98.17 per cent in 2010-11, 91.70 per cent in 2009-10 and 96.26 per cent in 2008-09, were disposed. Four districts during 2010-11, six districts in 2009-10 have disposed cent percent of the received complaints.

Out of the total number of accounts opened in state in each year, 13.36 per cent of accounts in Banks and 86.64 per cent of accounts in Post Offices during 2010-11, 14.04 per cent in Banks and 85.96 per cent in Post Offices during 2009-10 and 8.34 per cent in Banks and 91.66 per cent of Banks and 91.66 per cent of accounts in Post Offices in 2008-09 were opened. Moreover out of the total amount disbursed in each year, 27.05 per cent of amount from Banks and 72.95 per cent of amount from Post Offices during 2010-11, 19.98 per cent of the amount from Banks and 80.02 per cent of amount through Post Offices during 2009-10 and 26.75 per cent of the amount from banks and 73.25 per cent through Post Offices in 2008-09 were disbursed. No joint account is reported either in banks or in post offices in any of the 22 districts. Across the districts the percentage of total amount through both agencies taken together ranged from 1.56 in Krishna district to 6.81 in Srikakulam district during 2010-11. It is further observed that the number of post office accounts has increased about 5.87 per cent over the year 2009-10. During 2009-10, the percentage of amounts disbursed through banks ranged across the districts from 0.01 in Nellore district to 26.39 in Visakhapatnam out of the total amount disbursed in the state, while the percentage of amounts disbursed through post offices among districts varied from 0.01 in Visakhapatnam to 8.09 in Vizianagaram district. The disbursement amounts are reported to be nil in Krishna and West Godavari districts. During 2008-09 no bank account was opened in Visakhapatnam and West Godavari districts.

In Andhra Pradesh, no district has reported to have paid unemployment allowance during 2010-11. Out of the total number of works taken up in the year 2010-11, 83.56 per cent of works are estimated to likely to be spilled over from current year to next financial year. About 27.82 lakhs of new works are proposed for the next financial year with an estimated cost of Rs. 631659.49 lakhs and the person days to be generated is about 4418.63 lakhs. Out of the total estimated cost in the state 61.25 per cent of the amount is expected to spend on unskilled wage and 38.75 per cent of the amount on material including skilled and semiskilled wages. Across the districts the percentage of the total estimated cost varied from 0.68 in Karimnagar district to 6.46 in Rangareddy district. Moreover, the percentage of estimated cost on unskilled wage ranged from 0.73 in Karimnagar to 6.49 in Rangareddy district, while the percentage of material cost varied from 0.60 in Karimnagar to 6.40 in Rangareddy district.

-----% % % % %-----

CHAPTER – III

Household Characteristics and their Income and Consumption Pattern

Introduction:

As mentioned in the introductory chapter, five districts namely 1) Adilabad, 2) Chittoor, 3) Mahaboobnagar, 4) Srikakulam and 5) Krishna are selected for the household level analysis. From each district, two villages are selected keeping into account their distance from the location of the district or the main city/town. One village is selected from the nearby periphery of around 5 kilometers of the district/city head quarters and the second village is selected from the farthest location of 20 kilometers or more than that. From each selected village, primary data is collected from 20 participants in MGNREGA and 5 non-participants working as wage employed. Thus 10 villages are selected and a total number of 250 households are surveyed in detail with the help of a structured questionnaire. The district-wise details of the selected villages and selected beneficiary and non-beneficiary sample farmers are as follows:

District-wise selected Villages and sample Households

District	Names of the villages	Total sample	No. of Beneficiary sample Households	No. of Non-Beneficiary sample Households
1. Adilabad	1. Wanwat	25	20	5
	2. Lingapur	25	20	5
2. Chittoor	1. Udamalakurthi	25	20	5
	2. Krishnampalli	25	20	5
3. Mahaboobnagar	1. Machanpally	25	20	5
	2. Kondapur	25	20	5
4. Srikakulam	1. Gudem	25	20	5
	2. Thandemvalasa	25	20	5
5. Krishna	1. Jupudi	25	20	5
	2. Chilukuru	25	20	5

Source: Field survey 2011

3.1 Household Profile of the respondents:

The particulars regarding the demographic profile of the beneficiary and non-beneficiary sample households in the selected districts are presented in the Table 3.1.

Table 3.1 Demographic Profile of the Respondents (% of Households for Selected Districts - 2009

(% hh)

CM characteristics	ADILABAD			CHITTOOR			MAHABOOB NAGAR			
	Beneficiaries	Non - Beneficiaries	Aggregate	Beneficiaries	Non - Beneficiaries	Aggregate	Beneficiaries	Non - Beneficiaries	Aggregate	
No. Of households	40	10	50	40	10	50	40	10	50	
Household size(numbers)	4.08	3.4	3.94	4.25	2.5	3.9	4.23	3.6	4.1	
Average number of earners	2.43	1.7	2.28	2.5	5.8	2.36	2.35	2	2.28	
Gender	Male	51.53	55.88	52.28	44.71	52	45.64	49.7	52.78	50.24
	Female	48.47	44.12	47.72	55.29	48	54.36	50.3	47.22	49.76
Age group	<16	31.9	20.59	29.95	28.82	20	27.69	33.73	13.89	30.24
	16-60	67.48	79.41	69.54	69.41	60	68.21	62.13	86.11	66.34
	Above 60	0.62	0	0.51	1.76	20	4.1	4.14	0	3.41
Identity of respondent	Head	95	100	96	97.5	100	98	92.5	100	94
	Others	5	0	4	2.5	0	2	7.5	0	6
Education status of the members	Illiterate	46.63	32.35	44.16	38.82	68	42.56	44.97	13.89	39.51
	Upto primary	34.97	26.47	33.5	30.59	4	27.18	40.83	44.44	41.46
	Upto secondary	16.56	29.42	18.78	25.88	28	26.15	11.83	30.56	15.12
	Upto graduates	1.84	11.76	3.56	4.71	0	4.1	2.37	11.11	3.9
	Above graduates	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Caste	SC	15	0	12	40	30	38	30	10	26
	ST	12.5	10	12	0	0	0	15	0	12
	OBC	47.5	30	44	7.5	20	10	45	50	46
	GENERAL	25	60	32	52.5	50	52	10	40	16
Card holding	AAY	0	0	0	5	0	4	5	0	4
	BPL	100	100	100	95	100	96	95	90	94
	APL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	2
	NONE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Decision maker	Male	90	100	92	77.5	70	76	87.5	100	90
	Female	10	0	8	22.5	30	24	12.5	0	10
Main occupation	Farming	4.12	5.88	4.39	2	38.89	7.63	0	0	0
	Self business	0	23.53	3.5	0	27.78	4.24	1.06	10	2.63
	Salaried and pensioners	0	0	0	0	11.11	1.69	1.06	0	0.88
	Wage earners	95.88	70.59	92.11	98	22.22	86.44	95.74	90	94.74
Involved in migration during year 2009	2.5	0	2.0	7.04	0	6	2.0	0	1.40	

Contd...

Table - 3.1 Demographic Profiles of the Respondents (% of Households for Selected Districts)

Characteristics	SRIKAKULAM			KRISHNA			OVERALL (STATE)			
	Beneficiaries	Non - Beneficiaries	Aggregate	Beneficiaries	Non - Beneficiaries	Aggregate	Beneficiaries	Non - Beneficiaries	Aggregate	
No. Of households	40	10	50	40	10	50	200	50	250	
Household size(numbers)	4.2	3.7	4.1	4.23	4	4.18	4.20	3.44	4.03	
Average number of earners	2.83	1.9	2.64	2.95	2.3	2.82	2.61	2.74	2.48	
Gender	Male	51.19	40.54	49.27	53.85	52.5	53.59	50.20	50.74	50.20
	Female	48.81	59.46	50.73	46.15	47.5	46.41	49.80	49.26	49.80
Age group	<16	25	37.84	27.32	16.57	22.5	17.7	27.20	22.96	26.58
	16-60	67.86	45.95	63.9	81.07	77.5	80.38	69.59	69.79	69.67
	Above 60	7.14	16.22	8.78	2.36	0	1.92	3.20	7.24	3.74
Identity of respondent	Head	92.5	100	94	97.5	100	98	95.00	100.00	96.00
	Others	7.5	0	6	2.5	0	2	5.00	0	4
Education status of the members	Illiterate	41.07	67.57	45.85	42.01	57.5	44.98	47.20	47.86	43.41
	Upto primary	36.9	24.32	34.63	28.99	20	27.27	34.46	23.85	32.81
	Upto secondary	21.43	8.11	19.02	19.53	10	17.7	19.05	21.22	19.35
	Upto graduates	0.6	0	0.49	7.69	12.5	8.61	3.44	7.07	4.13
	Above graduates	0	0	0	1.78	0	1.44	0.36	0	0.29
Caste	SC	7.5	0	6	45	40	44	27.50	16.00	25.20
	ST	0	0	0	37.5	0	30	13.00	2.00	10.80
	OBC	85	100	88	17.5	60	26	40.50	52.00	42.80
	GENERAL	7.5	0	6	0	0	0	19.00	30.00	21.20
Card holding	AAY	12.5	20	14	0	0	0	4.50	4.00	4.40
	BPL	67.5	70	68	100	100	100	91.50	92.00	91.60
	APL	12.5	0	10	0	0	0	2.50	2.00	2.40
	NONE	7.5	10	8	0	0	0	1.50	2.00	1.60
Decision maker	Male	85	90	86	97.5	100	98	87.50	92.00	88.40
	Female	15	10	14	2.5	0	2	12.50	8.00	11.60
Main occupation	Farming	7.96	0	6.82	11.86	73.9	21.99	5.19	23.73	8.17
	Self business	0.89	31.58	5.3	3.39	8.7	4.26	1.07	20.32	3.99
	Salaried and pensioners	1.77	10.53	3.03	6.78	8.7	7.08	1.92	6.07	2.54
	Wage earners	89.38	57.89	84.85	77.97	8.7	66.67	91.39	49.88	84.96
Involved in migration during year 2009		5	4	0	0	0	6.91	8.00	5.21	

SOURCE: Field Survey 2011.

The aggregate size of the household is reported to be 4.03 while the average size for beneficiary and non-beneficiary households respectively are 4.20 and 3.44. The average number of earners reported by beneficiary households is 2.61 while it is 2.74 for non-beneficiary households. Glancing over the family members of the households the aggregate per cent of 50.20 is reported in case of males while the female percentage is reported as 49.80. The percentage of male members varied between 50.20 for beneficiary and 50.74 per cent for non-beneficiary households. Comparing the number of family members between beneficiary and non-beneficiary households much difference is not observed under the age group of 16-60. 95 per cent of beneficiary sample households reported themselves as heads of the household while all non-beneficiary households reported themselves as heads of the households. In aggregate 96 per cent of the households reported as heads of the household. Highest percentage of illiteracy among the family members are reported by both beneficiary and non-beneficiary households. On an aggregate about 43 per cent of illiteracy is reported considering all beneficiary and non-beneficiary households. Highest percentage of graduates is reported by non-beneficiary households. Considering both categories of households about 43 per cent of households are reported from OBC category. About 92 per cent of households reported to be under BPL category. An aggregate per cent of 88.40 from males have reported themselves as decision makers. About 85 per cent of households reported themselves as wage earners. On the whole 5.21 percentage of households taking both categories together, have reported migration during 2009.

Adilabad District:

The aggregate size of the household is reported to be 3.94 while the average size is 4.08 for beneficiary and 3.4 for non-beneficiary households. The average number of earners reported by beneficiary households is 2.43 while it is only 1.7 for non-beneficiary households. Among the family members of the households, the aggregate per cent of 52.28 is reported in case of males while only 47.72 per cent is reported for females. The percentage of male members varied between 51.53 for beneficiary and 55.88 per cent for non-beneficiary households. About 67 per cent of the family members of beneficiary households and about 79 per cent of members of non-beneficiary households are reported under the age group of 16-60 years. 95 per cent of beneficiary sample households reported themselves as head of the households while all non-beneficiary households reported themselves as head of the households. Highest percentage of illiteracy among the family members is reported by both

beneficiary and non-beneficiary households. Highest percentage of graduates is reported by non-beneficiary group of households. About 47 percentage of beneficiaries reported from OBC caste group while 60 per cent of non-beneficiaries reported from general category. All the beneficiary and non-beneficiary sample households reported themselves to be under BPL category. About 90 per cent of beneficiaries and all non-beneficiary sample households reported themselves as decision makers. Around 96 per cent of beneficiary sample households and about 71 per cent of non-beneficiary households are wage earners. Only 2.5 per cent of households have migrated among beneficiaries, during the year 2009.

Chittoor District:

The average size of the household is reported to be 4.25 in case of beneficiaries and 2.5 in case of non-beneficiary households while the aggregate size is 3.9. The average number of earners is reported higher (i.e., 5.8) in case of non-beneficiary households than beneficiary households while the aggregate number of earners is 2.36. Highest percentage of females is reported by beneficiary households while the percentage of males is more in case of non-beneficiary households. 69.41 per cent by beneficiary households and 60 per cent by non-beneficiary households reported to be under 16-60 age group. 97.5 per cent from beneficiary category and all the non-beneficiary sample households reported themselves as head of the households. About 39 per cent in case of beneficiary households and 68 per cent of non-beneficiaries reported illiteracy. Only 4.71 per cent of beneficiary families have reported to be graduates. Among the caste groups, higher percentages of households are reported from general and SC categories respectively by both beneficiary and non-beneficiary sample households. 95 per cent of beneficiaries and all non-beneficiaries reported themselves as BPL card holders. Among the sample households 77.5 per cent of beneficiary males and 70 per cent of non-beneficiary males are decision makers of their families. The main occupation reported by 98 per cent of beneficiaries is wage earning, while 38.89 per cent from farming, 27.78 per cent from self-business and 11.11 per cent salary/pension are reported by non-beneficiary category. Among the beneficiary households only 7.04 per cent have reported migration during the year 2009.

Mahaboobnagar District:

The average size of the beneficiary households is reported to be 4.23 while it is 3.6 for non-beneficiary households. The average number of earners reported in case of beneficiaries is

2.35 and 2 in case of non-beneficiary households, the aggregate number being 2.28. Among the family members of the sample households, 50.3 per cent were females in case of beneficiary households while the males in case of non-beneficiaries are 52.78 per cent. Highest percentages of family members are reported to be under 16-60 age group, by both beneficiary and non-beneficiary households. 92.5 per cent of beneficiary households and all non-beneficiary households reported themselves as heads of the family members. Highest percentage of family members of beneficiary households are reported to be illiterate, while in case of non-beneficiaries, highest percentage of members reported primary education. Among the beneficiary households, 45 per cent are from OBC category, 30 per cent from SC category, 15 per cent from ST category and 10 per cent are from general category. In case of non-beneficiaries 50 per cent of the households are from OBC category, 40 per cent from general category and 10 per cent are from SC category. 95 per cent of beneficiary households and 90 per cent of non-beneficiary households are BPL card holders and 5 per cent of beneficiaries are AAY card holders 10 per cent of non-beneficiaries are APL card holders. Moreover, 87.5 per cent of males from beneficiary households and all non-beneficiary households have reported themselves as decision makers of their families. Around 96 per cent of beneficiary households and 90 per cent of non-beneficiary households reported to have the wage earning as main occupation. Only 2 per cent of the beneficiary households have reported migration during 2009.

Srikakulam District:

The average size of the beneficiary households is 4.2 and 3.7 for non-beneficiary households while the aggregate of the household size being 4.1. The average number of earners per household is reported to be 2.83 for beneficiaries and 1.9 for non-beneficiaries while the aggregate of these two groups being 2.64. Among the family members of the households, 51.19 per cent were males in case of beneficiary households and 59.46 per cent were females in case of non-beneficiary households. Among the family members of the beneficiary and non-beneficiary households, 67.86 per cent from beneficiary households and 45.95 per cent from non-beneficiary households are reported to be under the age group of 16-60. More number of persons from non-beneficiary households have reported to be under less than 16 years of age group. About 93 per cent of beneficiary households and all non-beneficiary households reported themselves as heads of the households. Around 41 per cent of family members of beneficiary households and 67.57 per cent of members from non-beneficiary

households reported to be as illiterates while 36.9 per cent and 24.32 per cent from beneficiary and non-beneficiary households respectively, reported primary education. The members reported secondary education is 21.43 per cent and 8.11 per cent from beneficiary and non-beneficiary households respectively. Among the beneficiary households, 85 per cent are from OBC category and 7.5 per cent and 7.5 per cent are from SC and general categories respectively. All the non-beneficiary households are from OBC category. Moreover, 67.5 per cent of beneficiary households and 70 per cent of non-beneficiary households are BPL card holders. On the other hand 12.5 per cent of beneficiaries and 20 per cent of non-beneficiaries are AAY card holders. 7.5 per cent from beneficiary and 10 per cent of non-beneficiary households are not having any cards. Highest percentages of households reported themselves as decision makers from both beneficiary and non-beneficiary categories. Among the beneficiary households 89.38 per cent have reported to have the main occupation of wage earning while 57.89 per cent of non-beneficiary households reported wage earning as their main occupation. Only 5 per cent of the beneficiary households have reported migration during the year 2009.

Krishna District:

The aggregate size of the household is reported to be 4.18 while the average size for beneficiary households being 4.23 and 4 for non-beneficiary households. The average number of earners per household is reported as 2.95 for beneficiaries and 2.3 for non-beneficiary households. Among the family members of the beneficiaries 53.85 per cent are males and 46.15 per cent are females. On the other hand, in the case of non-beneficiary households 52.5 per cent are males and 47.5 per cent are females. Among the family members, 81.07 per cent from beneficiary households and 77.5 per cent from non-beneficiary households reported to be under the age group of 16-60 years. Moreover, 97.5 per cent of beneficiaries and all non-beneficiaries reported themselves as heads of the households. Around 42 per cent from beneficiary households and 57 per cent from non-beneficiary households are reported to be illiterates. Comparatively higher percentages were reported by beneficiaries under primary and secondary education than the percentages of members reported from non-beneficiary households. About 13 per cent of members of non-beneficiary households reported to be graduates as against 7.69 per cent of members of beneficiary households. Glancing over the caste groups, 45 per cent of the beneficiary households are from SC category, 37.5 per cent from ST category and 17.5 per cent are from OBC category. On the other hand, in the case of

non-beneficiary households, 60 per cent are from OBC category and 40 per cent are from SC category. All the beneficiary and non-beneficiary households reported to have BPL cards. Moreover, 97.5 per cent of the males of beneficiary households and all the non-beneficiary households reported themselves as decision makers. Among the sample households, 77.97 per cent of beneficiary households reported wage earning as their main occupation while 73.9 per cent of non-beneficiary households reported farming as their main occupation. No migration cases are reported by both beneficiary and non-beneficiary households during the year 2009.

3.2. Main Occupation:

The occupational particulars of the sample households in the sample villages of selected districts are presented in Table 3.2. Glancing over the overall performance of the households, it is observed that more number of days have been engaged in agricultural casual labour work than other activities. About 35 per cent of man days were reported to be engaged in Agricultural casual labour work by beneficiary households while their participation was only about 32 per cent of man days under MGNREGA. On the other hand higher percentage of man days were reported to be engaged in self employed agriculture and non-agricultural casual labour works by non-beneficiary households. The other major activities in which the beneficiary households engaged are self-employment in agriculture, self-employment in livestock and non-agricultural casual labour works while the non-beneficiaries engaged in self employment in agriculture, non-agricultural casual labour and self employed in non-farming activities. Viewing all the above activities it is observed that the reason to be engaged for more days in agricultural casual labour work is, the higher wage rates than the stipulated wage rates in MGNREGA.

In Adilabad district, 45.68 per cent of man-days per household were reported to have engaged in agricultural casual labour by beneficiary households. They are self employed in agriculture and reported about 26.82 per cent of man-days per household. Only 24.23 per cent of man-days were reported to be involved under MGNREGA works, and negligible percentages of man-days were reported to be engaged in self employed non-farming activities and live stock. On the other hand, the non-beneficiary households have reported to have engaged

TABLE 3.2: MAIN OCCUPATION - (% OF TOTAL MAN DAYS) OF SAMPLE HOUSEHOLDS IN SAMPLE VILLAGES OF SELECTED DISTRICTS - 2009

(Per hh)

Occupation	ADILABAD			CHITTOOR			MAHBOOBNAGAR		
	Beneficiaries	Non beneficiaries	Aggregate	Beneficiaries	Non beneficiaries	Aggregate	Beneficiaries	Non beneficiaries	Aggregate
Agricultural casual labour	45.68	32.25	38.96	25.06	9.15	22.41	35.30	42.96	36.60
Non agricultural casual labour	0.00	42.25	22.09	8.70	17.94	10.25	0.00	37.54	6.37
Work for public work programme other than MGNREGA	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Self employed in non farming	1.72	0.00	1.56	0.00	24.08	4.02	0.00	12.42	2.11
Self employed in agriculture	26.82	0.00	9.42	9.78	10.63	9.92	0.00	0.00	0.00
Self employed in live stock	1.55	0.00	1.41	27.44	0.32	22.90	0.00	0.00	0.00
Regular/salary job	0.00	25.50	4.50	9.18	36.62	13.77	0.00	0.00	0.00
Worked as a migrant worker	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.36	1.26	1.34	1.11	7.08	2.13
Worked under MGNREGA	24.23	0.00	22.06	18.48	0.00	15.39	63.59	0.00	52.79
Any other work	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Occupation	SRIKAKULAM			KRISHNA			OVERALL (STATE)		
	Beneficiaries	Non beneficiaries	Aggregate	Beneficiaries	Non beneficiaries	Aggregate	Beneficiaries	Non beneficiaries	Aggregate
Agricultural casual labour	25.61	2.07	20.98	45.30	39.25	43.80	35.39	18.69	33.08
Non agricultural casual labour	21.00	59.97	28.66	4.82	0.00	3.62	6.90	23.09	9.78
Work for public work programme other than MGNREGA	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.20	0.00	0.15	0.04	-	0.03
Self employed in non farming	4.60	25.29	8.67	1.68	6.12	2.78	1.60	13.58	3.83
Self employed in agriculture	7.55	4.94	7.04	2.45	20.39	6.90	9.32	27.19	11.45
Self employed in live stock	14.99	7.73	13.56	0.61	3.65	1.37	8.92	2.34	7.85
Regular/salary job	8.39	0.00	6.74	9.82	29.77	14.77	5.48	13.28	7.05
Worked as a migrant worker	1.70	0.00	1.37	0.00	0.82	0.20	0.83	1.83	1.00
Worked under MGNREGA	16.16	0.00	12.98	35.12	0.00	26.41	31.52	-	25.93
Any other work	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	-	-	-
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

SOURCE: Field Survey 2011.

around 32.25 per cent of man-days in agricultural casual labour, 42.25 per cent of man-days in non-agricultural casual labour and only 25.50 per cent of days in salaried job.

In Chittoor district, the beneficiary households reported to have engaged about 18.48 per cent of man-days per household under MGNREGA works, and 25.06 per cent of the days in agricultural casual labour and 27.44 per cent of man-days in self employed live stock. The members of these households worked in some other agricultural and non-agricultural casual labour works other than MGNREGA works. On the other hand, the non-beneficiary households reported to have engaged about 24.08 percent of days in self-employed non-farming works, 36.62 per cent of days in salaried job; and 17.94 per cent of days in non-agricultural casual labour works. A negligible percentage of days were reported to be engaged in the works at other places as migrant workers.

In Mahaboobnagar district, the beneficiary households reported to be engaged under MGNREGA works about 63.59 per cent of days per household. About 35.30 per cent of days were reported to be engaged under agricultural casual labour works. Only 1.11 per cent of days, the members were involved in other works at other places as migrant workers. On the other hand, the non-beneficiary households reported to be involved in agricultural casual labour and non-agricultural casual labour works about 42.96 per cent of days and 37.54 per cent of days respectively. Moreover, 12.42 per cent of days are reported to be engaged in self employed non-farming work and 7.08 per cent of days as migrant workers.

In Srikakulam district, majority percentages of days (25.61 & 21.00) were reported to be engaged in agricultural casual and non-agricultural casual labour works respectively by the beneficiary households. About 16.16 per cent of days were reported to be involved under MGNREGA works. About 15 per cent of days were reported to be involved in self-employed livestock. Around 8.39 per cent of days in salaried job and 1.70 per cent of days as migrant workers are reported. On the other hand, around 60 per cent of days, by non-beneficiaries, are reported to be engaged in non-agricultural casual labour and 25.29 per cent of days in self-employed non-farming activities.

In Krishna district, the beneficiary households reported to be engaged about 45.30 per cent of days in agricultural casual labour and 35.12 per cent of days under MGNREGA works. The members of these households also engaged in other activities other than MGNREGA.

Among the other activities reported 9.82 per cent of days are reported to be involved in salaried job. On the other hand, the non-beneficiary households reported to be involved about 39.25 per cent of days in agricultural casual labour, 20.39 per cent of days in self employed agriculture and 29.77 per cent of days in salaried job. Moreover, 6.12 per cent of days in self employed non-farming and 3.65 per cent of days in self employed livestock are reported to be involved. A negligible per cent of days were reported to be as migrant workers.

Glancing over the performance of the beneficiary sample households, it can be observed that more number of days were reported to be involved in other works than under MGNREGA works. The reason may be attributed to the non-availability of adequate number of days of work under MGNREGA activities.

The percentage of man-days per beneficiary household for MGNREGA works are reported high in Mahboobnagar and low in Srikakulam district among the sample districts. For the beneficiary households engaged in agricultural casual labour, the highest percentage of man-days per household is reported in Adilabad followed by Krishna district. It can be observed that though Adilabad district is comparatively a back ward district in agriculture than Krishna district, it has competed in providing as many days of employment as in Krishna district. On the other hand, highest percentage of per household man-days is reported by the non-beneficiary households of Srikakulam district. The reason may be attributed to the performance of the labourers towards an attractive wage rate in non-agricultural operations. The percentage of man-days per household in case of self-employed non-farming is reported by non-beneficiary households of all districts except in Adilabad district. Alternatively, the beneficiary households of Adilabad have reported higher percentage involvement in the self-employed non-farming activities than in other sample districts.

3.3. Household Net Income:

The per household net income particulars of sample beneficiary and non-beneficiary households are presented in the Table 3.3. On an average the aggregate per households income is reported as Rs.39361 of which only 14.10 per cent of income is derived from MGNREGA activities. Across the activities the aggregate average per household net income varied from 1.52 per cent from migrant workers to 28.81 per cent from agricultural wages. The per household net income from all activities of beneficiary households is reported to be Rs.

38,341 of which 18.10 per cent of income is derived through MGNREGA works. Across different activities the per household net income varied from 1.70 per cent from migrant workers to 32.61 per cent of income through agricultural wages. Higher percentages of incomes are reported by agricultural wages and livestock activities. On the other hand, the per household net income from all activities in case of non-beneficiary households is reported to be Rs. 43,441/- . Higher percentages of incomes are reported through Agriculture/Livestock activities and non-agricultural wage rates.

In Adilabad district, the average net income per household is reported to be Rs. 19,511. Across different activities in which the households have participated varied from 1.28 per cent in self-employing non-farming to 41.66 per cent participating in agricultural works during the year. Out of the total per household income of the beneficiaries, only 17.11 per cent of income was reported to be derived from the MGNREGA works. The higher per cent of co-efficient of variation incase of self employment of non-farming activities indicate the vast difference in wage rates per day than other works. On the other hand, the non-beneficiary households

TABLE 3.3: ANNUAL HOUSEHOLD NET INCOME OF SAMPLE VILLAGES OF SELECTED DISTRICTS – 2009

(Rs/Per hh)

	ADILABAD						CHITTOOR					
	Average Income	CV	Average Income	CV	Average Income	CV	Average Income	CV	Average Income	CV	Average Income	CV
	Beneficiaries		Non Beneficiaries		Aggregate		Beneficiaries		Non Beneficiaries		Aggregate	
Income from work under MGNREGA	3338 (17.11)	131.91	-	-	2670 (11.47)	155.53	8639 (12.50)	30.55	-	-	6912 (10.32)	60.93
Income from wages in agriculture	8128 (41.66)	21.43	-	-	6502 (27.92)	55.88	16426 (23.77)	30.11	4950 (8.48)	137.80	14131 (21.11)	49.80
Income from wages non agriculture	-	-	-	-	-	-	10320 (14.94)	92.70	11975 (20.53)	180.75	10651 (15.91)	118.52
Income from wages in PWP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Income from wages as migrant workers	-	-	-	-	-	-	1556 (2.26)	256.09	1100 (1.88)	285.72	1465 (2.19)	259.83
Income from self employed in non farming	250 (1.28)	632.46	-	-	200 (0.85)	707.11	6113 (8.85)	89.70	7680 (13.16)	316.23	6426 (9.60)	179.24
Income from agriculture/livestock	7795 (39.95)	44.74	38400 (100)	88.66	13916 (59.76)	139.25	25408 (36.77)	52.79	31700 (54.31)	93.88	26666 (39.83)	66.27
Income from regular job/salary/pension	-	-	-	-	-	-	630 (0.91)	197.61	960 (1.64)	241.52	696 (1.04)	214.98
Income from sale of assets/rent/transfer etc.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	19511 (100)	22.97	38400 (100)	88.66	23288 (100)	55.10	69092 (100)	33.18	58365 (100)	50.06	66947 (100)	36.40

	MAHBOOBNAGAR						SRIKAKULAM					
	Average Income	CV	Average Income	CV	Average Income	CV	Average Income	CV	Average Income	CV	Average Income	CV
	Beneficiaries		Non Beneficiaries		Aggregate		Beneficiaries		Non Beneficiaries		Aggregate	
Income from work under MGNREGA	15722 (64.14)	68.97	-	-	12578 (51.40)	92.01	8965 (14.96)	50.55	-	-	7172 (11.85)	75.69
Income from wages in agriculture	8283 (33.79)	43.12	10400 (42.76)	100.77	8706 (35.57)	64.01	17755 (29.63)	44.57	1375 (2.18)	316.23	14479 (23.93)	68.06
Income from wages non agriculture	-	-	10620 (43.67)	99.86	2124 (8.68)	294..29	15269 (25.48)	83.40	38775 (61.47)	110.55	19970 (33.00)	118.16
Income from wages in PWP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Income from wages as migrant workers	506 (2.06)	449.34	3000 (12.34)	316.23	1005 (4.10)	463.14	1706 (2.85)	504.33	-	-	1365 (2.26)	564.68
Income from self employed in non farming	-	-	300 (1.23)	316.23	60 (0.25)	707.11	2179 (3.64)	375.10	16675 (26.44)	161.44	5035 (8.32)	294.32
Income from agriculture/livestock	-	-	-	-	-	-	13800 (23.03)	92.66	6250 (9.91)	137.60	12290 (20.31)	100.65
Income from regular job/salary/pension	-	-	-	-	-	-	245 (0.41)	297.21	-	-	196 (0.32)	335.27
Income from sale of assets/rent/transfer etc.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	24511 (100)	50.34	24320 (100)	74.74	24473 (100)	55.10	59919 (100)	39.60	63075 (100)	56.06	60507 (100)	43.06

Contd....,

TABLE 3.3: ANNUAL HOUSEHOLD NET INCOME OF SAMPLE VILLAGES OF SELECTED DISTRICTS – 2009

(Rs/Per hh)

	KRISHNA						OVERALL (STATE)					
	Average Income	CV	Average Income	CV	Average Income	CV	Average Income	CV	Average Income	CV	Average Income	CV
	Beneficiaries		Non Beneficiaries		Aggregate		Beneficiaries		Non Beneficiaries		Aggregate	
Income from work under MGNREGA	13752 (31.81)	34.23	-	-	11002 (23.88)	63.31	6939 (18.10)	63.24	-	-	5551 (14.10)	89.49
Income from wages in agriculture	20198 (46.71)	47.40	27165 (47.36)	53.64	21591 (46.87)	50.71	12501 (32.61)	37.33	6698 (15.42)	121.69	11341 (28.81)	57.69
Income from wages non agriculture	4275 (9.89)	282.45	-	-	3420 (7.42)	319.00	5973 (15.58)	91.71	10150 (23.37)	78.23	6808 (17.30)	169.99
Income from wages in PWP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Income from wages as migrant workers	-	-	800 (1.39)	316.23	160 (0.35)	707.11	652 (1.70)	242.55	380 (0.87)	183.66	598 (1.52)	398.95
Income from self employed in non farming	613 (1.42)	389.74	4800 (8.37)	316.23	1450 (3.15)	486.28	1831 (4.78)	297.40	5831 (13.42)	222.03	2622 (6.66)	474.81
Income from agriculture/livestock	950 (2.20)	295.77	10500 (18.30)	74.48	2860 (6.21)	199.05	9591 (25.01)	97.19	17370 (39.99)	78.92	11146 (28.32)	101.04
Income from regular job/salary/pension	3450 (7.98)	314.79	14100 (24.58)	139.72	5580 (12.11)	242.88	865 (2.22)	132.96	3012 (6.93)	46.72	1294 (3.29)	128.88
Income from sale of assets/rent/transfer etc.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	43238 (100)	41.19	57365 (100)	33.12	46063 (100)	40.69	38341 (100.00)	37.46	43441 (100.00)	60.53	39361 (100.00)	46.07

SOURCE: Field Survey 2011.

reported the per household income as Rs. 38,400/- which they derived completely through agricultural works and livestock activities. On the whole the aggregate per household income is reported to be Rs. 23,288/-, from which the per household income derived through MGNREGA activities is 11.47 per cent.

The average per household net income, for beneficiary households of Chittoor district is reported to be Rs. 69,092/- of which 12.50 per cent of income is reported to be derived from MGNREGA works. Across the activities, the per household income varied from Rs. 630 for salaried job to Rs. 25,408 for agricultural works and livestock. The higher co-efficient of variation reported in per household income by migrant workers indicate a higher wage rate with minimum number of days of work at a distant place. On the other hand, in case of non-beneficiaries, higher co-efficients of variation are reported by the members of the households who have participated in migrant works, self-employed in non-farm activities and salaried jobs. The aggregate per household net income is reported to be Rs. 66,947 of which 10.32 per cent of income is derived through MGNREGA activities.

The beneficiary households of Mahboobnagar district have involved in MGNREGA and Agricultural labour works. The average per household income from all sources is reported to be Rs. 24,511 of which 64.14 per cent of income was derived through MGNREGA works while 33.79 per cent of income was obtained by attending to agricultural labour works. Though the per household income derived through migration works is only 2.06 per cent, highest co-efficient of variation is reported compared to other works. On the other hand the non-beneficiary households reported an average income of Rs. 24,320 per household of which 42.76 per cent of income was derived through agricultural wage works and 43.67 per cent of income by attending to non-agricultural works. About 12.34 per cent of income was derived through the works at a migrated place, compared to other selected districts, the migrant workers of non-beneficiary households of this district could achieve more income. On the whole the aggregate income per household is reported to be Rs. 24,473 of which 51.40 per cent of income was derived through MGNREGA works.

In Srikakulam district, the average income per beneficiary household is reported to be Rs. 59,919 of which 14.96 per cent of income was derived from MGNREGA works. About 29.63

per cent of income through agricultural wage works, 25.48 per cent through non-agricultural wage works and 23.03 per cent of income through employment in livestock, are derived by the beneficiary households. As in case of other selected districts, here also, highest co-efficient of variation is recorded in case of income derived through works at migrated places. On the other hand, the non-beneficiary households have reported the per household income of Rs. 63,075/- of which 61.47 per cent of income is earned through non-agricultural wage works. About 26.44 per cent of income is derived through self-employed non-farming activities. On the whole, the aggregate per household income is reported to be Rs. 60, 507 of which only 11.85 per cent of income was derived through MGNREGA works. The highest percentages of co-efficients of variation indicate the vast variation in wages for work to work and from one activity to another activity depending upon the urgency of the work for which the workers were employed.

The beneficiary households of Krishna district have reported, the average income per household about Rs. 43,238 from all sources of which 31.81 per cent of income was reported to have derived from MGNREGA works. Moreover, 46.71 per cent of income was earned through agricultural labour work and 9.89 per cent of income from non-agricultural works. On the other hand the non-beneficiary households on an average have reported a per household income of Rs. 57,365, of which 47.36 per cent of income was reported to have derived from agricultural labour works, 24.58 per cent of income from salaried services and pensions and 18.30 per cent of income through livestock activities. On the whole, the per household aggregate income is reported to be Rs. 46,063 of which, 23.88 per cent of income is reported to have derived from MGNREGA works.

Higher variation of income from MGNREGA works is observed in case of beneficiary households of Adilabad district among the sample districts. Much variation through agricultural wage rates is reported by the non-beneficiary households of all sample districts except Adilabad district. On the other hand, larger incomes through agricultural wages are reported by the beneficiary households of Chittoor, Srikakulam and Krishna districts than Adilabad and Mahboobnagar districts. Though Krishna district is agriculturally developed district, much variation in the incomes through livestock is reported by the beneficiary households than the beneficiary households of other sample districts. Moreover, much variation in the incomes from self-employed non-farming activities is observed in case of beneficiary households of Adilabad, Srikakulam and Krishna districts. Larger incomes are derived through livestock activities by the

non-beneficiary households of Adilabad, Chittoor and Krishna districts. Much variations is observed between beneficiary and non-beneficiary households of Chittoor and Krishna districts in the earnings through regular salaries or pensions. Considerable variation in the incomes of migrant workers from both beneficiary and non-beneficiary household categories is observed in Chittoor, Mahboobnagar, Srikakulam and Krishna districts. On interaction with the beneficiary and non-beneficiary households, it is observed that by involving the members of households in the soil conservation works, they are deriving higher wages than the wage rates in MGNREGA works. Moreover, the works initiated are also not adequate to provide 100 days of employment to the household. The developmental works in urban areas also draw more number of labourers with attractive wage rates in respective non-agricultural activities. The per household income through MGNREGA works is reported higher in Mahboobnagar followed by Krishna district. On the other hand similar per household incomes through MGNREGA works are reported by the beneficiaries of Chittoor and Srikakulam districts.

The performance of wage earning activities from different sources by beneficiary households indicate that more incomes are being reported to have earned through other activities than MGNREGA works. The highest percentages of co-efficient of variation indicate the vast variation in wages for work to work and from one activity to another activity depending upon the urgency of the work for which the workers were employed.

3.4. Household Consumption:

3.4.1. Monthly Per Capita Consumption of Food Items:

The particulars of monthly per capita consumption of Food items of sample households in the selected districts are presented in the Table 3.4. The differences in the consumption of food items between beneficiary and non-beneficiary households of sample districts are analyzed and compared with the NSS data. However, the physical quantities for some group of food items is not available since the items in that group are not homogeneous products and hence the group totals cannot be arrived at.

Observing the aggregate performance of the households, it is found that the cereal consumption by beneficiary households is reported to be comparatively less than the non-beneficiary households. Comparing with NSS data of 2004-05, the consumption of cereals by beneficiaries is comparatively lower than the data of NSS 2004-05. On the other hand the

cereal consumption is reported about 15.88 kgs by non-beneficiary households, which is higher than the NSS reported quantity of cereals per month. Moreover, the edible oil consumption is reported higher by both beneficiary and non-beneficiary households when compared to NSS data of consumption. Interestingly the consumption of poultry meat and confectionary by both categories of households is reported much higher than the consumption data of NSS further respective items in 2004-05.

Much difference is not observed in the aggregate values of rice consumption among the sample households of the sample districts. Comparatively larger quantity of spices consumption is reported by both beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries in Krishna district. Vegetable consumption is reported to be higher in Adilabad district. Significant difference in the consumption of liquid milk is not observed between beneficiary and non-beneficiary sample households except in Krishna district. The per capita monthly consumption of pulses is comparatively reported to be higher in beneficiaries of Mahboobnagar district than other sample districts. Marginal difference in the consumption of poultry meat is observed between beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries in the districts of Mahboobnagar, Srikakulam and Krishna while no difference is observed between beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries in the consumption of poultry meat in the districts Adilabad and Chittoor.

Among the sample households across the sample districts, the consumption of cereals is observed to be reported higher in case of beneficiary households than the non-beneficiary households. No difference is observed in the consumption of pulses between beneficiary and non-beneficiary households in the districts of Adilabad, Chittoor and Srikakulam while a marginal difference between beneficiary and non-beneficiary households is observed in Mahboobnagar and Krishna districts.

The consumption of liquid milk is reported to be higher in case of beneficiaries than the non-beneficiaries of all the sample districts except in Krishna district. Spices consumption is

TABLE 3.4: HOUSEHOLD CONSUMPTION OF FOOD ITEMS (KG.S PER CAPITA PER MONTH)

	ADILABAD			MAHBOOBNAGAR			CHITTOOR			SRIKAKULAM		
	Bene- ficiaries	Non-Bene- ficiaries	Aggre- gate	Bene- ficiaries	Non-Bene- ficiaries	Aggre- gate	Bene- ficiaries	Non-Bene- ficiaries	Aggre- gate	Bene- ficiaries	Non-Bene- ficiaries	Aggre- gate
Rice	7.00	6.00	6.50	6.50	5.50	6.00	6.50	5.50	6.00	8.00	6.00	7.00
Wheat	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Other cereals	4.00	3.00	3.50	3.80	2.00	2.90	3.80	2.00	2.90	2.00	2.00	2.00
Total cereals	11.00	9.00	10.00	10.30	7.50	8.90	10.30	7.50	8.90	10.00	8.00	9.00
Total pulses	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50
sugar	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50
Edible oils ¹	0.50	0.40	0.45	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50
Liquid Milk ¹	2.00	1.00	1.50	2.00	1.50	1.75	2.00	1.50	1.75	2.00	1.50	1.75
Milk Products	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.15	0.20	0.18	0.15	0.20	0.18	0.25	0.00	0.13
Spices ²	200.00	200.00	200.00	200.00	250.00	225.00	200.00	250.00	225.00	250.00	230.00	240.00
Poultry - meet	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.60	0.50	0.55
Fruits	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	4.00	2.50
Vegetables	6.00	7.00	6.50	5.00	4.00	4.50	5.00	4.00	4.50	6.00	1.00	3.50
Confectionery	2.00	1.00	1.50	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	2.00	1.50
	KRISHNA			OVERALL (STATE)								
	Bene- ficiaries	Non-Bene- ficiaries	Aggre- gate	Bene- ficiaries	Non-Bene- ficiaries	Aggre- gate	NSS ² 1993-94 In Kgs	NSS ² 1999-00 In Kgs	NSS ² 2004-05 In Kgs			
Rice	7.00	5.50	6.25	7.46	5.92	6.69	11.55	11.65	10.95			
Wheat	0.50	1.00	0.75	0.5	0.2	0.4	0.09	0.11	0.14			
Other cereals	2.00	1.50	1.75	1.34	1.0	1.01	0.40	-	0.0004			
Total cereals	9.50	8.00	8.75	11.70	15.88	13.79	13.30	12.65	12.04			
Total pulses	0.50	0.60	0.55	1.0	0.76	0.88	-	0.73	0.70			
sugar	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.60	0.52	0.56	0.43	0.44	0.43			
Edible oils ¹	0.45	0.50	0.48	0.84	0.64	0.74	0.37	0.46	0.55			
Liquid Milk ¹	1.00	1.50	1.25	2.48	2.2	2.34	2.62	2.87	3.05			
Milk Products	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.16	0.12	0.14	-	-	0.01			
Spices ²	300.00	250.00	275.00	270	236	253	-	-	-			
Poultry - meet	0.50	0.40	0.45	0.68	0.60	0.64	0.12	-	0.14			
Fruits	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.0	1.0	1.0	-	-	-			
Vegetables	5.50	4.00	4.75	5.5	4.00	4.75	-	-	-			
Confectionery	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.2	1.4	1.3	-	0.34	0.12			

1. Edible Oil and liquid milk is in liters

2. Spices in gms.

NOTE: Since some of the food items are not homogeneous products, the group totals cannot be arrived at for presenting the total quantities.

observed to be much higher in Krishna district by both beneficiary and non-beneficiary households compared to other sample districts. Higher consumption of vegetables is reported by the non-beneficiary households of Adilabad district while higher consumption of fruits is reported by the non-beneficiary households of Srikakulam district. Marginal difference of consumption of poultry meat is reported between beneficiary and non-beneficiary households in the districts of Mahboobnagar, Srikakulam and Krishna while equal quantity of consumption is reported by both beneficiary and non-beneficiary households in the districts of Adilabad and Chittoor.

The National Sample Survey data for the years 1993-94, 1999-2000 and 2004-05 show more or less equal level of monthly per capita consumption of food items. The beneficiary and non-beneficiary households of all sample districts have reported higher level of consumption of sugar than the consumption level reported in the NSS data in the three specified years. The consumption of wheat is reported only in Krishna district but reported a higher level than the level of consumption reported in NSS data. Low level of rice consumption is reported by the households of sample districts compared to the consumption level reported in NSS data. The reason may be attributed that the households usually consume more cereals like Ragi, Bajra, Maize, and Samai mostly in Adilabad, Mahboobnagar and Chittoor districts than in Srikakulam and Krishna districts. The reason for low-level consumption of liquid milk than the NSS data, may be the households who maintain cattle would sell milk to neighbouring urban people. As a result they consume lesser quantity than the consumption level reported in NSS data.

3.4.2. Consumption Expenditure of Households:

The Monthly Consumption Expenditure particulars of the households in the selected districts are presented in the Table 3.5. The variation of consumption expenditure among the beneficiary and non-beneficiary households is analyzed through estimation of co-efficient of variation for each food and non-food items. Since the data on the expenditure of consumption of food and non-food items for 2004-05, is not available from NSS Rounds, the data on the monthly per capita consumption expenditure of food and non-food items for the year 1999-2000 is presented as a proxy for the year 2004-05 for comparison.

Table 3.5: Monthly Consumption Expenditure of Households

Food Items	Adilabad									Chittoor								
	Beneficiaries			Non Beneficiaries			Aggregate			Beneficiaries			Non Beneficiaries			Aggregate		
	Monthly per capita (Rs)	Percentage	Coefficient of variation (%)	Monthly per capita (Rs)	Percentage	Coefficient of variation (%)	Monthly per capita (Rs)	Percentage	Coefficient of variation (%)	Monthly per capita (Rs)	Percentage	Coefficient of variation (%)	Monthly per capita (Rs)	Percentage	Coefficient of variation (%)	Monthly per capita (Rs)	Percentage	Coefficient of variation (%)
Rice	101.34	15.92	28.19	95.77	16.33	62.42	98.55	16.12	51.79	99.71	17.43	15.31	94.03	17.79	19.38	96.87	17.60	16.71
Wheat	0.78	0.12	370.72	0.00	0.00		0.39	0.06	416.50	0.00	0.00		0.00	0.00		0.00	0.00	
Other cereal	37.57	5.90	30.68	26.45	4.51	65.00	32.01	5.23	43.88	28.15	4.92	25.32	22.33	4.23	58.05	25.24	4.59	52.98
Total cereals	139.69	21.94	20.70	122.22	20.84	58.35	130.95	21.41	43.30	127.85	22.35	16.85	116.37	22.01	27.89	122.11	22.19	22.25
Pulses	34.89	5.48	28.83	30.67	5.23	60.79	32.78	5.36	36.28	36.12	6.31	28.06	33.00	6.24	34.77	34.56	6.28	30.40
Sugar	12.09	1.90	31.72	10.60	1.81	54.15	11.35	1.86	42.65	16.26	2.84	34.63	16.35	3.09	28.83	16.30	2.96	33.26
Cook oil	32.92	5.17	24.11	25.48	4.34	48.60	29.20	4.77	33.07	37.15	6.49	22.73	30.75	5.82	43.78	33.95	6.17	31.46
Spice	12.65	1.99	47.31	15.50	2.64	55.00	14.08	2.30	55.33	13.54	2.37	35.74	15.25	2.89	48.54	14.39	2.62	38.92
Milk	43.75	6.87	64.23	32.92	5.61	53.92	38.33	6.27	65.52	17.11	2.99	40.67	44.38	8.39	78.72	30.74	5.59	49.02
Meat	54.51	8.56	33.57	27.17	4.63	59.26	40.84	6.68	43.30	59.43	10.39	33.05	50.42	9.54	48.13	54.93	9.98	41.92
Fruit	18.58	2.92	79.33	14.67	2.50	39.71	16.62	2.72	77.69	13.77	2.41	76.88	10.83	2.05	109.60	12.30	2.24	82.71
Vegetables	43.43	6.82	34.90	30.73	5.24	52.53	37.08	6.06	46.62	45.38	7.93	99.70	38.50	7.28	76.20	41.94	7.62	97.00
Confec	9.29	1.46	79.33	8.33	1.42	39.71	8.81	1.44	77.69	9.00	1.57	632.46	0.00	0.00		4.50	0.82	707.11
Total Food	401.81	63.12	18.99	318.28	54.27	51.16	360.04	58.87	35.75	375.60	65.67	32.16	355.84	67.32	42.13	365.72	66.46	35.62
Edu	38.97	6.12	67.33	38.67	6.59	98.97	38.82	6.35	105.43	42.42	7.42	94.28	38.33	7.25	188.18	40.38	7.34	106.44
Cloth	46.16	7.25	94.11	36.50	6.22	54.64	41.33	6.76	86.06	37.93	6.63	48.93	32.15	6.08	48.27	35.04	6.37	48.33
Foot	8.00	1.26	42.65	9.77	1.67	52.53	8.89	1.45	45.75	7.51	1.31	47.28	7.22	1.37	54.99	7.37	1.34	48.28
Other	82.81	13.01	140.82	84.12	14.34	52.67	83.46	13.65	122.62	84.56	14.78	53.26	75.38	14.26	61.68	79.97	14.53	54.65
Fuel	58.86	9.25	32.27	99.17	16.91	49.40	79.01	12.92	47.09	23.94	4.19	39.96	19.67	3.72	98.33	21.80	3.96	52.07
TOTAL Non-food	234.80	36.88	87.19	268.22	45.73	56.10	251.51	41.13	80.22	196.36	34.33	36.87	172.75	32.68	46.84	184.56	33.54	38.87
GRAND TOTAL	636.61	100.00	30.99	586.49	100.00	52.63	611.55	100.00	42.65	571.96	100.00	26.14	528.59	100.00	33.29	550.28	100.00	27.63

Contd.....,

Table 3.5: Monthly Consumption Expenditure of Households

Food Items	Mahabubnagar									Srikakulam								
	Beneficiaries			Non Beneficiaries			Aggregate			Beneficiaries			Non Beneficiaries			Aggregate		
	Monthly per capita (Rs)	Percentage	Coefficient of variation (%)	Monthly per capita (Rs)	Percentage	Coefficient of variation (%)	Monthly per capita (Rs)	Percentage	Coefficient of variation (%)	Monthly per capita (Rs)	Percentage	Coefficient of variation (%)	Monthly per capita (Rs)	Percentage	Coefficient of variation (%)	Monthly per capita (Rs)	Percentage	Coefficient of variation (%)
Rice	81.48	14.60	30.13	73.68	14.50	66.98	77.58	14.55	44.23	96.33	16.50	23.60	91.67	17.26	15.66	94.00	16.86	22.41
Wheat	1.88	0.34	632.46	0.00	0.00		0.94	0.18	707.11	0.00	0.00		0.00	0.00		0.00	0.00	
Other cereal	32.29	5.78	40.07	30.45	5.99	45.12	31.37	5.88	41.02	32.97	5.65	72.33	31.20	5.87	74.71	32.08	5.76	71.62
Total cereals	115.64	20.72	24.97	104.13	20.49	53.00	109.88	20.61	34.63	129.30	22.15	21.90	122.87	23.13	12.67	126.08	22.62	20.59
Pulses	38.52	6.90	39.49	34.00	6.69	100.31	36.26	6.80	52.48	49.94	8.56	100.32	31.00	5.84	173.81	40.47	7.26	107.98
Sugar	18.51	3.32	44.67	20.91	4.12	36.59	19.71	3.70	42.81	19.94	3.42	27.29	14.12	2.66	40.24	17.03	3.05	30.88
Cook oil	37.95	6.80	40.06	37.80	7.44	57.05	37.88	7.10	43.02	35.81	6.14	28.26	30.27	5.70	24.54	33.04	5.93	27.64
Spice	7.87	1.41	70.35	10.98	2.16	37.84	9.43	1.77	63.58	9.89	1.69	49.64	8.40	1.58	61.56	9.14	1.64	54.03
Milk	33.97	6.09	64.38	25.30	4.98	77.42	29.63	5.56	66.57	44.86	7.69	47.25	45.10	8.49	45.63	44.98	8.07	47.73
Meat	53.08	9.51	76.90	45.17	8.89	110.82	49.13	9.21	83.75	45.84	7.85	71.75	40.10	7.55	50.05	42.97	7.71	67.78
Fruit	17.81	3.19	82.10	12.17	2.39	89.49	14.99	2.81	82.71	14.40	2.47	64.54	28.87	5.43	63.01	21.63	3.88	64.48
Vegetables	53.88	9.65	61.55	43.00	8.46	107.90	48.44	9.09	79.87	55.84	9.57	50.64	41.00	7.72	34.66	48.42	8.69	48.11
Confec	8.91	1.60	82.10	8.08	1.59	89.49	8.49	1.59	82.71	17.74	3.04	85.77	26.38	4.97	98.55	22.06	3.96	85.40
Total Food	386.15	69.19	24.10	341.54	67.22	49.11	363.85	68.25	30.80	423.54	72.56	31.13	388.10	73.06	20.59	405.82	72.80	29.05
Edu	27.71	4.96	469.25	25.00	4.92	316.23	26.35	4.94	428.73	42.69	7.31	108.39	38.22	7.20	194.63	40.45	7.26	133.60
Cloth	25.52	4.57	39.93	28.89	5.69	46.91	27.20	5.10	41.70	39.38	6.75	61.93	28.29	5.33	71.21	33.83	6.07	63.84
Foot	9.63	1.73	31.83	10.61	2.09	47.57	10.12	1.90	34.90	14.83	2.54	62.44	13.28	2.50	73.12	14.05	2.52	63.36
Other	90.55	16.22	167.54	85.42	16.81	93.41	87.98	16.50	161.65	30.50	5.23	76.80	22.89	4.31	70.70	26.70	4.79	75.04
Fuel	18.56	3.33	62.75	16.67	3.28	59.01	17.61	3.30	61.50	32.75	5.61	63.40	40.40	7.61	68.43	36.58	6.56	64.55
TOTAL Non-food	171.97	30.81	99.06	166.58	32.78	41.68	169.28	31.75	92.26	160.15	27.44	50.03	143.08	26.94	72.74	151.61	27.20	56.72
GRAND TOTAL	558.12	100.00	37.77	508.13	100.00	41.01	533.12	100.00	38.01	583.68	100.00	28.77	531.19	100.00	24.95	557.44	100.00	27.69

Contd.....

Table 3.5: Monthly Consumption Expenditure of Households

Food Items	Krishna									Overall (State)									NSS* 2004- 2005 Rs.
	Beneficiaries			Non Beneficiaries			Aggregate			Beneficiaries			Non Beneficiaries			Aggregate			
	Monthly per capita (Rs)	Percentage	Coefficient of variation (%)	Monthly per capita (Rs)	Percentage	Coefficient of variation (%)	Monthly per capita (Rs)	Percentage	Coefficient of variation (%)	Monthly per capita (Rs)	Percentage	Coefficient of variation (%)	Monthly per capita (Rs)	Percentage	Coefficient of variation (%)	Monthly per capita (Rs)	Percentage	Coefficient of variation (%)	
Rice	118.49	21.50	21.43	113.54	22.42	36.93	116.02	21.94	25.03	99.47	17.14	41.13	93.74	17.61	64.77	96.60	17.36	46.22	103.89
Wheat	1.63	0.29	210.55	2.45	0.48	111.64	2.04	0.39	181.22	0.86	0.15	420.40	0.49	0.09	321.21	0.67	0.12	398.95	1.86
Other cereal	30.00	5.44		28.00	5.53		29.00	5.48		32.20	5.55	118.35	27.69	5.20	115.73	29.94	5.38	117.79	0.03
Total cereals	150.11	27.24	21.53	144.00	28.43	36.54	147.05	27.81	25.01	132.53	22.84	46.23	121.92	22.90	66.46	127.21	22.86	50.39	113.60
Pulses	46.71	8.48	21.00	39.45	7.79	44.65	43.08	8.15	33.68	41.25	7.11	71.12	33.62	6.32	79.14	37.43	6.73	73.49	19.36
Sugar	17.35	3.15	62.17	15.94	3.15	37.96	16.64	3.15	60.48	16.83	2.90	67.83	15.58	2.93	76.32	16.21	2.91	69.36	7.23
Cook oil	40.02	7.26	24.41	35.05	6.92	35.40	37.53	7.10	26.00	36.77	6.34	44.80	31.87	5.99	54.40	34.32	6.17	46.88	28.00
Spice	3.86	0.70	36.64	4.33	0.85	17.98	4.09	0.77	33.51	9.56	1.65	65.23	10.89	2.05	89.46	10.23	1.84	71.39	14.09
Milk	31.02	5.63	49.69	28.18	5.56	44.27	29.60	5.60	47.78	34.15	5.88	60.95	35.18	6.61	61.46	34.66	6.23	61.13	32.83
Meat	59.47	10.79	23.71	49.29	9.73	21.47	54.38	10.28	24.06	54.47	9.39	68.58	42.43	7.97	75.91	48.45	8.71	69.89	25.10
Fruit	8.61	1.56	85.14	8.44	1.67	92.20	8.52	1.61	86.44	14.63	2.52	88.55	15.00	2.82	85.87	14.82	2.66	87.98	2.63
Vegetables	54.82	9.95	18.69	50.01	9.88	22.10	52.42	9.91	19.24	50.67	8.72	54.71	40.65	7.64	59.11	45.66	8.21	55.71	34.16
Confec	0.00	0.00		0.00	0.00		0.00	0.00		8.99	1.55	352.60	8.56	1.61	145.17	8.77	1.58	323.93	1.57
Total Food	411.96	74.76	14.88	374.68	73.98	19.75	393.32	74.39	16.02	399.85	68.90	31.83	355.70	66.84	41.13	377.76	67.91	33.73	323.15
Edu	38.54	6.99	233.03	36.94	7.30	316.23	37.74	7.14	254.89	38.08	6.56	161.40	35.43	6.66	172.20	36.76	6.61	167.10	26.03
Cloth	47.96	8.70	58.80	38.51	7.60	36.38	43.23	8.18	55.65	39.39	6.79	66.45	32.87	6.18	71.15	36.13	6.49	67.30	43.41
Foot	18.56	3.37	61.28	12.26	2.42	41.07	15.41	2.91	58.30	11.70	2.02	63.07	10.63	2.00	69.49	11.16	2.01	64.45	3.15
Other	6.66	1.21	47.20	10.02	1.98	59.07	8.34	1.58	55.27	59.03	10.17	164.48	55.57	10.44	90.18	57.30	10.30	156.94	--
Fuel	27.34	4.96	36.99	34.02	6.72	46.04	30.68	5.80	38.74	32.29	5.56	54.55	41.99	7.88	72.02	37.14	6.68	57.95	88.29
Total Non-food	139.06	25.24	79.75	131.75	26.02	29.11	135.41	25.61	74.95	180.49	31.10	86.46	176.49	33.16	58.60	178.49	32.09	83.69	595.31
GRAND TOTAL	551.02	100.00	23.94	506.43	100.00	19.46	528.73	100.00	23.09	580.34	100.00	39.94	532.19	100.00	39.76	556.25	100.00	40.17	1018.55

SOURCE: Field Survey 2011.

* NSS Round 2004-05.

As per the consumption data from NSS Round 2004-05 the monthly per capita consumption expenditure on both food and non-food items together is reported as Rs.1018.55.

Comparing the overall performance of the monthly consumption expenditure of the sample households, it is observed that the aggregate value of consumption expenditure in case of total cereals is higher than the per capita consumption of expenditure shown in NSS data of 2004-05. Between beneficiary and non-beneficiary households, the monthly consumption expenditure is reported higher in case of pulses by beneficiary households than the non-beneficiary households. However, the consumption expenditure of pulses is reported higher by both categories of sample households than the data shown in NSS round 2004-05. The consumption of cooking oil is reported comparatively higher by beneficiary households than the non-beneficiary households. While the consumption expenditure on Milk is reported higher by non-beneficiary households than beneficiary households. The consumption of meat and vegetables are also reported higher by beneficiary households than the non-beneficiary households. On the whole, the monthly consumption expenditure on total food items are reported higher by both categories of households against the expenditure shown in NSS round 2004-05.

Among the selected districts the monthly per capita consumption expenditure ranged from Rs. 528.73 in Krishna district to Rs. 611.55 in Adilabad district. The hike in the consumption expenditure is due to rise in prices of food and non-food items. In case of expenditure on food items, almost all sample households except non-beneficiary households of Adilabad districts, have reported higher consumption expenditure on food items than the expenditure in 2004-05. This is due to the increase in the prices of food items rather than the increase of quantity of consumption. On the other hand, all the beneficiary and non-beneficiary households of all sample districts have reported lower consumption expenditure on non-food items than the NSS data of 2004-05. This indicates that, in the rural areas, the households generally invest more on food items than on non-food items due to more number of household members and also inadequate incomes to invest more on non-food items.

Much difference in the consumption expenditure in case of total cereals between beneficiary and non-beneficiary households is not noticed. Among the selected districts comparatively higher consumption expenditure on pulses is reported by the beneficiary

households of Srikakulam and Krishna districts than other districts. The percentage of consumption expenditure on meat and vegetables is reported to be low in case of non-beneficiaries of Adilabad district. The percentage of consumption expenditure on milk is reported high in case of non-beneficiaries of Chittoor and Srikakulam districts.

The percentages of expenditure on education and clothing are reported to be low in case of beneficiary and non-beneficiary households of Mahboobnagar district compared to other sample districts. The Co-efficient of variation of expenditure on meat is reported to be higher in case of non-beneficiaries of sample districts except in Srikakulam and Krishna districts.

On the whole the Co-efficient of variation on both food and non-food items taken together for beneficiary households ranged from 23.94 in Krishna district to 37.77 in Mahboobnagar district and varied between 19.46 in Krishna district and 52.63 in Adilabad district for non-beneficiary households. Moreover, the variation among the food and non-food items is reported higher in case of beneficiaries of Mahboobnagar district and non-beneficiaries of Adilabad district.

The Impact of MGNREGA scheme on the improvement in the percentages of consumption of food and non-food items for the sample households is only marginal but not as much as expected.

3.5. Variability (CV) and Gini ratios of income and Consumption:

As the earlier sections are dealt with the per household incomes and per capita consumption of the beneficiary and non-beneficiary households of the sample districts, this section presents the analysis of variation in incomes and consumption of the sample households. The details of variability in consumption and income of beneficiary and non-beneficiary households are presented in Table 3.6.

Glancing over the overall performance of both categories of households taken together, it is found that the overall average per household income is reported to be Rs. 44,256, while the average per household income of beneficiary households is reported as Rs. 43,244 and Rs. 48,305 for non-beneficiary households. On the other hand the per household consumption for beneficiary and non-beneficiary households are Rs. 44,605 and Rs. 41,059 respectively during

the year 2009. The co-efficient of variation of consumption is reported higher in case of beneficiary households while the co-efficient of variation of reported for non-beneficiary households is lesser than the average co-efficient of variation of both categories taken together. Moreover the Gini co-efficient of income of non-beneficiary households indicates more inequality than the beneficiary households and even to the aggregate co-efficient of income. This reason may be attributed to the wages of different works in which the non-beneficiary households have involved. On the other hand the Gini co-efficient of consumption is reported higher by beneficiary households whereas the non-beneficiaries reported a lower co-efficient than the average Gini co-efficient.

Adilabad:

The average per household incomes of beneficiary and non-beneficiary sample households are reported to be Rs. 19,511 and Rs. 38,400 respectively. On the other hand the per household consumption for beneficiary and non-beneficiary households are Rs. 45,611 and Rs. 46,058 during the year 2009. The co-efficient of variation of consumption is reported higher in case of non-beneficiary households than the beneficiary household, which means there is a wide variation of consumption among non-beneficiary households than beneficiary households. Moreover the Gini co-efficients of income indicate that there is more inequality in case of per household incomes of non-beneficiary households than beneficiary households. This is due to variations in wages of different works they have involved. Compared to the Gini co-efficients of income, the Gini co-efficients of consumption have not shown considerable inequality between beneficiary and non-beneficiary households.

Chittoor:

The per household income of beneficiary households is reported to be Rs. 69,092 while the per household incomes of non-beneficiary households accounts to be Rs. 58,365. Comparatively higher consumption is reported by the beneficiaries than non-beneficiary households. Much variation in consumption is reported among beneficiaries than non-beneficiaries. On the other hand the inequality of incomes is reported higher in case of non-beneficiaries than beneficiary households. Higher ratio of concentration is reported in case of consumption of non-beneficiaries which means higher inequality than beneficiary households.

Table 3.6: Variability in Consumption and Income of Sample Villages of Selected Districts – 2009

Description	Adilabad			Chittoor			Mahboobnagar		
	Beneficiary	Non Beneficiary	Total	Beneficiary	Non Beneficiary	Total	Beneficiary	Non-Beneficiary	Total
Average household Income during the reference year (Rs)	19511	38400	23288	69092	58365	66947	24511	24320	24473
Average household Consumption during the reference year (Rs)	45611	46058	45700	39140	27816	36876	54331	52187	53903
Coefficient of variation in consumption across households	332.01	369.12	342.03	411.02	220.08	333.02	288.05	204.04	268.52
Gini coefficient of income	0.0371	0.3518	0.0332	0.0781	0.2355	0.0990	0.0352	0.2454	0.0448
Gini coefficient of consumption	0.0137	0.0429	0.0849	+0.0785	0.1719	0.0022	0.0990	0.2015	0.1167
Description	Srikakulam			Krishna			Overall (STATE)		
	Beneficiary	Non Beneficiary	Total	Beneficiary	Non Beneficiary	Total	Beneficiary	Non Beneficiary	Total
Average household Income during the reference year (Rs)	59919	63075	60507	43238	57365	46063	43244	48305	44256
Average household Consumption during the reference year (Rs)	46755	44676	46339	37167	34558	36645	44605	41059	43893
Coefficient of variation in consumption across households	277.03	260.04	268.22	321.01	350.00	327.33	302.01	227.03	283.25
Gini coefficient of income	0.037023	0.275228	0.099012	0.060591	0.094753	0.060311	0.2818	0.3405	0.2937
Gini coefficient of consumption	0.014831	0.06464	0.039891	0.11162	0.078971	0.044192	0.1166	0.0495	0.1296

SOURCE: Field Data 2011.

Mahboobnagar:

Much variation is not observed in case of the per household incomes of beneficiary and non-beneficiary households. The variation in the per household consumption is reported higher in case beneficiaries. The inequality in incomes and consumption is comparatively reported higher in case of non-beneficiaries than beneficiary households.

Srikakulam:

The per household incomes of beneficiary and non-beneficiary households are reported as Rs. 59,919 and Rs. 63,075 respectively. Much variation is not observed with regard to per household consumption between beneficiary and non-beneficiary households. The inequalities in income and consumption are more or less similar among beneficiary households. On the other hand the inequality in case of incomes of non-beneficiary households recorded higher than the inequalities of consumption.

Krishna:

The per household incomes of non-beneficiary households are reported to be higher than the per household incomes of the beneficiary households. The variation in per household consumption among non-beneficiary households is found to be higher than the variation among beneficiary households. Considerable inequalities in incomes were not reported between beneficiary and non-beneficiary households. However, considerable inequality in the consumption is reported higher among beneficiary households than among non-beneficiary households.

3.6. Determinants of participation in MGNREGA:

This section deals with the analysis of the determinants of participation of the selected households of selected districts in MGNREGA. To analyze the determinants of involvement in MGNREGA and to attribute a weight to those determinants the logit model is used. The Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) method of equations are also used for analyzing the determinants of participation of households at household level and at member level.

The form of logit model equation is:

$$\log(p/1-p) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \dots + \beta_k X_k$$

Where P is the probability that Y=1 and X_1, X_2, \dots, X_k are the independent variables. $\beta_0, \beta_1, \beta_2, \dots, \beta_k$ are known as the regression co-efficients which are estimated through the data. The Logit/Logistic regression estimates the probability of a certain event occurring.

Logistic regression thus forms a predictor variable ($\log(p/(1-p))$) which is a linear combination of the explanatory variables. Logistic regression also produces Odds Ratios (O.R.) associated with each predictor value. The "Odds" of an event is defined as the probability of the outcome event occurring divided by the probability of the event not occurring. In general, the "Odds ratio" is one set of odds divided by another. The odds ratio for a predictor is defined as the relative amount by which the odds of the outcome increase (O.R. greater than 1.0) or decrease (O.R. less than 1.0) when the value of the predictor variable is increased by 1.0 units. In other words (odds for PV+I) (odds for PV), PV is the value of the predictor variable.

In the present analysis the form of logit function is $\text{Ln } Y = \mathcal{L}_o + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \beta_3 X_3 + \beta_4 X_4 + \beta_5 X_5 + \beta_6 X_6 + \beta_7 X_7 + \beta_8 X_8 + \beta_9 X_9$.

Where,

Y = Dummy Household Participation in MGNREGA

\mathcal{L}_o = Constant

X_1 = Employment other than NREGA

X_2 = Household Income other than NREGA

X_3 = Household size

X_4 = Land ownership Dummy

X_5 = Value of Household Assets

X_6 = Dummy BPL card holding

X_7 = Dummy SC

X_8 = Dummy ST

X_9 = Dummy OBC and

$\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3, \dots, \beta_9$, are the regression co-efficients.

3.6.1. Discussion of the Regression Results:

Logit model of Regression:

The results of the Logit Regression are presented in the following Table 3.7.

Table 3.7 – Determinants of Participation in MGNREGA (Logit)

Variable	Co-efficient	't' Value	Marginal Effect	Odds Ratio
Employment other than MGNREGA (X ₁)	0.002**	2.000	0.002	0.245
Household Income other than MGNREGA (X ₂)	0.000		0.000	0.244
Household size (X ₃)	0.675*	4.167	0.024	0.480
Land Ownership Dummy (X ₄)	0.298	0.723	0.059	0.329
Value of Household Asset (X ₅)	0.000		0.000	0.244
Dummy BPL Card holding (X ₆)	0.523	1.087	0.088	0.412
Dummy SC (X ₇)	1.607**	2.438	0.010	1.219
Dummy ST (X ₈)	2.476*	3.232	0.598	2.907
Dummy OBC (X ₉)	1.095***	1.955	0.241	0.731
Constant	(-)1.409	1.648	--	--
No. of observations	250			
Log likelihood	179.603			
Pseudo R ²	0.246			

* : Significant at 1% Level; ** : Significant at 5% Level ; *** : Significant at 10% Level.

Out of the total of nine explanatory variables employed in the regression analysis, only five variables are found to be statistically significant. They are 1) Employment other than MGNREGA, 2) Household size, 3) Dummy SC, 4) Dummy ST and 5) Dummy OBC. The impact of these variables is positive over the dummy household participation in MGNREGA. Among the dummy variables of caste groups, ST category has reported larger number of household participation than other caste categories. The positive significant coefficient of household size indicates that a unit increase in household size results in about 67 per cent of increase of household participation in MGNREGA. The positive significant coefficient of the variable "Employment other than MGNREGA" indicates that though the households are getting employment in other than MGNREGA works, still they are inclined towards participation in MGNREGA works.

The non-significance of the explanatory variable "Dummy BPL Card Holding" indicates that the BPL Card Holders are participating in MGNREGA works only when they could not get the work with a higher wage rates elsewhere. As a result, the impact of this variable over the participation in MGNREGA works is meager. On the other hand the variable of "Household income other than MGNREGA" and the variable of "Value of Household Asset" have totally no impact over the variable "Dummy Participation of Households" in MGNREGA works. This means that though the households are getting works with higher wage rate elsewhere still they are participating in MGNREGA works and the values of Household assets could not hinder the households from participating in MGNREGA works.

Moreover, the marginal effects of the explanatory variables indicate that there is no significant impact of these variables over the participation of households in MGNREGA. Among the odds ratios of the caste groups, ST category of households has reported the higher value than the other two categories. On an overall, the logit function explains the willingness of the households to participate in MGNREGA works in spite of getting works other than MGNREGA elsewhere.

3.7. Summing Up:

The aggregate size of the household is reported to be 4.03 while the average size for beneficiary and non-beneficiary households respectively are 4.20 and 3.44. An aggregate per cent of 88.40 from males have reported themselves as decision makers. About 85 per cent of households reported themselves as wage earners. It is observed that more number of days have been engaged in agricultural casual labour work than other activities. About 35 per cent of man days were reported to be engaged in Agricultural casual labour work by beneficiary households while their participation was only about 32 per cent of man days under MGNREGA. Higher percentages of incomes are reported by agricultural wages and livestock activities. On the other hand, the per household net income from all activities in case of non-beneficiary households is reported as Rs. 43,441/- . Comparing with NSS data of 2004-05, the consumption of cereals by beneficiaries is comparatively lower than the data of NSS 2004-05. On the other hand the cereal consumption is reported about 15.88 kgs by non-beneficiaries households, which is higher than the NSS reported quantity of cereals per month. Moreover, the edible oil consumption is reported higher by both beneficiary and non-beneficiary households when

compared to NSS data of consumption. Interestingly the consumption of poultry meat and confectionary by both categories of households is reported much higher than the consumption data of NSS. The monthly consumption expenditure on total food items is reported higher by both categories of households against the expenditure shown in NSS round 2004-05. Interestingly the expenditure on clothes and fuel shown in NSS data are much higher than the expenditure reported by beneficiary and non-beneficiary households. On the whole, the expenditure pattern on consumption of food and non-food items is comparatively improved through the wages earned by beneficiary households. Moreover the Gini co-efficient of income of non-beneficiary households indicates more inequality than the beneficiary households and even to the aggregate co-efficient of income. On the other hand the Gini co-efficient of consumption is reported higher by beneficiary households whereas the non-beneficiaries reported a lower co-efficient than the average Gini co-efficient. Glancing over the performance of the beneficiary sample households, it can be observed that more number of days were reported to be involved in other works than under MGNREGA works. This is due to the non-availability of adequate number of days of work under MGNREGA activities. Observing the wage earning activities of beneficiary households, more incomes are reported to have earned through other activities than from MGNREGA works. The impact of MGNREGA scheme on the improvement in the percentages of consumption of food and non-food items for the sample households is only marginal but not as much as expected.

Higher ratio of concentration is reported in case of consumption of non-beneficiaries in Chittoor district, which means higher inequality than beneficiary households. In Mahboobnagar district, the inequality in incomes and consumption is comparatively reported higher by the non-beneficiaries than the beneficiary households. Much variation is not observed with regard to per household consumption between beneficiary and non-beneficiary households of Srikakulam district. In Krishna district, considerable inequalities in incomes were not reported between beneficiary and non-beneficiary households. However, considerable inequality in the consumption is reported higher among beneficiary households than among non-beneficiary households. The logit function explains the willingness of the households to participate in MGNREGA works, in spite of getting works other than MGNREGA elsewhere.

CHAPTER – IV

WORK PROFILE UNDER MGNREGA, WAGE STRUCTURE AND MIGRATION ISSUES

This chapter deals with the work profile under MGNREGA, wage structure and migration issues relating to the households employed in MGNREGA works. As the reference period for the field analysis is from January to December 2009. The basic aims of programme like generation of employment, income generation and reduction of migration have been analyzed across the selected districts and villages.

4.1. Work Profile under MGNREGA:

The details of work profile under MGNREGA during January to December 2009 are presented in the Table 4.1 for the 5 selected districts.

Table 4.1 – The work profile under MGNREGA (Reference period – January to December 2009)

Characteristics		Adilabad	Chittoor	Mahboob nagar	Srikanthapur	Krishna	Overall (State)
No. of members per HH employed during the year	Aggregate	1.35	2.33	2.03	1.93	2.43	2.01
	General	1.20	2.43	1.50	2.00	-	1.97
	SC	1.67	2.31	2.17	2.00	3.00	2.42
	ST	1.20	-	1.83	-	1.87	1.73
	OBC	1.37	1.67	2.11	1.91	2.14	1.84
	Women	0.63	1.13	1.00	0.88	0.95	0.92
	Men	0.72	1.20	1.03	1.05	1.48	1.09
No. of days per HH employed during the year	Aggregate	21.06	40.34	51.20	45.58	57.33	43.10
	General	19.50	36.00	59.73	58.00	0.00	35.89
	SC	35.10	42.92	54.55	46.33	39.33	43.62
	ST	16.17	-	63.46	-	72.50	59.58
	OBC	18.73	57.00	42.98	44.42	71.13	40.85
	Women	9.79	19.61	25.28	20.85	22.45	19.68
	Men	11.27	20.73	25.92	24.73	34.88	23.42
Percentage of HHs employed 100 days*		-	-	-	-	-	-
Wage rate obtained (Rs.)	Aggregate	98.90	92.99	103.46	101.75	90.70	97.56
	General	99.91	93.57	116.11	113.68	-	84.65
	SC	96.74	90.87	98.74	111.07	88.31	97.15
	ST	107.02	-	93.00	-	119.50	63.90
	OBC	97.39	102.75	99.01	99.78	103.26	100.44
	Women	70.00	80.00	75.00	75.00	85.00	77.00
Average distance from residence where employed (Kms)		1	1	2	1	5	2

Source: Field Survey 2011.

* No household, in any of the selected districts has reported to have completed 100 days of employment.

4.1.1. Characteristics of the sample households in the selected districts:

Glancing over the overall performance of the districts, one can observe that, the aggregate number of members per household is reported to be 2.01. Comparing across the caste groups, the highest number of members per households is reported by Scheduled Caste (SC) category (2.42) while the lowest number reported by Scheduled Tribe (ST) category (1.73). Moreover, the per household women members are reported to be 0.92. The aggregate number of members per household employed during the year, among the selected districts ranged from 1.35 in Adilabad district to 2.43 in Krishna district. Across the caste groups, the highest number of members employed per household is reported to be 3.00 by Scheduled Caste (SC) category of Krishna district while the general category of Chittoor district has reported the highest number of members per household. No general category member was reported in Krishna district. The members employed per household in Scheduled Tribe (ST) category are reported as high as 1.87 in Krishna district. On the other hand, the number of members employed per household is reported to be 2.14 by Other Backward Caste (OBC) in Krishna district which is higher among the selected districts while highest number of women employed per household is reported in Chittoor district.

The overall per household number of days employed are reported to be 43.10 while across the caste groups the per household number of days of employment ranged between 35.89 in general category and 59.58 in Scheduled Tribe category. The per household number of days of employment in women category reported to be 19.68. The aggregate number of days per household employed during the year ranged between 21.06 in Adilabad and 57.33 in Krishna district. The maximum number of days employed per household are reported by general and SC categories of Mahboobnagar district followed by Krishna district. There are three districts for ST households and out of them Krishna district shows higher level of households, of course, Krishna district is not a highly resident area of STs from the sample districts. The women in Mahboobnagar district have reported more number of days of employment (25.28) compared to other selected districts followed by Krishna and Srikakulam districts respectively.

An overall wage rate of Rs. 97.56 is reported in the state, while across caste groups, the wage rates are ranged from Rs. 63.90 in ST category to Rs. 100.44 in OBC category. The average wage rate for women is reported to be Rs. 77.

The highest aggregate wage rates obtained by the sample households i.e., Rs. 103.46 and 101.75 are reported in Mahboobnagar and Srikakulam districts respectively. Glancing across districts, the aggregate wage rate ranged between Rs. 90.70 in Krishna district and Rs. 103.46 in Mahboobnagar district. Across Caste groups, higher wages are reported by ST category in Krishna and Adilabad districts while general category in Srikakulam and Mahboobnagar districts, SC category in Srikakulam district and OBC category in Krishna and Chittoor districts reported higher wage rates. It is interesting to observe that women employees obtained wages between Rs. 70 in Adilabad district and Rs. 85 in Krishna district. Though the stipulated wage rate is Rs. 100 for both male and female employees under MGNREGA scheme, in many cases across the caste groups received the wage rates less than Rs. 100. The reason for variation in wage rates may be attributed to the type of activity in which they were involved. Though Mahboobnagar district is agriculturally backward, the wage rate is more than the prescribed rate (Rs. 100) and for the other, the agriculturally advanced Krishna district shows lower wage (Rs. 91) compared to other districts.

All the sample households in Adilabad, Chittoor and Srikakulam districts reported that they were employed at a distance of 1km from their residence while the households in Mahboobnagar and Krishna districts, reported their employment at a distance of 2 kms and 5 kms respectively. These two districts are opposite cases for agricultural development.

4.2. How successful has been MGNREGA providing 100 days employment (to the registered families at their doorsteps):

The basic objective of the Act is to enhance livelihood security in rural areas by providing at least 100 days of guaranteed wage employment in a financial year to every household whose adult members volunteer to do unskilled manual work.

As mentioned in the second chapter, during 2009-10, out of 61.58 lakh households who were provided employment, only 22.66 per cent got 100 days of employment and the per household number of days were reported as 63.57 days. Looking over the selected five districts, one can observe that out of total number of households who were provided employment only 28.68 per cent in Adilabad district, 31.12 per cent in Chittoor, 19.78 per cent in Mahboobnagar, 28.07 per cent in Srikakulam and only 3.10 per cent in Krishna district could

complete 100 days of employment. On the other hand the number of days per household is reported to be 78.12 in Adilabad, 80.59 in Chittoor, 62.27 in Mahboobnagar district, 76.65 in Srikakulam and only 23.71 in Krishna district. Moreover, in all the selected five districts the households completed 100 days of employment ranged between 3.10% in Krishna district and 31.12% in Chittoor district. The per household number of days of employment varied from 23.71 in Krishna district to 80.59 in Chittoor district. On the whole, among the selected districts, higher performance was reported by Chittoor district and the minimum performance was recorded in Krishna district.

Glancing over the village level performance, on an average, the number of days of employment per household reported as 21.65 in Adilabad district and 55.22 in Mahboobnagar district. The ST category had high employment in Krishna district, though it is not a much residential area of scheduled Tribes. It may be because of village specific and it cannot be nearly applicable to the whole district. The OBC category shows much employment in Krishna district followed by Chittoor by district. Women employment is found much in Mahboobnagar and Srikakulam, while Adilabad district shows lower participation. It displays at low ebb to all categories compared to other districts.

Viewing over district level and village level performances it is understood that the government is providing employment but not full of 100 days to every household as targeted in the act.

4.3. Nature of Assets created and their Durability:

The details of nature of assets created and their quality are presented in Table 4.2. The activities that were taken up in the villages of selected five districts are as follows: 1) Rural Connectivity, 2) Water Conservation and Water harvesting works, 3) Micro Irrigation works, 4) Provision of Irrigation facility to land owned by Panchayat and 5) Land Development works. The district-wise sample households engaged in different activities and the quality of the assets created is discussed as under:

Out of the total sample of 200 households, 41.50 per cent of households were engaged in land development works, 27 per cent of households were employed in Micro Irrigation Works, 22.50 per cent of households in Water Conservation and Water Harvesting, 5 per cent in

Provision of Irrigation facility works and 4 per cent of households were employed in Rural Connectivity activities. Among the total sample of households 75.50 per cent of households reported the quality of the assets created are good and 24.50 per cent of households have reported the quality of the assets as very good. None of the households have reported to have received unemployment allowance for not getting work under NREGA after registration.

Observing across the selected five districts, among the total households, participated in MGNREGA works in each district, only 8.68 per cent in Adilabad, 7.14 per cent in Mahboobnagar and only 4.30 per cent in Chittoor district were employed in rural connectivity works. More number of households, in each of the selected district, are employed in Water Conservation and Water harvesting works and Land development works. All the sample households in Srikakulam district were employed in Micro Irrigation works. With regard to the quality of the assets created under MGNREGA works, majority of the sample households in each district expressed that the quality of the assets is good.

Table 4.2 – Work-wise employed in MGNREGA and the Quality of Assets created – 2009

Characteristics		Adilabad	Chittoor	Mahboobnagar	Srikakulam	Krishna	Overall (State)
Name of the activity under which employed	Rural Connectivity	8.68	4.30	7.14	0	0	4.00
	Flood control and protection	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Water conservation and water harvesting	52.43	0	33.33	0	27.84	22.50
	Drought proofing	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Micro irrigation works	0	0	16.67	100.00	16.49	27.00
	Provision of irrigation facility to land owned by (Panchayat)	8.64	0	11.11	0	4.12	5.00
	Renovation of traditional water bodies	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Land Development	30.25	95.70	31.48	0	51.55	41.50
	Any other activity approved by the Min. of Rural Development	0	0	0	0	0	0
Quality of the assets created through MGNREGA activity	Very good	38.89	48.39	0	2.60	31.96	24.50
	Good	61.11	51.61	100.00	97.40	68.04	75.50
	Bad	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Worst	0	0	0	0	0	0
Average unemployment allowance received by the household for not getting work under MGNREGA after registration (Rs. Per hh)		0	0	0	0	0	0

Source: Field Survey 2011.

All sample household in the selected districts have reported the non-receiving of unemployment allowance for not getting work under MGNREGA after registration.

4.4. Wage Differentials under MGNREGA and its comparison with Minimum Wage Act.

Every person working under the scheme shall be entitled to wage at the minimum wage rate fixed by the state government for agricultural labourers under the Minimum Wages Act, 1948. As stated in the Act (Schedule I, Section 6), labourers shall not be paid less than the above-mentioned wage rate under any circumstances. There is a separate rural standard schedule of rates prepared for the works taken up under the scheme. The unit rates for different types of tasks are fixed, that a worker-man or woman will be able to earn Rs. 80/- per day through seven hours of work. In Andhra Pradesh, the minimum wage rate fixed for unskilled labour of MGNREGA works was Rs. 80/- during 2005-06. Later, the government revised the wage rate in 2009 from Rs. 80/- to 100/- and this wage has been in force.

Though the Government of Andhra Pradesh declared wages for manual agricultural operations ranging from Rs. 119 to Rs. 196 for different operations, the MGNREGA pays Rs. 100 per day to the manual workers (unskilled). According to the wages act even the wages of different manual works (unskilled) are higher than that of MGNREGA. Some changes have occurred during the planning period. Agricultural production in most of the states has increased. The resulting prosperity of farmers has induced agricultural workers in some places to demand more wages. Moreover, changes accompanying land reforms also increased aspiration of agricultural labourers. In this changing environment the government has initiated a number of steps to fix minimum wages for agricultural labourers. Legislations have been passed in all the states fixing the minimum wages in all states except in Jammu & Kashmir, Nagaland and Sikkim. However, an account of practical difficulties and excessive supply of labour, benefits from these legislations have been very limited. Due to lack of bargaining power, agricultural workers do not press for minimum wages.

As per the G.O. Ms.No.93, LET&F (Lab.II) Dept., Dt. 17.10.2008, published in Gazette No. 654, dated 18.11.2008 the basic wages for different operations for agricultural workers are presented in the following Table.

Wage rates for Agricultural Labourers

S.No.	Name of the Category	Basic Wage		
		Zone - I	Zone - II	Zone - III
1.	Adult Farm servants for attached workers (Per Annum)	40843.00	40843.00	40843.00
II	Casual Labour			
1	Ploughing	147.00	128.00	112.00
2	Threshing	162.00	138.00	112.00
3	Sowing/Transplanting/Harvesting/Weeding	139.00	127.00	112.00
4	Any other light operation not involving skill or hazard/grass cutting workers	119.00	112.00	112.00
5	Digging/Stacking/Pruning	157.00	119.00	112.00
6	Supervisor	196.00	157.00	119.00
7	Head Mali/Watch man	196.00	138.00	119.00
8	Mali	157.00	119.00	112.00
9	Tractor Driver (per month)	6776.00	5819.00	4832.00
10	Sprayer of pesticides	235.00	186.00	153.00
11	Tobacco curing operation	226.00	157.00	157.00
12	Tobacco Plucker/Cotton Plucking operation/sugarcane plantation Dressing/other plantation operations in fields not classified elsewhere	196.00	196.00	176.00
13	Loading and Unloading operations	196.00	138.00	122.00

* Zone – I – Coastal Districts, Zone – II – Rayalaseema and Zone – III – Telangana Districts. Notification issued vide G.O.Ms. No. 93, LET&F (Lab.II) Dept. dt: 17.10.2008 published in Gazette No. 654, Dt. 18.11.2008.

It is evident from the table that the wages are different for different agricultural operations in different zones. Similarly, the wages for non-agricultural operations also vary from district to district depending upon the location of the work site. If the location site is nearer to town or industrially developed area or city, obviously the wage rates vary from operation to operation and from location site to another location site.

4.5. Wage differentials in different activities, among beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries:

The details of wage differentials in the sample villages of sample districts are presented in Table 4.3. The aggregate wage rates for all types of works involved by the households are reported higher than the wage rates of MGNREGA. The male labourers of non-beneficiary households have reported higher wage rates than the wage rates of beneficiary males for involving in agricultural and non-agricultural Casual labour work. Moreover, the co-efficients of variation for non-agricultural casual labour work are reported 9.18 and 6.78 respectively for beneficiary and non-beneficiary households compared to Agricultural Casual Labour work

attended by both categories of households. However, much variation of wage rates is observed in case of female migrant workers of beneficiary households and male migrant workers of non-beneficiary households. The wage rates of all works other than NREGA are reported higher than the MGNREGA wage rates. Moreover, much variation is observed in the wage rates between males and females for all works other than MGNREGA. Due to higher wage rates for the works other than MGNREGA works, the labourers are very much inclined towards the other works than MGNREGA works.

In Adilabad district, the average wage rate for MGNREGA work is reported to be 90.88 for both men and women labourers. Comparatively higher wage rates are reported by the beneficiary households for doing both agricultural and non-agricultural works than the MGNREGA average wage rate for both genders. The average wage rates reported by migrant workers are Rs. 250 for male and Rs. 200 for female. On the other hand, the non-beneficiary households reported higher wage rates by involving in non-agricultural operations than that of agricultural operations.

In Chittoor district, higher wage rates are reported by beneficiary households involving in agricultural and non-agricultural operations than that of non-beneficiary households. The average wage derived through MGNREGA work is reported to be Rs. 91.05 in case of both male and female workers, while in Adilabad, the migrant workers reported the wage rates of Rs. 250 for male and Rs. 200 for female.

Much variation is not observed in Mahboobnagar district between beneficiary and non-beneficiary households in the wages of agricultural casual labour. On the other hand the difference is observed in case of non-agricultural casual labour wages between beneficiary and non-beneficiary households. The average wages reported by the household attended to public work programmes is Rs. 200 for male and Rs. 150 for female. Moreover the average wage received by attending to MGNREGA work is reported to be Rs. 93.24 for both male and female workers.

Table – 4.3 – Wage Differentials among different activities in selected villages in selected districts – 2009

Occupation		Adilabad						Chittoor					
		Beneficiaries		Non-Beneficiaries		Aggregate		Beneficiaries		Non-Beneficiaries		Aggregate	
		Avg. (Rs.)	C.V.	Avg. (Rs.)	C.V.	Avg. (Rs.)	C.V.	Avg. (Rs.)	C.V.	Avg. (Rs.)	C.V.	Avg. (Rs.)	C.V.
Wage rate in agricultural casual labour	Male	149	5.22	147	5.21	148	5.22	152	9.12	147	3.54	151	8.32
	Female	99	4.05	95	6.31	98	5.23	99	4.05	93	11.42	99	4.44
Wage rate in non-agricultural casual labour	Male	177	5.22	188	6.33	181	6.01	161	18.22	160	14.03	160	17.23
	Female	145	5.03	119	10.11	133	12.20	99	4.05	95	7.04	98	4.05
Wage rate in public work programmes	Male	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
	Female	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
Wage rate earned by migrant workers	Male	250	-	250	-	250	-	250	-	250	-	250	-
	Female	200	-	200	-	200	-	200	-	200	-	200	-
Wage rate under MGNREGA	Male	90.88	9.01	0	-	90.88	9.01	91.05	10.11	0	-	91.05	10.11
	Female	90.88	9.01	0	-	90.88	9.01	91.05	10.11	0	-	91.05	10.11
Any other work	Male	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
	Female	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
Occupation		Mahboobnagar						Srikakulam					
		Beneficiaries		Non-Beneficiaries		Aggregate		Beneficiaries		Non-Beneficiaries		Aggregate	
		Avg. (Rs.)	C.V.	Avg. (Rs.)	C.V.	Avg. (Rs.)	C.V.	Avg. (Rs.)	C.V.	Avg. (Rs.)	C.V.	Avg. (Rs.)	C.V.
Wage rate in agricultural casual labour	Male	147	10.33	146	4.32	147	9.12	149	3.33	149	3.33	149	3.35
	Female	96	7.40	96	4.55	96	5.33	99	5.22	100	5.25	99	5.22
Wage rate in non-agricultural casual labour	Male	198	4.11	193	3.22	197	3.53	158	13.05	155	8.32	157	12.09
	Female	146	4.03	139	7.01	144	5.15	99	4.05	108	7.35	101	5.02
Wage rate in public work programmes	Male	200	-	200	-	200	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
	Female	150	-	150	-	150	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
Wage rate earned by migrant workers	Male	200	-	200	-	200	-	200	-	200	-	200	-
	Female	200	-	200	-	200	-	150	-	150	-	150	-
Wage rate under MGNREGA	Male	93.24	6.58	0	-	93.24	6.58	92.23	6.24	0	-	92.23	6.24
	Female	93.24	6.58	0	-	93.24	6.58	92.23	6.24	0	-	92.23	6.24
Any other work	Male	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	0	0	-	0	-
	Female	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	0	0	-	0	-

Source: Field Survey 2011.

Contd.....,

Table – 4.3 – Wage Differentials among different activities in selected villages in selected districts – 2009

Occupation		Krishna						Overall (State)					
		Beneficiaries		Non-Beneficiaries		Aggregate		Beneficiaries		Non-Beneficiaries		Aggregate	
		Avg. (Rs.)	C.V.	Avg. (Rs.)	C.V.	Avg. (Rs.)	C.V.	Avg. (Rs.)	C.V.	Avg. (Rs.)	C.V.	Avg. (Rs.)	C.V.
Wage rate in agricultural casual labour	Male	156	12.02	173	15.23	159	13.11	150.60	8.00	152.40	6.33	150.80	7.82
	Female	65	11.14	61	10.02	63	10.30	91.60	6.37	89.00	7.51	91.00	6.10
Wage rate in non-agricultural casual labour	Male	191	5.31	203	2.01	178	13.11	177.00	9.18	179.80	6.78	174.60	10.39
	Female	145	5.03	145	5.03	145	4.22	126.80	4.44	121.20	7.31	124.20	6.13
Wage rate in public work programmes	Male	200	-	200	-	200	-	200.00	-	200.00	-	200.00	-
	Female	150	-	150	-	150	-	150.00	-	150.00	-	150.00	-
Wage rate earned by migrant workers	Male	243	2.01	240	6.23	235	8.35	228.60	2.01	228.00	6.23	227.00	8.35
	Female	191	5.12	195	4.11	192	5.23	188.20	5.12	189.00	4.11	188.40	5.23
Wage rate under MGNREGA	Male	95.92	8.07	0	-	95.92	8.07	92.66	8.00	0	0	92.66	8.00
	Female	95.92	8.07	0	-	95.92	8.07	92.66	8.00	0	0	92.66	8.00
Any other work	Male	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Female	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	0

Source: Field Survey 2011.

Note: If only single person attends to any activity, the C.V. is not estimated for that activity.

The variation exists quite high for beneficiaries in Krishna and Mahboobnagar districts and it indicates the wage fluctuations hovering around agriculturally developed and under developed areas. This trend is recorded for both genders in the two districts. The wage differential has been substantially reported for males in Chittoor and Srikakulam districts, whereas it is not found in other districts. It might be the consequence of scarcity of male workers or the proximity of town and its demand. The variation of wage rate under MGNREGA is at considerable reveal in Adilabad and Chittoor districts for both genders while it is not significant in other districts. It is to be further studied the reasons for 9 per cent to 10 per cent wage variation. The variation of wages of Agricultural Casual labour for beneficiaries of male workers is quite high than the non-beneficiaries and this does not appear for females.

In Srikakulam district, no variation is observed in the wages of agricultural casual labour between beneficiary and non-beneficiary households. The female wage rate is reported higher in case of non-beneficiary households than that of beneficiary households. Moreover, the wage rate derived by beneficiary households by attending MGNREGA work is reported as Rs. 92.23. The average wage rates reported by migrant workers are Rs. 200 and Rs. 150 for male and female workers respectively.

The wage rate for males for attending agricultural casual labour work in Krishna district is reported as Rs. 156, which is lesser than the wage rate derived by male worker of non-beneficiary households. Higher wage rates are reported by male workers of non-beneficiary households than that of beneficiary households. The wage rates reported for attending public works programmes are same for both beneficiary and non-beneficiary households. In the case of migration, the male workers of beneficiary households earned a comparatively higher wage than that of males of non-beneficiary households. The beneficiary households derived a wage rate of Rs. 95.92 for attending MGNREGA works. The average wage rates for MGNREGA works in the selected villages of sample districts ranged between Rs. 90.88 in Adilabad and Rs. 95.92 in Krishna district and the wage rates reported in all the selected districts are found to be higher than the state average wage rate of Rs. 90.35 during 2009-10 (see Table A - Year-wise progress of 2nd Chapter).

The variations in different wage rates of different activities among the participant and non-participant households are observed through the estimation of co-efficient of variations. Much variation in the aggregate wage rates of MGNREGA works is observed in Chittoor,

Adilabad and Krishna districts when compared to Mahboobnagar and Srikakulam districts. The reason may be attributed to the inconsistent number of days of employment for different types of MGNREGA works. The labourers are more attracted by the higher wages paid for agricultural and non-agricultural works than the wages paid for MGNREGA works.

4.6. How has MGNREGA affected Labour Migration (Labour Migrating back into village and Migrated out of village), Direction of Migration (Rural to Urban and Vice-versa):

Sometimes some of the households who got registration under MGNREGA, may not get employment due to the distribution of labour to various works which are to be attended immediately. In such circumstances, the households, who could not get employment, are forced to migrate from the village to other place where they can get employment. But some type of works need excess labour to complete in the stipulated schedule. Under this situation, the households who migrated to other places obviously return back to their parent village to participate in those works and to complete the works in the targeted time bound.

The details of migration incidents in the sample villages of sample districts are presented in the Table 4.4. After the implementation of MGNREGA scheme, the migration of labourers for want of employment was reduced to a great extent. However, in stray cases where the work was not equally distributed to all the persons demanded employment, the labour households who cannot maintain their livelihood had to migrate from the parent village to other place where they can get employment.

Viewing the overall performance of total sample households, the number of members per household who migrated from the villages are reported to be 0.2 and the same number of households returned back to their parental village to participate in NREGA works. Out of the total number of members returned back to their parental village, 70 per cent of the members worked earlier near by town, 20 per cent of the members in the same district and 10 per cent of the members in the same state. Moreover, during their migration period, 60 per cent of the members were engaged in Construction works and 40 per cent were engaged in Trading and Transport services. Moreover, 80 per cent of the total migrated households reported that they have shifted to that place only last year and only 20 per cent have reported to have migrated during before last year. All the members returned back to the parental village reported that their family is better off now compared to previous occupation.

It can be observed from the table that the per household members migrated from the village are reported to be 0.3 in Chittoor and Adilabad districts, 0.1 in Krishna and Mahboobnagar districts and 0.2 in Srikakulam district. The same persons who migrated from their parent villages to other places returned back to their parent villages to participate in the MGNREGA works initiated in their villages. The members who returned back to villages worked earlier in other places viz., nearby town, same distinct way and in same state.

The district-wise details of migration has taken place in district way in Adilabad district among the members migrated to other places and returned back to parent villages, 66.67 per cent worked earlier nearby town and 33.33 per cent at a place in the same district. These members were engaged in construction works and trading services respectively. In Chittoor district, also the percentages of migrants are the same as in Adilabad district but 33.33 per cent were engaged in construction/mining work and 66.67 per cent in trading services. In Mahboobnagar district the percentage of members migrated to the place nearby town engaged only in construction works. In Srikakulam district, out of the total migrated, 50 per cent migrated to the place nearby town and 50 per cent to a distant place in the state. All the members were engaged in construction or mining works at their respective places. In Krishna, all the members migrated to a place nearby town and engaged in trading services.

With reference to the question of improvement in the standard of living of the migrant persons, all the persons who returned back to their parent village expressed that their families are comparatively maintaining a better standard of living. Moreover, the migration of members is not only due to non-availability of work but also to earn a better wage rate than the stipulated wage rates in MGNREGA works. In some cases, where the members fail to achieve a better wage rate at their migrated places, there they obviously return back to their parent villages to earn at least a minimum wage to maintain their livelihood.

Table 4.4 – Migration incidence in selected districts in MGNREGA - 2009

Characteristics		Adilabad	Chittoor	Mahboob-nagar	Srikakulam	Krishna	Overall (State)
No. of members migrated from the village because of not getting work under MGNREGA even after registration (per household)		0.3	0.3	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.2
No. of out-migrated members returned back to village because of getting work in MGNREGA (per household)		0.3	0.3	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.2
In the case some members returned back to the village to work under MGNREGA where were they earlier working (% of returned members)	Nearby Village						-
	Nearby Town	0.2 (66.67)	0.2 (66.67)	0.1 (100.00)	0.1 (50.00)	0.1 (100.00)	0.14 (70.00)
	Same District	0.1 (33.33)	0.1 (33.33)	-	-	-	0.04 (20.00)
	Same State	-	-	-	0.1 (50.00)	-	0.02 (10.00)
	Other State	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Other Country	-	-	-	-	-	-
In the case of some members returned back to the village to work under MGNREGA which activity earlier working in (% of returned members)	Const/manufacturing/mining	0.2 (66.67)	0.1 (33.33)	0.1 (100.00)	0.2 (100.00)	-	0.12 (60.00)
	Trading/services and transport	0.1 (33.33)	0.2 (66.67)	-	-	0.1 (100.00)	0.08 (40.00)
	Private work/self business	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Other government work	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Agriculture labour	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Any other	-	-	-	-	-	-
Year in which shifted (% of shifted hh)	Shifted last year	0.2 (66.67)	0.2 (66.67)	0.1 (100.00)	0.2 (100.00)	0.1 (100.00)	0.16 (80.00)
	Shifted before last year	0.1 (33.33)	0.1 (33.33)	-	-	-	0.04 (20.00)
Is your family better off now compared to previous occupation (% of shifted hh)		0.3 (100.00)	0.3 (100.00)	0.1 (100.00)	0.2 (100.00)	0.1 (100.00)	0.2 (100.00)

Source: Field Survey 2011.

Note: Figures in parentheses refer percentages

4.7. Summing Up:

Viewing the overall performance of the districts, the aggregate number of members per households is reported as 2.01. The per household number of days employed are reported to be 43.10 while across caste groups, the per household number of days of employment ranged between 35.89 in General category and 59.58 in Scheduled Tribe category. The per household number of days of employment in women category reported to be 19.68. An overall wage rate of Rs. 97.56 is reported in the state, while across caste groups the wage rates are ranged from 63.90 in Scheduled Tribe category to Rs. 100.44 in OBC category. The average wage rate for women is reported to be Rs. 77/-.

Out of the total sample of 200 households, 41.50 per cent of households were engaged in Land Development works, 27 per cent of households were employed in Micro Irrigation works, 22.50 per cent of households in Water Conservation and Water Harvesting, 5 per cent in Provision of Irrigation facility works and 4 per cent of households were employed in Rural Connectivity activities. Among the total sample of households 75.50 per cent of households reported the quality of the assets created are good and 24.50 per cent of households have reported in quality of the assets as very good. None of the households have reported to have received unemployment allowance for not getting work under MGNREGA after registration.

The aggregate wage rates for all types of works involved by the households are reported higher than the wage rates of MGNREGA. The male labourers of non-beneficiary households have reported higher wage rates than the wage rates of beneficiary males for involving in Agricultural and Non-Agricultural Casual Labour work. Moreover, the co-efficients of variation for non-agricultural casual labour work are reported 9.18 and 6.78 respectively for beneficiary and non-beneficiary households compared to Agricultural Casual Labour work attended by both categories of households. However, much variation of wage rates is observed in case of female migrant workers of beneficiary households and male migrant workers of non-beneficiary households. The wage rates of all works other than NREGA are reported higher than the MGNREGA wage rates. Moreover, much variation is observed in the wage rates between males and females for all works other than MGNREGA. Due to higher wage rates for the works other than MGNREGA works, the labourers are very much inclined towards the other works than MGNREGA works.

Viewing the overall performance of total sample households, the number of members per household who migrated from the villages are reported to be 0.2 and the same number of households returned back to their parental village to participate in NREGA works. Out of the total number of members returned back to their parental village, 70 per cent of the members worked earlier nearby town, 20 per cent of the members in the same district and 10 per cent of the members in the same state. Moreover, during their migration period, 60 per cent of the members were engaged in Construction works and 40 per cent were engaged in Trading and Transport services. Moreover, 80 per cent of the total migrated households reported that they have shifted to that place only last year and only 20 per cent have reported to have migrated during before last year. All the members returned back to the parental village reported that their family is better off now compared to previous occupation.

Observing the village level performance of MGNREGA scheme, one can understand that the government is providing employment but not full of 100 days to every household demanded employment as targeted in the act. No sample household, in the sample villages, received unemployment allowance for not getting work under MGNREGA after registration. The wage rates reported in the sample villages for MGNREGA works ranged between Rs. 91.05 and Rs. 95.92, which are higher than the state average wage rate of Rs. 90.35 during 2009-10. Much variation in the aggregate wage rates of MGNREGA works is observed in Chittoor, Adilabad and Krishna districts when compared to Mahboobnagar and Srikakulam districts. The reason may be attributed to the inconsistent number of days of employment for different types of MGNREGA works. The labourers are more attracted by the higher wages paid for agricultural and non-agricultural works than the wages paid for MGNREGA works. The migration of members is not only due to non-availability of work but also to earn a better wage rate than the stipulated wage rates in MGNREGA works. However, in some cases where the members failed to achieve a better wage rate at their migrated places, there from they obviously returned back to their parent villages to earn at-least a minimum wage to maintain their livelihood.

CHAPTER-V

THE FUNCTIONING OF MGNREGA-QUALITATIVE ASPECTS

Introduction:

In this chapter, it has been made an attempt to analyze the comparative picture of MGNREGA for the sample villages (10) of five selected districts in A.P. Based on the responses of participants, it is examined the vulnerability of scheme participants against Assets building, strength of borrowings, qualitative and quantitative functioning of MGNREGA, potential benefits of the scheme and the level of food security achieved through the programme.

5.1.: Household Assets Holdings:

In the arena of **assets holding** by per household of the beneficiary in the possession of assets is at the lowest by 15 times for ornaments followed by utensils (Table 5.1) other assets like land, 'others' and consumer assets reported much lower possession by the beneficiary against non-beneficiary. It clearly divulges the level of distance of asset holding in between two groups in A.P. It is found that agricultural implements and live stock show less variation in the per house holding between two groups.

TABLE 5.1 Assets Holding of Sample Villages in Andhra Pradesh (Rs. Per household)

	Beneficiary	Non Beneficiary	Aggregate
Land	3296	26364	7909.6
House property	1284.38	5192	2065.9
Live stock	281.19	918	408.55
Agricultural implements	53.44	108	47.25
Consumer assets	190.29	1015	355.23
Business assets	272.81	994	417.05
Ornaments	217.56	1990	572.05
Utensils	19.56	168.1	49.27
Others	169.23	944.4	324.27
Total	5784.46	37693.5	12149.17

Source: Field survey 2011

In aggregate of both participants and non-participants for all study villages, it is reported that the highest is land with 65% followed by housing property. The other

significant asset holding items are 1) ornaments 2) Business assets and 3) live stock. The least is with agricultural implements by 0.39%. In rural area, as usual, the land is the major asset generation and it is appeared in this study.

5.2A Household Status on Borrowings and their Financial Vulnerability:

The **borrowings**, being sample households of villages in A.P., is presented in table 5.2. 'Others' shows the highest share out of all sources of loan followed by institutional loan. As estimated at national level, the institutional finance is high for non-beneficiaries than their counter part. There is significant fact that the both groups are equally in the hands of 'traders-cum-money lenders'. It reports the local traders influence in financial matters in rural area. In these study villages, commission agent has his influence over beneficiaries. When compared to all other groups, land employment is meager but it is comparatively high to beneficiaries.

Table 5.2 : Borrowings by Sample Households of Villages in Andhra Pradesh (Rs. Per household)

Occupation		Beneficiaries	Non-Beneficiaries	Aggregate
Source of Loan	Institutional Loan (Banks)	16150	10065	14813
	Traders-cum-money lenders	6155	3300	5584
	Commission Agent	625	-	500
	Landlord Employment	3100	1200	2720
	Friends/ Relatives	100	-	80
	Others	33250	16965	30273
Purpose of Loan	Daily Consumption	13665	7570	12446
	Social Ceremony	675	-	540
	Purchase of Land, Live Stock or Other Assets	2550	2100	2460
	Consumer Durables	1300	1040	1248
	Construction	1885	-	1508
	Health Treatment	2500	1500	2300
	Others	10675	5055	9771
Rate of Interest (Percent per Annum)		24	24	24

Source: Field survey 2011

The purpose of loan divulges the highest share of daily consumption followed by 'others' for both groups of the study. Interestingly both participants and non-participants have undergone significant portion of loan to purchase of land, live stock or other assets

and this loan purpose has shown third place across the purposes to both groups. The similar trend could be observed for 'health treatment'. The per household spending is high for 'daily consumption' to the beneficiaries when compared to non-beneficiary in the loan purpose. All the spending of above purpose of loans is high for beneficiaries compared to non-beneficiaries. The rate of interest is one and the same rate but it is 24% which is very high.

In the aggregate of sources of loan 'others' report the highest and followed by institutional loan. Traders-cum-money lenders occupied third place followed by landlord employment. Thus these four are important sources of loan in rural A.P. in study villages. At aggregate level, 'Daily Consumption' exhibited the first place and the second place is shown by 'others' followed by purchase of land, live stock and other assets.

5.2B Household Strength on Borrowing and other Household Assets of Sample Villages:

At aggregate level also the similar groups of the above trends are observed. Rate of interest is exorbitant as well as in case of individual groups. The **borrowing strength** of householders indicates the level of credit available during exigencies. It is presented the information of the study area in Table 5.3. A significant fact appears that the highest

Table 5.3 : Household Strength on Borrowing and other Household Assets of Sample Villages in Andhra Pradesh - 2011
(% of households)

Occupation	Bene- ficiary	Non Bene- ficiary	Aggre- gate
Doing wage work to those whom they are indebted	4.00	2.6	6.6
Availability of co – operative credit society in village	-	-	-
Family member being member of such society	7.6	2	9.6
Availability of informal credit society/SHG in village	80.4	80	80.4
Family member being member of such society	80.4	80	80.4
Having account in a bank/post office/other institution	56	43.2	59.2
Having any stock/bond/shares/other similar assets	11.4	3.2	14.6
Having life insurance policy	8.4	2.2	10.6

Source: Field survey 2011

borrowing (80%) is available to both groups-beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries by the SHG in village followed by bank/post-office/other institution. There is no availability of credit from co-operative society to either group. One welcome feature is that the least appears

from 'doing wage work to those whom they are indebted'. This indicates decline of attached labour in the study area. Life insurance has also played good role for households in the strength of borrowing, but it is high for beneficiaries than its counterpart.

5.3: Qualitative Functioning of MGNERGA from Sample Villages:

The **qualitative functioning** of scheme in A.P. has been estimated through table 5.4. There is **no payment** of fees or charges or bribe to get a '**Job Card**'. Since there is no payment, no bribe will appear in the study area. The participants by 10% expressed that there was a practice of 'no entry made' even through the job card holders worked. All the participants reported that there was no incomplete or missing or fake information in the maintenance of job cards in the scheme in the study area. No entry was overwritten in the study area and there was no blank or partly blank of the signature column of job card. All the participants informed the job card with them only. Nowhere the job card is kept or engaged.

The **work application** was received and arranged employment as per 90% participants, while 10% of them disagreed with the statement. The receipt for work application is not a regular practice, as 20% of participants say that there is no issuing of receipt. Through the practice prevails, the work is arranged within 15 days of the application made. There is no existence of unemployment allowance and the participants are unable to inform regarding this aspect.

The payments of wages are similar to both men and women in the scheme as informed by 90% participants. There is little reference for the higher wages for men as 10% participants report this. The wages are paid on piece rate/task wage basis in the study area, since many participants (70%) have informed this periodicity. On daily wage basis, wages paid is referred by only 30% participants.

Measurement of work was done mostly on team basis or collective basis rather than individual one. And the wages are paid fortnightly. In rare cases, monthly payment took place. There are no responses regarding the payment more than a month or a year. The payment of wages are regular in the stipulated period and there are no any delays in the study area. Wages are paid to all participants through post office and there is no other reference for any payment from other sources like Sarpanch or government official.

Table 5.4: Qualitative questions related to Functioning of NERGA from Sample Villages in Andhra Pradesh - 2011

(Percentage of HH)

Aspect	Variable	Yes	No	Not sure
Job Cards	Paid any fees/charges or bribe to get a job card		100	
	The amount paid for job card(exorbitant)			
	The amount paid as bribe (exorbitant)			
Irregularity in the Job card	No entries were made even through the job card holders had worked on NERGA	10	90	
	Some entries were incomplete or missing or fake information was entered		100	
	Some entries had been over written		100	
	The signature column was blank or partly blank		100	
Where was the card generally kept	With the card holders	100		
	With sarpanch or sachiv			
	With contractor			
	With the gram rojgar sevak			
	Elsewhere			
Work Application	Are you employed in response to an application for work	90	10	
	If applied, did you get a dated receipt for the application	80	20	
	If applied, did you get work within 15 days of application	100		
	In case of failure to provide work within 15 days unemployment allowance paid	80	20	
Payments of wages	Are the wage rates same for men and women	90		
	Wage rates higher for men	10		
	Wage rates higher for women	-		
	Wage paid on daily wage basis	30		
	Wage paid on piece rate/task -wage basis	70		
Measurement of work	Work was measured by individuals work	10		
	Work was measured by team measurement	70		
	Work was measured by collective measurement	20		
Period of wage payment	Wages were paid within a fortnight	90		
	Wage were paid within a month	10		
	Wages were paid more than a month	-		
	Wages were paid after one year	-		

Contd....

Table 5.4 : Qualitative questions related to Functioning of NERGA from Sample Villages in Andhra Pradesh - 2011

(Percentage of HH)

Aspect	Variable	Yes	No	Not sure
Who made the wage payment	Sarpanch or sachiv	-		
	Post office	100		
	Bank	-		
	Representative of line department	-		
	Other government official or any other	-		
In case of wage payment made in the bank	Bank account was on self's name	-		
	Spouse's name	-		
	Parents name	-		
	Children's name	-		
	Others	-		
	Individual account	-		
	Joint account	-		
In case of wages were not paid through bank	Did bank follow usual procedure of banking	-		
	Wage paid in front of all labourers	100		
	Wages paid on the worksite	-		
	Wages paid in panchayat bhawan	-		
	Wages paid on other public/private place	-		
Complaints regarding wage payment	Wages paid on some one's private residence	-		
	There were delays in wage payments	100		
	Wage paid less than the minimum wage		100	
	Wage paid less than asked for sign/thumb impression		100	
	Task was too much compared to the wages paid		100	
	Faced problems in accessing post office/bank accounts	50	50	
	On what basis wages were calculated not clear		100	
Details of Worksite facilities	Others	-		
	A board/gram panchayat member gave details of the sanctioned amount, work dimensions and other requisite details	100		
	The worksite had drinking water facility	100		
	Worksite had shade for periods of rest	100		
	Worksite had child care facility	100		
Worksite had first aid kit/medicines	100			

Contd....

Table 5.4 : Qualitative questions related to Functioning of NERGA from Sample Villages in Andhra Pradesh - 2011

(Percentage of HH)

Aspect	Variable	Yes	No	Not sure
Monitoring	Was there any authority to monitor the functioning of the NERGA administration	100		
	Any complaint lodged relating to worksite etc, to the gram panchyat, progarama officer or other officer		100	
	If yes, was any action taken on your complaint	-		
Economic Usefulness of the work	Work is very useful to the villagers	100		
	Work is quite useful to the villagers	-		
	Work is not particularly useful to the villagers	-		
	Work is useless for the villagers	-		
Nature of assets And their Durability in which the interview involved	The structure created may last up to one year	10		
	The structure created may last up to five year	10	20	
	The structure created may last up to ten year	10		
	The structure created may last more than ten year	70		
	Is it worth creating the structure	100		
	Was the structure created adequate	90	10	
	No structure needed more attention to be able to last long	-		
How has NREGA has affected labour Migration?	Did any your family members migrated out for job after implementation of NERGA (year 2005 onwards)		100	
	If yes, only one member of the family migrated	-		
	More than one member of the family migrated	-		
	Are wages higher in city or other states than NERGA		100	
	Any family member migrated as wage labourer with dissatisfaction from NERGA		100	
	If yes only one member of the family migrated	-		
	More than one member of the family migrated	-		

Contd....

Table 5.4: Qualitative questions related to Functioning of NERGA from Sample Villages in Andhra Pradesh - 2011

Aspect	Variable	(Percentage of HH)		
		Yes	No	Not sure
Respondents Awareness About NREGA Implementation	Are respondents aware about NERGA implementation ?	100		
	Right to apply for work and get employed within 15 days	100		
	The work application procedure	100		
	Right to minimum wages	100		
	The level of minimum wages	100		
	The wage calculation method	100		
	Right to the unemployment allowance		100	
	Minimum worksite facilities(drinking water, first aid)	100		
	Mandatory availability of muster rolls at the worksite	100		
	The list of permissible works under the NERGA	100		
Potential Benefits of NREGA	NERGA enhanced food security	100		
	NERGA provided protection against extreme poverty	100		
	NERGA helped to reduce distress migration	100		
	NERGA helped to reduce indebtedness	90		10
	NERGA gave grate economic independence to women	100		
	NERGA generated purchasing power at local economy	100		
Questions Related to food security	Did your family get full two meals throughout year 2009	100		
	Family did not get sufficient food for noe month			
	Family did not get sufficient food for two month			
	Family did not get sufficient food for above two month			
	How did you cope with the situation - take loan			
	Catch fish/rat/crab etc			
	Near/sometime starvation/take meal only once			
	Begging			
	Any other			

Source: Field survey 2011

When the wages are not paid through bank/post office, the payment has taken place in front of all labourers. There are no occasions for the payment at work site or Panchayat Bhavan or Private Place/residence. It can be inferred that the process of wages and payments to participants are not misdirected and delayed.

There are certain complaints in the payment process. All the participants (100%) reported that there are delays in the payment of wages. Further, they divulged that there are some problems in getting access to post office/bank accounts. Apart from the above problems, the other problems like less payment, too much comparison of task to the paid wages and calculation basis are not appeared in the study area.

All the **Work Site Facilities** are available in the study area. All the participants reported the availability and access of those facilities. Gram Panchayat has given the details of work measurements. Drinking facility, shade for rest, Child care facility and First Aid Kit are fully available in the sample villages.

Monitoring is there for the functioning of the MGNREGA scheme. No complaint in this regard has taken place. Economic usefulness of work is accepted by all the participants. All the participants by 100% informed the usefulness of the work. All the participants agreed that the created structures were worthy. Only 90% workers expressed that the created work was adequate. Many workers (70%) commented that the work would last for more than ten years. The participants by 10% commented that the created structures would last for one year or five years or up to ten years.

Labour migration to city has become a feature for some part of the labour, despite MGNREGA has been there in sample districts. Even after 2005 there has been labour migration to towns. One member of the family used to migrate or commute to the proximate town/city. This may be because of higher wage than MGNREGA wage and the body fitness to the manual work in the towns.

All the participants unanimously expressed the existence of higher wages to the labour who commute to the towns. There is no any dissatisfaction to the labour who work in the scheme, since there are women and aged men. These workers do not find fitness to the arduous jobs in the towns or elsewhere.

Awareness of respondents about MGNREGA implementation is fully acknowledged. They (100%) know very well about scheme and rights 'to work' within 15 days. They are in touch with application procedure. All the participants are conscious

about the right to minimum wages, level of minimum wages and the method of wage calculation. They (100%) do not know about unemployment allowance. All the participants know the requisites at work site ex. drinking water, first aid and shadow. They are happy with the list of possible works under the scheme in the sample districts of A.P.

In the accrual of '**Potential of Benefits**' of MGNREGA, the respondents are satisfied with the benefits received. It is observed that there is good food security established to the workers. Further they reported that the scheme helped them to come out from poverty chains. The scheme has generated employment so as to reduce distress migration. Only 90% participants informed that the scheme enabled them to reduce indebtedness. Unanimously all the workers agreed that the women economic independence has increased enormously in the sample districts of A.P. There has taken place the increase of purchasing power among all the workers.

Food Security has shown lot of strength in the sample villages of A.P. All family members of participants have expressed that they had two meals across the whole year during 2009. There is no other opinion in case of food security. All the families of workers had food for all the months during 2009. They did not refer any month or two months of lacking food for their families. There are no comments regarding other aspects like loan for the purpose of food or any begging.

5.4 Some Qualitative Aspects of MGNREGA IN A.P.:

The **quantitative functioning** of MGNREGA in A.P. is given in table 5.5. All the participants answered that there was no demand for any bribe to job card issuing. All the job cards are kept with the participants. The whole scheme is monitored by Panchayat Raj in the study districts of A.P. There are some complaints at the rate of 29% but the redressal taken place is at the rate of 19% of the complaints. The 20% of the participants informed that there was higher wage and therefore they migrated to town. Some of the workers came back from town due to non-fitness of body to the manual work and also the overage of the labour. The higher wages and physical fitness to the work in the town are the best causes for labour migration to town in the sample districts A.P.

5.5 Potential Benefits of MGNREGA IN A.P.:

Potential benefits of MGNREGA in sample villages of A.P. are presented in table 5.6. All the participants reported the enhancement of food security. As previously discussed, all the workers of the scheme have divulged a very strong positive impact on poverty. Because of the scheme, the women workers found economic independence which

is applicable to all the workers in the sample villages of A.P. The programme has reduced indebtedness among the participants (90%).

Table 5.5 : Quantitative questions related to NREGA functioning Sample villages of Andhra Pradesh – 2011
(Percentage of HH)

S.No	variable
1	If you paid some amount to get job card: how much for job card and how much bribe.
Answer	100 % not paid any amount to get job card
2	If the job card is not kept with you, what is the reason for that?
Answer	No
3	If there is any authority who monitors the functioning of NREGA then describe the details
Answer	100 % Panchayat Raj
4	If you lodged any complaints give details and also provide details of what action was taken
Answer	29 % complaint, 19% Action taken
5	Provide description of the work and its starting date?
Answer	Yes 36%
6	Provide details of family members migrated to city after implementation of NREGA and why
Answer	-
7	Provide details of family members migrated back to village to work in NREGA and why?
Answer	Yes 25.6%
8	Provide details of family members migrated to city with dissatisfaction of NREGA and why?
Answer	-

Source: Field survey 2011

Table 5.6: Provide details on the following potential benefits of NERGA of Sample Villages in Andhra Pradesh - 2011
(Percentage of HH)

Component	Yes	No
NREGA enhance food security	100	-
NREGA provided protection against extreme poverty	100	-
NREGA gave greater economic independence to women	100	-
NREGA helped to reduce distress migration	90	10
NREGA helped to reduced indebtedness	80	20
NREGA gave greater economic independence to women	100	-

Source: Field survey 2011

5.6 Quantitative Aspects of Food Security of Sample Villages of A.P.:

The quantitative aspects of food security of sample villages of A.P. is shown in table 5.7. There is existence of sufficient food for the whole year and no worker from the scheme suffered from any deprivations. Main expenditure faced by the participants is for education by 34% and for medical by 66%. They reported that these are the basic heads which are demanding much expenditure out of their incomes. The stable wage rates are lacking to the households. Many (55%) expressed this problem to their families. Further, they informed that there was a problem of in-time works from other sources. To develop the scheme, the participants (60%) viewed for the increase of number of days of scheme. The 40% of workers informed that there should be available works nearer to village, since the villagers found much problem to reach the distant worksites and additional time and energy taken to reach these sites. The landless labour should be given higher priority in the allocation of work. This is to be covered 100% of the workers of the village. It will enable them to enhance their income levels and to possess stable income sources.

Table 5.7: Quantitative questions related to food security of Sample villages of Andhra Pradesh – 2011
(Percentage of HH)

1	Do you feel that your family does not have sufficient food for the whole year give reasons
Answer	No
2	Have you faced any deprivations other than food insufficiency? If yeas, explain
Answer	No
3	What were the main difficulties you and your family faced during the last year?
Answer	34% education, 66% Medical
4	What is the most important thing your household lacks
Answer	55% In Sufficient wage rates in other activity, 45 % Availability of other works in time
5	What is the suggestion for amelioration
Answer	60 % Increase in number of working days, 40% Availability of other works nearer to village
6	Any suggestions to improve NREGA functioning
Answer	100 % Compulsory work allocation for exclusively landless

Source: Field survey 2011

Summary:

The asset holding is reported that the highest is land with 65% followed by housing property. The purpose of loan divulges the highest share of daily consumption followed by 'others' for both groups of the study, but the rate of interest is 24% which is very high. A significant fact appears that the highest borrowing (80%) is available to both groups-beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries by the SHG in village followed by bank/post-office/other institution. There is no payment of fees or charges or bribe to get a 'Job Card'. The work application was received and arranged employment as per 90% participants, while 10% of them disagreed with the statement. The payments of wages are similar to both men and women in the scheme as informed by 90% participants. Measurement of work was done mostly on team basis or collective basis rather than individual one. And the wages are paid fortnightly. It can be inferred that the process of wages and payments to participants are not misdirected and delayed, while some workers (100%) reported that there are delays in the payment of wages. Further, they divulged that there are some problems in getting access to post office/bank accounts. All the 'Work Site Facilities' are available in the study area. Monitoring is there for the functioning of the MGNREGA scheme. No complaint in this regard has taken place. Economic usefulness of work is accepted by all the participants. Labour migration to city has become a feature for some part of the labour, despite MGNREGA has been there in sample districts. Awareness of respondents about MGNREGA implementation is fully acknowledged.

It is observed that there is good food security established to the workers. Further they reported that the scheme helped them to come out from poverty chains. The scheme has generated employment so as to reduce distress migration. Only 90% participants informed that the scheme enabled them to reduce indebtedness. Unanimously all the workers agreed that the women economic independence has increased enormously in the sample districts of A.P. There are some complaints at the rate of 29% but the redressal taken place is at the rate of 19% of the complaints. The landless labour should be given higher priority in the allocation of work. This is to be covered 100% of the workers of the village. It will enable them to enhance their income levels and to possess stable income sources.

CHAPTER-VI

MGNREGA IMPACT ON VILLAGE ECONOMY

Introduction:

It has been examined the infrastructure, occupational shift and existing wage rates in the sample villages in the selected districts in A.P. Further, the average prevailing labour charges for agricultural operations are analyzed. How the qualitative changes taken place in the study villages are estimated due to MGNREGA. Lastly the qualitative functioning of the programme in the selected districts is examined with reference to the perception of the programme participants.

6.1 Infrastructure Available in the Sample Villages in A.P.:

The infrastructure is the basic factor for good level of production and incomes in either society (Table 6.1). It is estimated the infrastructure available with in the study villages in A.P. All the villages (100 %) have road connectivity, while the rain connectivity is 100 % from nearest village with average distance of 18.70 kms. All the 90% villages have telephone connection but 10 percent villages meet from the nearest village by 4 kms average distance. Post office shows its presence in 80 per cent villages, while 20 per cent villages visit the nearest villages by covering the average distance 5.50 kms.

Table 6.1- Infrastructure Available Within the Village (Percentage of Villages)

	within village	nearest village	if nearest village average distance (KMs)
Road connectivity	100	--	--
Railway connectivity	--	100	18.70
Land line or mobile connectivity	90	10	4.00
Post office	80	20	5.50
Co-operative credit society	20	80	7.40
Regional rural bank	--	100	9.90
Commercial bank	--	100	11.60
Agricultural produce market	--	100	14.70
Self help group centre	80	20	9.50
School primary	100	--	--
School secondary	50	50	3.60
School higher secondary	--	100	6.30
Primary health centre	30	70	6.10
Hospital/dispensary	--	100	9.50
Gram Panchayat office	100	--	--
Fair price shop	70	30	8.70
Any other (anganwadi)	100	--	--

Source: Field survey 2011

Only 20 per cent villages under the sample in A.P. have co-operative societies and the other villages with the co-operative society which is located at 7.40 kms by overall distance. All villages (100 %) do not have RRBs and farmers find banks at 9.90 kms distance for Commercial Banks.

The Agricultural Marketing Centre (AMC) is available to neither study village but farmers are to transport their produce to nearest villages which are located at 14.70 kms average overall distance. The Self-Help Groups are formed and available to 80 per cent villages and 20 per cent villages are to move to 9.50 kms of the nearest village. All the villages (100 %) have primary schools, despite the secondary schools are located in 50 % villages and these are located by 3.60 kms to the uncovered villages.

No higher secondary is available in either study village in A.P but these are located at 6.30 kms to all the villages. The primary health center is available to 30 per cent sample villages, while the remaining villages are to reach other nearest village at a distance of 6.10 kms. No village is with hospital but these villages are to travel 9.50 kms. Every village possesses Gram Panchayat Office, while fair price shop is only available to 70 per cent villages and the others are to go 8.70 kms to purchase subsidized goods.

6.2 Occupational Structure in Sample villages:

The occupational structure and its diversification exhibit the sectoral dependence of rural people and their significance for the future policy formulation. As a whole the occupational structure has been diversified in rural A.P. during (2009-2010) Table – 6.2. The dependence on agriculture has been declined and the rural non-farm occupation has shown much increase. Transport and communication showed much growth (from 2.08 %

Table 6.2: Occupational Structure (Per cent of households)

Occupation	Reference period 2009	2001
1.Cultivators	43.80	45.87
2.Agricultural labour	49.20	49.17
3.Household small industry	1.74	1.54
4.Other manufacturing/mining	1.93	1.84
5.Construction	0.83	0.35
6.Tade, commerce and business	0.42	0.24
7.Transport and communication	2.08	1.08
8.Other services	--	--
Total	100.00	100.00

Source: Field survey 2011

to 1.08%), while the counter trend appeared for cultivation (from 45.87% to 43.80%). The rural non-farm employment displays raising trend. It clearly signifies the diversification of rural occupational structure.

6.3. Wage Rates of Labour in all Sample Villages: (State level/Overall):

The existing wages will be the guiding tool to know the level of poverty in the village economy in question. The shift of wages in between 2005 and 2009 took place in the villages in A.P. for male and female. The increase in agricultural wage for female is higher (80 %) than that of male (60%) (Table 6.3). It may be ascribed to the effect of MGNREGA. In case of non agricultural wage, the male has better edge in getting good wage than for female, whereas female has good increase in wage for construction work rather than the wage of male. This has become possible due to MGNREGA scheme based on the demand for labour. Under the other skilled work 'Pump set boring' has not received much hike in the wage which is very low than the wages of electrician and plumber. Out of all the different occupations referred, the electrician has the highest wage in sample villages in A.P.

Table 6.3 Wage rates for different activities
(Average in Rs.)

Activity		Reference period (2009)		Before NREGA(2005)	
		Male	Female	Male	Female
Prevailing agricultural wages		150	93.5	94	52
Prevailing non agricultural wages		125	64	72	39
Construction		155	106	128	69
Mining					
Other skilled work	Electrician	231		158	
	Plumber	195		142	
	Pump-set boring	120		85	

Source: Field survey 2011.

6.4. Average Prevailing Labour charges for Agricultural Operations in Sample Villages by Overall/State:

The prevailing labour charges for agricultural operations could be estimated (Table 6.4). There have been continued acceleration charges for different agricultural operations in study villages in A.P. Out of the charges, the charge for cane-cutting is the highest and followed by threshing of paddy during the study period 2009-2011. The other higher charges of agriculture operations are paddy weeding, transplanting and harvesting of paddy.

**Table 6.4 Prevailing labour charges for agricultural operations
(Average of all villages)**

Activity	Reference period 2009	Before NREGA	
		2005	2001
Ploughing	870	570	415
Leveling	625	365	245
Weeding	1690	1090	700
Paddy Transplanting	1525	1075	788
Harvesting of Wheat			
Harvesting of Paddy	1260	795	595
Harvesting of Grams	675	410	350
Harvesting of Pigeon Pea			
Harvesting of Ragi	170	120	65
Harvesting of Jowar			
Harvesting of Maize	750	575	425
Cane-Cutting	2250	1810	1295
Harvesting other Crops			
Digging of Potatoes			
Threshing of paddy	1940	1500	895
threshing of wheat			
winnowing of wheat/paddy	595	390	240

Source: Field survey 2011

6.5. Qualitative changes in Sample villages during Last One year in A.P:

The qualitative shift in the sample villages during last one year is presented in Table 6.5. There was shortage of agricultural wage labour at some point during last year, as expressed by 70 per cent participants and the same trend was true even after MGNREGA implementation. The cost of production at 20 per cent level due to agricultural labour was reported by 20 per cent participants, while the cost increased by 20 per cent to 50 per cent due to scarcity of agricultural labour was reported by 20 per cent participants. The 10 per cent participants felt that there was 100 per cent increase in the cost of production in cultivation due to increase of wage of agricultural labour.

After implementation of MGNREGA, some workers came back from town to village to work, was reported by 60 per cent participants and the remaining participants indicated the existence of migration to towns. The wage differential has become a major factor for

**Table 6.5.: Qualitative questions of changes in the villages during last one year
(% of HH)**

Description	Yes	No	Not sure
Was there shortage of agricultural wage labour at some point during last year	70	30	
After implementation of NREGA has there been a shortage of agriculture labour	70	30	
After implementation of NREGA the cost of production in agriculture increased due to Scarcity labour (in %)	20	30	
Cost increased by 20 per cent	20		
Cost increased by 20-50 per cent			
Cost increased by 50-75 per cent	10		
Cost increased by 100 per cent			
Cost increased by more than 100 per cent			
After implementation of NREGA labour who migrated earlier to town/city are coming back to work in the village	60	20	20
More labour is migrating from the village as wage rate in the town is higher than wage rate under NREGA or other activities in the village	50	20	30
Some labour has come back to work in NREGA but others are moving to the town/city because of wage differential	10	20	70
There is no change in labour migration by NREGA activities	10	20	70
After NREGA change in wages of casual labourers has increased	80	10	10
After NREGA change in wages of casual labourers has decreased	10		90
After NREGA change in wages of casual labourers remained same			
The trend of people living in village and going to work outside daily has increased	40	60	
The trend of people living in village and going to work outside for longer period has increased	40	60	
Has living standard improved in your village since the introduction of NREGA	100		
After NREGA have you witnessed increase in house hold consumption in village	100		
After NREGA have you witnessed more children are now going to the School	90	10	
After NREGA have you witnessed change in trend of attached labour in agriculture	100		
After NREGA have villagers awareness towards government schemes increased	100		

Source: Field survey 2011

migration of labour from village to town. Even after MGNREGA as per the village study, there is migration to town, as expressed positively by 50 per cent participants. The other 20 per cent reported no migration because of wage and the remaining 30 per cent

participants were unable to decide either side. The 70 per cent participants were not sure over the migration because of wage even after MGNREGA and the similar response was given for the changes in migration only 10 per cent participants report that there is change in wages of casual labour but 80 per cent participants report that there is increase in wages after MGNREGA. No one reported that there was no change in wages after the scheme in force.

The commutation of agricultural workers in between village and town has increased as responded by 40 per cent participants. All the participants (100 %) unanimously have informed the increase of standard of living. They further said there was clear enhancement in daily consumption in village. The children of the participants have the position to join to school much compared to previous situation. There is much sea change in attached labour in the village, as reported by 100 per cent participants and the awareness over government schemes has increased.

6.6 Qualitative Functioning of MGNREGA in A.P.:

The good function of any scheme will achieve its desired objectives when it is run properly. The qualitative function of MGNREGA is estimated (Table 6.6). There is 100 per cent shortage of agricultural labour at same point during July, August, November and December. After MGNREGA implementation, there has been shortage of agricultural labour by 100 per cent in September, October and November months. There has been continuous increase in wages by 20 per cent during the last 5 years after MGNREGA. The standard of living increased by 15 per cent in the study villages after the scheme implementation.

The household consumption increased in pulses and oil by 25 per cent due to the impact of MGNREGA for all the participants. The scheme has certainly impacted positively over the education of children of the participants and they said that there was 20 per cent increase for their children. In the study villages still attached labour has existed as per 40 per cent participants and 60 per cent participants informed no attached labour after the scheme in force. The Gram Sabha has increased awareness over the government schemes.

The suggestions given by participants over the scheme are:1) they wanted to increase the rate of wage by 45 percent participants 2) 50 per cent suggested to continue the 100 days and many participants (62%) suggested to stop the MGNREGA scheme during agricultural peak season. As a whole the scheme was given very good sway on the lives of agricultural labour in the study villages of A.P.

Table 6.6 Qualitative questions about the functioning of NREGA

	OPINION	Answers in %
Q1.	Was there a shortage of agricultural wage labour at some point during last year? If so in which months?	In the crop season July, Aug, Nov, Dec by 100%
Q2.	After implementation of NREGA has there been a shortage of agriculture labour? If yes in which years/months?	100% of shortage of labour in Sep, Oct, Nov
Q3.	Give details of change in wages of casual labour during the last 5 years after NREGA	Increased by 20%
Q4.	In what way the standard of living improved in your village since the introduction of NREGA?	Increased by 15%
Q5.	In what way the household consumption improved in your village since the introduction of NREGA	Purchase pulses and oils by 25%
Q6.	In what way NREGA has impacted the children education	Children going to School & purchase of books by 20%
Q7.	In what way NREGA has impacted the trends of attached labour in agriculture	60% no attached labour and 40% attached labour
Q8.	In what way NREGA has improved villagers awareness towards government schemes	55% of Grama Sabha
Q9.	Your suggestions to improve the implementation of NREGA for the benefits of both labourers as well as cultivators?	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. NREGA increase of wage rate by 45% 2. NREGA work 100 days continuing by 50% 3. Agriculture Peak season NREGA work should stop by 62%

Source: Field survey 2011

Note: This table is only indicative and the answer need to be coded and presented in percentage terms.

Summary:

The infrastructure is the basic factor for good level of production and incomes in either society/economy. It is estimated the infrastructure available within the study villages in A.P. All the villages (100 %) have road connectivity, while the rain connectivity is 100 % from nearest village with average distance of 18.70 kms. The dependence on agriculture has been declined and the rural non-farm occupation has shown much increase. The shift of wages in between 2005 and 2009 took place in the villages in A.P. for male and female. The increase in agricultural wage for female is higher (80 %) than that of male (60%). In case of non agricultural wage, the male has better edge in getting good wage than for female. Out of all the different occupations referred, the electrician has the highest wage in sample villages in A.P. Out of the agricultural charges, the charge for cane-cutting is the highest and followed by threshing of paddy during the study period 2009-2011. The other higher

charges of agriculture operations are paddy weeding, transplanting and harvesting of paddy. The wage differential has become a major factor for migration of labour from village to town. Even after MGNREGA as per the village study, there is migration to town, as expressed positively by 50 per cent participants. All the participants (100 %) unanimously have informed the increase of standard of living. They further said that there was clear enhancement in daily consumption in village. After MGNREGA implementation, there has been shortage of agricultural labour by 100 per cent in September, October and November months. There has been continuous increase in wages by 20 per cent during the last 5 years after MGNREGA. It is suggested to stop the MGNREGA scheme during agricultural peak season. As a whole the scheme was given very good sway on the lives of agricultural labour in the study villages of A.P.

CHAPTER – VII

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

7.1. Introduction:

It was realized that a sustainable strategy of poverty alleviation has to be based on increasing the productive employment opportunities in the process of growth itself. As a result, the stress was laid on employment and poverty alleviation in the sixth five Year Plan onwards.

A) National Rural Employment Programme (NREP):

The Ministry of Rural Development, Government of India launched National Rural Employment Programme (NREP) in October 1980 to generate additional gainful employment in rural areas with an outlay of Rs. 1620 crores, which was to be shared equally between the Central government and state governments. The important objective of this programme was creation of durable assets. This programme apparently lacked a direct focus on the target-group for whom it was meant.

B) Rural Landless Employment Guarantee Programme (RLEGP):

This programme was introduced by the Ministry of Rural Development, Government of India on 15th August, 1983, to supplement NREP with the objective of improving and expanding employment opportunities for the rural landless. The prime objective of this programme was providing guarantee of employment to at least one member of every landless household upto 100 days in a year and creating durable assets for strengthening the infrastructure so as to meet the growing needs of the rural economy. During 1985 the Central Committee approved 320 projects with an estimated cost of Rs. 906.59 crores. The target for employment generation in 1983-84 and 1984-85 was fixed at 360 million man days against which 72.27 per cent of man-days of employment was actually generated. Hence both the projects viz., NREP and RLEGP were merged as Jawahar Rozgar Yojana (JRY).

C) JAWAHAR ROZGAR YOJANA (JRY):

Jawahar Rozgar Yojana (JRY) was launched in the last year of 7th Five Year Plan with a total allocation of Rs. 2,600 crores to generate 931 million man-days of employment. The Primary objective of the programme was generation of additional employment on productive works, which would either be of sustained benefit to the poor or to contribute to the creation of rural infrastructure.

Under the programme, projects were to be executed by the Government Ministries and agencies without the contractors so that full benefit of wages should go to the workers. The payments to contractors constituted at least 10 per cent of the cost of project. Clear-cut guidelines were absent regarding the Criteria to be used by the Panchayats in selecting the rural poor.

D) Employment Assurance Scheme (EAS):

The scheme was launched on 2nd October, 1993 in 1775 identified backward blocks situated in drought prone, desert, tribal and hill areas in which the revamped public distribution system was in operation by District Rural Development Agency (DRDA).

However, it was felt that a stage has come when the development of village infrastructure needs to be taken up in a planned manner. This could best be done by the village Panchayats who are closest to the ground realities and who can effectively determine their local needs. Accordingly, the government had restructured the existing wage employment programme namely Jawahar Rozgar Yojana (JRY) and Employment Assurance Scheme (EAS) and the new programme is named as Jawahar Gram Samridhi Yojana (JGSY).

E) Jawahar Gram Samridhi Yojana (JGSY):

This programme was dedicated entirely to the development of rural infrastructure at the village level and implemented by the village panchayats. This programme came into effect from 1st April, 1999. The primary objective of JGSY was creation of demand driven community village infrastructure including durable assets at the village level and assets to enable the rural poor to increase the opportunities for sustained employment. The secondary objective was

generation of wage employment for the unemployed poor in the rural areas. The JGSY was implemented by village level institutions (PRIs) while the EAS relied on the State Administrative apparatus. Consequently EAS and JGSY were merged into a new scheme, the "Sampoorna Grammen Rozgar Yojana (SGRY).

F) Sampoorna Grameen Rozgar Yojana (SGRY):

The "Sampoorna Grameen Rozgar Yojana" (SGRY) was started in September, 2001. The objectives of SGRY were to provide additional wage employment in rural areas and also food security, alongside the creation of durable community, social and economic assets and infrastructure development. The SGRY also encompasses all food for work programmes in the country since it includes a special component for augmenting food security through additional wage employment in calamity affected rural areas. There was a need for substantial additional investment in these districts to convert their surplus labour into required capital formation solving livelihood issues. Such an attempt was started on January 2000-01 by Ministry of Rural Development, Government of India, by introducing a new programme "The National Food for Work Programme".

G) National Food for Work Programme (NFFWP):

An attempt was made, through the programme, to co-ordinate among different on-going schemes, which had wage employment potential, so that the focused approach provides a solid base for the districts to take-off on their own. It was felt that there was an excess flow of food grains for the poor through the wage employment schemes.

H) National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (MGNREGA):

In the annals of employment generation schemes this programme is a mile stone. This act was passed in the year 2005. MGNREGA has extensive in-built transparency safeguards. The act is designed to offer employment within 15 days of application of work, if the employment cannot be provided by the authorities, then daily un-employment allowance has to be paid.

Features of MGNREGA:

- i) Time bound employment guarantee and wage payment within 15 days.
- ii) Incentive-disincentive structure to the state Governments for providing employment, as 90 per cent of the cost for employment provided is borne by the Centre while payment of unemployment allowances are borne by the State Governments (at their own cost); and
- iii) Emphasis on labour intensive works prohibiting the use of contractors and machinery.
- iv) The Act mandates 33 per cent participation for women.
- v) The cost sharing is 75 per cent and 25 per cent by central and state governments respectively.

Key Processes in MGNREGA:

- a) Adult members of rural households submit their name, age and address with photo to the Gram Panchayat.
- b) The Gram Panchayat registers households after making enquiry and issues a job card which contains the details of adult member enrolled and his/her photo.
- c) Registered person can submit an application for work in writing (for at least fourteen days of continuous work) either to Panchayat or to Programme Officer.
- d) The Panchayat/Programme Officer will accept the valid application and issue dated receipt of application and the letter providing work will be sent to the applicant and also displayed at Panchayat Office.
- e) The employment will be provided within a radius of 5 kilometers and if it is above 5 kilometers extra wage will be paid.
- f) If employment under the scheme is not provided within fifteen days of receipt of the application, the daily un-employment allowance will be paid to the applicant.

Phases of MGNREGA:

- | | | |
|-----------|----|---|
| I Phase | -- | notified in 200 districts with effect from February 2 nd 2006. |
| II Phase | -- | Extended to 130 districts in the financial year 2007-08 (113 districts from April 1 st 2007 and 17 districts of UP were notified with effect from May 15 th 2007) |
| III Phase | -- | Remaining districts in all the states/UTs were notified from April, 1 st 2008. |

7.1.I. The Problem:

Keeping in view several success and failure cases of earlier employment programmes, the MGNREGA was launched in the year 2005, with high expectations in terms of employment generation, alleviation of poverty, food security, halting migration and overall rural development. Though there are numerous studies, the limited studies made field studies from the beneficiaries. As the scheme is in its initial stage, it is inevitable for a study to evaluate the scheme for its impact on rural poor. How much distressed and disadvantageous sections are benefited in the form of relative wage, unseasonal wage support by MGNREGA works and the impact on the rural incomes. It is to be brought to the sharp focus to formulate policies. Hence, there is a need for the exploration of field level deficiencies across Andhra Pradesh. In this connection, the Ministry of Agriculture, Government of India asked its Agro-Economic Research Centres to take up an evaluation study on the implementation of MGNREGA in their respective states. Therefore, the Agro-Economic Research Centre, Andhra University, Visakhapatnam has taken up the evaluation study in Andhra Pradesh, with the following objectives:

7.1.J. Objectives of the study:

1. To measure the extent of man power employment generated under MGNREGA, their various socio-economic characteristics and gender variability in all the districts implementing MGNREGA since its inception in A.P.,
2. To compare wage differentials between MGNREGA activities and other wage employment activities,
3. To know the effect of MGNREGA on the pattern of migration from rural to urban areas,
4. To find out the nature of assets created under MGNREGA and their durability,
5. To Identify factors determining the participation of people in MGNREGA scheme and whether MGNREGA has been successful in ensuring better food security to the beneficiaries and
6. To assess the implementation of MGNREGA, its functioning and to suggest suitable policy measures to further strengthen the programme.

7.1.K. Data base and Methodology:

The study is based on both primary and secondary data. For primary data, reference period is January 2009 to December 2009. Five districts namely 1) Adilabad, 2) Chittoor, 3) Mahboobnagar, 4) Srikakulam and 5) Krishna are selected for the study from the state of Andhra Pradesh. From each district, two villages are selected keeping into account their distance from the location of the district or the main city/town. One village is selected from the nearby periphery of around 5 kilometers of the district/city head quarters and the second village is selected from the farthest location of 20 kilometers or more than that. From each selected village, primary data is collected from 20 participants in MGNREGA and 5 non-participants working as wage employed. Thus 10 villages are selected and a total number of 250 households are surveyed in detail with the help of a structured questionnaire. Therefore, in A.P., 200 participants and 50 non-participants are surveyed to estimate the variations specially and temporally. For selecting participant households, a list of all beneficiaries in the village is obtained from the Gram Panchayat or programme Officer in the village along with the information of caste and gender. After getting the list, the participant households are selected giving proportionate representation to the community i.e., i) Scheduled Castes ii) Scheduled Tribes 3) Other Backward Castes and 4) Other Castes, through a stratified Random sampling method with a due representation to gender. Since the list of non-participants of MGNREGA is not available, the non-participating households are selected with analogues design of MGNREGA workers. To analyze the incomes and consumption aspects of the participants, Gini ratio's and to analyze the determinants of participation in MGNREGA, the Logit function are adopted to find the variations across selected groups of workers and villages.

In addition to household questionnaire, a village schedule is also canvassed to capture the general changes that have taken place in the village during the last half decade and to take note of increase in labour charges for agricultural operations after the implementation of MGNREGA. The qualitative questions in the village schedule helps to know the change in standard of life. Village schedule in each village is canvassed with the help of a group discussion with Panchayat members, officials, educated and other well-informed people available in the village.

7.1.L. An Overview:

The present study report is divided into seven chapters. The first chapter being the introductory chapter, the second chapter presents the Man Power Employment generated under MGNREGA and its socio-economic characteristics. The third chapter deals with the household characteristics and their income and consumption pattern while the fourth chapter focuses on work profile under MGNREGA, wage structure and migration issues. The fifth chapter analyzes the functioning of MGNREGA probing the qualitative aspects and the sixth chapter discusses the impact of MGNREGA on village economy. Finally, concluding remarks and policy suggestions are presented in the seventh chapter.

7.2. Man Power Employment Generated under MGNREGA and its Socio-Economic Characteristics:

The scheme showed a better performance during 2009-10 than 2010-11 and 2008-09. A gradual improvement is observed in case of beneficiaries of Land reform/IAY and disabled beneficiary households during the three years. However, the basic objective of the Act in providing at least 100 days of guaranteed wage employment is not achieved as expected. The number of projects under taken in the state was increased from year to year. Increase in the number of works completed from 2008-09 to 2010-11 is observed in case of water conservation and water harvesting and Micro Irrigation works while a decrease is noticed in case of land development works and provision of Irrigation facilities. Viewing the performance of all ongoing projects from 2008-09 to 2010-11, a decrease in number is observed in almost all activities except in the case of Rural Connectivity activities, Harvesting works, Land Development works and provision of irrigation facilities. It is observed that about 33.25 per cent of increased amount was spent on complete projects during 2009-10 compared to the previous year. Between 2009-10, and 2010-11 the increase in the amount spent is reported around 72 per cent. Observing over the performance of the three years, larger amounts were spent on ongoing projects during 2009-10 than in the years 2010-11 and 2008-09.

Of the total number of muster rolls used 91.71 per cent of the muster rolls are verified during 2010-11 and 2009-10 and only 88.16 per cent in the year 2008-09. The percentage of verification of muster rolls ranged from 90.25 in Prakasam district to 92.80 in Mahaboobnagar

district during 2010-11. Glancing across the districts similar performance is observed during 2009-10 and 2010-11. Six districts have reported to have got the muster rolls verified below 80 per cent during 2008-09. The social audit was held in 86.47 per cent of Gram Panchayats in 2010-11 92.65 per cent of Panchayats in 2009-10 and only in 73.76 per cent of Gram Panchayats during 2008-09 in the state. The percentage of number of panchayats among the 2nd and 3rd phase of districts in which social audit was held ranged from 59.95 in Guntur to 97.67 in Kurnool district during 2009-10, from 64.77 in Rangareddy to 99.77 in Adilabad during 2010-11 and from 7.56 in Krishna district to 98.74 in Rangareddy during 2008-09. Meager percentage of GPs have reported to have conducted social audit in the districts of Visakhapatnam, Krishna and West Godavari. This is to due to irresponsibility and negligence by the GP staff in the respective districts. Out of the total works taken up, during the three years, 9.15 per cent of district level and 91.65 per cent of block level works during 2010-11, 9.15 per cent at district level and 91.25 per cent at block level during 2009-10 and 9.08 per cent at district level and 90.88 per cent at block level during 2008-09 were inspected. Out of the total number of Gram Panchayats in the state 91.28 per cent of Gram Panchayats held Gram Sabhas and the VMC meetings were held in 1.11 per cent of Panchayats during 2010-11, Gram Sabhas in 98.41 Panchayats and VMC meeting in 10.47 per cent of Panchayats during 2009-10 and 98.22 per cent of Gram Sabhas and 84.94 per cent of VMC meetings were held during 2008-09. Where the socio-economic awareness are the level of development is high, there the rigidity of political dynamism appears much. As the Krishna, Guntur and Nellore districts show much lower representation of the Gram Sabhas held, it indicates the people's participation or mobilization in the local administration at lower level. Out of the total number of complaints received in the state during the three years, 98.17 per cent in 2010-1, 91.70 per cent in 2009-10 and 96.26 per cent in 2008-09, were disposed. Four districts during 2010-11, six districts in 2009-10 have disposed cent percent of the received complaints.

Out of the total number of accounts opened in state in each year, 13.36 per cent of accounts in Banks and 86.64 per cent of accounts in Post Offices during 2010-11, 14.04 per cent in Banks and 85.96 per cent in Post Offices during 2009-10 and 8.34 per cent in Banks and 91.66 per cent of Banks and 91.66 per cent of accounts in Post Offices in 2008-09 were opened. Moreover out of the total amount disbursed in each year, 27.05 per cent of amount from Banks and 72.95 per cent of amount from Post Offices during 2010-11, 19.98 per cent of

the amount from Banks and 80.02 per cent of amount through Post Offices during 2009-10 and 26.75 per cent of the amount from banks and 73.25 per cent through Post Offices in 2008-09 were disbursed. No joint account is reported either in banks or in post offices in any of the 22 districts. Across the districts the percentage of total amount through both agencies taken together ranged from 1.56 in Krishna district to 6.81 in Srikakulam district during 2010-11. It is further observed that the number of post office accounts has increased about 5.87 per cent over the year 2009-10. During 2009-10, the percentage of amounts disbursed through banks ranged across the districts from 0.01 in Nellore district to 26.39 in Visakhapatnam out of the total amount disbursed in the state. While the percentage of amounts disbursed through post offices among districts varied from 0.01 in Visakhapatnam to 8.09 in Vizianagaram district, the disbursement amounts is reported to be Nil in Krishna and West Godavari districts. During 2008-09 no bank account was opened in Visakhapatnam and West Godavari districts.

In Andhra Pradesh, no district has reported to have paid unemployment allowance during 2010-11. Out of the total number of works taken up in the year 2010-11, 83.56 per cent of works are estimated to likely to be spilled over from current year to next financial year. About 27.82 lakhs of new works are proposed for the next financial year with an estimated cost of Rs. 631659.49 lakhs and the person days to be generated is about 4418.63 lakhs. Out of the total estimated cost in the state 61.25 per cent of the amount is expected to spend on unskilled wage and 38.75 per cent of the amount on material including skilled and semiskilled wages. Across the districts the percentage of the total estimated cost varied from 0.68 in Karimnagar district to 6.46 in Rangareddy district. Moreover, the percentage of estimated cost on unskilled wage ranged from 0.73 in Karimnagar to 6.49 in Rangareddy district. While the percentage of material cost varied from 0.60 in Karimnagar to 6.40 in Rangareddy district.

7.3. Household Characteristics and their Income and Consumption Pattern:

The aggregate size of the household is reported to be 4.03 while the average size for beneficiary and non-beneficiary households respectively are 4.20 and 3.44. An aggregate per cent of 88.40 from males have reported themselves as decision makers. About 85 per cent of households reported themselves as wage earners. On the whole 5.21 percentage of households taking both categories together, have reported migration during 2009. It is observed that more number of days have been engaged in agricultural casual labour work than

other activities. About 35 per cent of man days were reported to be engaged in Agricultural casual labour work by beneficiary households while their participation was only about 32 per cent of man days under MGNREGA. Across different activities the per household net income varied from 1.70 per cent from migrant workers to 32.61 per cent of income through agricultural wages. Higher percentages of incomes are reported by agricultural wages and livestock activities. On the other hand, the per household net income from all activities in case of non-beneficiary households is reported to be Rs. 43,441/- . Higher percentages of incomes are reported through Agriculture/Livestock activities and non-agricultural wage rates. Comparing with NSS data of 2004-05, the consumption of cereals by beneficiaries is comparatively lower than the data of NSS 2004-05. On the other hand the cereal consumption is reported about 15.88 kgs by non-beneficiaries households, which is higher than the NSS reported quantity of cereals per month. Moreover, the edible oil consumption is reported higher by both beneficiary and non-beneficiary households when compared to NSS data of consumption. Interestingly the consumption of poultry meat and confectionary by both categories of households is reported much higher than the consumption data of NSS further respective items in 2004-05. The monthly consumption expenditure on total food items are reported higher by both categories of households against the expenditure shown in NSS round 2004-05. Interestingly the expenditure on clothes and fuel shown in NSS data are much higher than the expenditure reported by beneficiary and non-beneficiary households. On the whole, the expenditure pattern on consumption of food and non-food items is comparatively improved through the wages earned by beneficiary households. Moreover the gini co-efficient of income of non-beneficiary households indicate more inequality than the beneficiary households and even to the aggregate co-efficient of income. This reason may be attributed to the wages of different works in which the non-beneficiary households have involved. On the other hand the gini co-efficient of consumption is reported higher by beneficiary households where as the non-beneficiaries reported a lower co-efficient than the average gini co-efficient.

Glancing over the performance of the beneficiary sample households, it can be observed that more number of days were reported to be involved in other works than under MGNREGA works. This is due to the non-availability of adequate number of days of work under MGNREGA activities. Observing the wage earning activities of beneficiary households, more incomes are reported to have earned through other activities than from MGNREGA works. The co-efficient

of variation on both food and non-food items taken together for beneficiary households ranged from 23.94 in Krishna district to 37.77 in Mahboobnagar district and varied between 19.46 in Krishna district and 52.63 in Adilabad district for non-beneficiary households. The impact of MGNREGA scheme on the improvement in the percentages of consumption of food and non-food items for the sample households is only marginal but not as much as expected.

Comparing the Gini Co-efficients of income and consumption, the Gini Co-efficients of consumption have not shown considerable inequality between beneficiary and non-beneficiary households of Adilabad district. Higher ratio of concentration is reported in case of consumption of non-beneficiaries in Chittoor district, which means higher inequality than beneficiary households. In Mahboobnagar district, the inequality in incomes and consumption is comparatively reported higher by the non-beneficiaries than the beneficiary households. Much variation is not observed with regard to per household consumption between beneficiary and non-beneficiary households of Srikakulam district. In Krishna district, considerable inequalities in incomes were not reported between beneficiary and non-beneficiary households. However, considerable inequality in the consumption is reported higher among beneficiary households than among non-beneficiary households.

The logit function explains the willingness of the households to participate in MGNREGA works, in spite of getting works other than MGNREGA elsewhere.

7.4. Work Profile under MGNREGA, Wage Structure and Migration issues:

Viewing the overall performance of the districts, the aggregate number of members per households is reported as 2.01. The per household number of days employed are reported to be 43.10 while across caste groups, the per household number of days of employment ranged between 35.89 in General category and 59.58 in Scheduled Tribe category. The per household number of days of employment in women category reported to be 19.68. An overall wage rate of Rs. 97.56 is reported in the state, while across caste groups the wage rates are ranged from 63.90 in Scheduled Tribe category to Rs. 100.44 in OBC category. The average wage rate for women is reported to be Rs. 77/-.

Out of the total sample of 200 households, 41.50 per cent of households were engaged in Land Development works, 27 per cent of households were employed in Micro Irrigation works, 22.50 per cent of households in Water Conservation and Water Harvesting, 5 per cent in Provision of Irrigation facility works and 4 per cent of households were employed in Rural Connectivity activities. Among the total sample of households 75.50 per cent of households reported the quality of the assets created are good and 24.50 per cent of households have reported in quality of the assets as very good. None of the households have reported to have received unemployment allowance for not getting work under MGNREGA after registration.

The aggregate wage rates for all types of works involved by the households are reported higher than the wage rates of MGNREGA. The male labourers of non-beneficiary households have reported higher wage rates than the wage rates of beneficiary males for involving in Agricultural and Non-Agricultural Casual Labour work. Moreover, the co-efficients of variation for non-agricultural casual labour work are reported 9.18 and 6.78 respectively for beneficiary and non-beneficiary households compared to Agricultural Casual Labour work attended by both categories of households. However, much variation of wage rates is observed in case of female migrant workers of beneficiary households and male migrant workers of non-beneficiary households. The wage rates of all works other than NREGA are reported higher than the MGNREGA wage rates. Moreover, much variation is observed in the wage rates between males and females for all works other than MGNREGA. Due to higher wage rates for the works other than MGNREGA works, the labourers are very much inclined towards the other works than MGNREGA works.

Viewing the overall performance of total sample households, the number of members per household who migrated from the villages are reported to be 0.2 and the same number of households returned back to their parental village to participate in NREGA works. Out of the total number of members returned back to their parental village, 70 per cent of the members worked earlier nearby town, 20 per cent of the members in the same district and 10 per cent of the members in the same state. Moreover, during their migration period, 60 per cent of the members were engaged in Construction works and 40 per cent were engaged in Trading and Transport services. Moreover, 80 per cent of the total migrated households reported that they have shifted to that place only last year and only 20 per cent have reported to have migrated

during before last year. All the members returned back to the parental village reported that their family is better off now compared to previous occupation.

Observing the village level performance of MGNREGA scheme, one can understand that the government is providing employment but not full of 100 days to every household demanded employment as targeted in the act. No sample household, in the sample villages, received unemployment allowance for not getting work under MGNREGA after registration. The wage rates reported in the sample villages for MGNREGA works ranged between Rs. 91.05 and Rs. 95.92, which are higher than the state average wage rate of Rs. 90.35 during 2009-10. Much variation in the aggregate wage rates of MGNREGA works is observed in Chittoor, Adilabad and Krishna districts when compared to Mahboobnagar and Srikakulam districts. The reason may be attributed to the inconsistent number of days of employment for different types of MGNREGA works. The labourers are more attracted by the higher wages paid for agricultural and non-agricultural works than the wages paid for MGNREGA works. The migration of members is not only due to non-availability of work but also to earn a better wage rate than the stipulated wage rates in MGNREGA works. However, in some cases where the members failed to achieve a better wage rate at their migrated places, there from they obviously returned back to their parent villages to earn at-least a minimum wage to maintain their livelihood.

7.5.1.: Household Assets Holdings:

It clearly divulges the level of distance of asset holding in between two groups in A.P. It is found that agricultural implements and live stock show less variation in the per house holding between two groups. In aggregate of both participants and non-participants for all study villages, it is reported that the highest is land with 65% followed by housing property.

7.5.2A Household Status on Borrowings and their Financial Vulnerability:

There is significant fact that the both groups are equally in the hands of 'traders-cum-money lenders'. It reports the local traders influence in financial matters in rural area. When compared to all other groups, land employment is meager but it is comparatively high to beneficiaries

7.5.2B Household Strength on Borrowing and other Household Assets of Sample Villages:

A significant fact appears that the highest borrowing (80%) is available to both groups-beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries by the SHG in village followed by bank/post-office/other institution. There is no availability of credit from co-operative society to either group. One welcome feature is that the least appears from 'doing wage work to those whom they are indebted'. This indicates decline of attached labour in the study area.

7.5.3: Qualitative Functioning of MGNREGA from Sample Villages:

There is no payment of fees or charges or bribe to get a 'Job Card'. All the participants informed the job card with them only. Nowhere the job card is kept or engaged. The work application was received and arranged employment as per 90% participants, while 10% of them disagreed with the statement. There is no existence of unemployment allowance and the participants are unable to inform regarding this aspect. The payments of wages are similar to both men and women in the scheme as informed by 90% participants. Measurement of work was done mostly on team basis or collective basis rather than individual one. And the wages are paid fortnightly. All the Work Site Facilities are available in the study area. Economic usefulness of work is accepted by all the participants. All the participants by 100% informed the usefulness of the work. Labour migration to city has become a feature for some part of the labour, despite MGNREGA has been there in sample districts. All the participants unanimously expressed the existence of higher wages to the labour who commute to the towns. Awareness of respondents about MGNREGA implementation is fully acknowledged. In the accrual of 'Potential of Benefits' of MGNREGA, the respondents are satisfied with the benefits received. It is observed that there is good food security established to the workers. Further they reported that the scheme helped them to come out from poverty chains. Food Security has shown lot of strength in the sample villages of A.P. All family members of participants have expressed that they had two meals across the whole year during 2009. There is no other opinion in case of food security.

7.5.4 Some Qualitative Aspects of MGNREGA IN A.P.:

All the participants answered that there was no demand for any bribe to job card issuing. All the job cards are kept with the participants. The 20% of the participants informed

that there was higher wage and therefore they migrated to town. Some of the workers came back from town due to non-fitness of body to the manual work and also the overage of the labour.

7.5.5 Potential Benefits of MGNREGA IN A.P.:

All the participants reported the enhancement of food security. As previously discussed, all the workers of the scheme have divulged a very strong positive impact on poverty. Because of the scheme, the women workers found economic independence which is applicable to all the workers in the sample villages of A.P. The programme has reduced indebtedness among the participants (90%).

7.5.6 Quantitative Aspects of Food Security of Sample Villages of A.P.:

There is existence of sufficient food for the whole year and no worker from the scheme suffered from any deprivations. Main expenditure faced by the participants is for education by 34% and for medical by 66%. They reported that these are the basic heads which are demanding much expenditure out of their incomes. To develop the scheme, the participants (60%) viewed for the increase of number of days of scheme. The 40% of workers informed that there should be available works nearer to village, since the villagers found much problem to reach the distant worksites and additional time and energy taken to reach these sites. The landless labour should be given higher priority in the allocation of work. This is to be covered 100% of the workers of the village. It will enable them to enhance their income levels and to possess stable income sources.

7.6.1 Infrastructure Available in the Sample Villages in A.P.:

All the villages (100 %) have road connectivity, while the rain connectivity is 100 % from nearest village with average distance of 18.70 kms. Post office shows its presence in 80 per cent villages, while 20 per cent villages visit the nearest villages by covering the average distance 5.50 kms. The Agricultural Marketing Centre (AMC) is available to neither study village but farmers are to transport their produce to nearest villages which are located at 14.70 kms average overall distance. The Self-Help Groups are formed and available to 80 per cent villages and 20 per cent villages are to move to 9.50 kms of the nearest village. All the villages (100

%) have primary schools, despite the secondary schools are located in 50 % villages. Every village possesses Gram Panchayat Office, while fair price shop is only available to 70 per cent villages and the others are to go 8.70 kms to purchase subsidized goods.

7.6.2 Occupational Structure in Sample villages:

The dependence on agriculture has been declined and the rural non-farm occupation has shown much increase. Transport and communication showed much growth (from 2.08 % to 1.08%), while the counter trend appeared for cultivation (from 45.87% to 43.80%). It clearly signifies the diversification of rural occupational structure.

7.6.3. Wage Rates of Labour in all Sample Villages: (State level/Overall):

The shift of wages in between 2005 and 2009 took place in the villages in A.P. for male and female. The increase in agricultural wage for female is higher (80 %) than that of male (60%). It may be ascribed to the effect of MGNREGA. In case of non agricultural wage, the male has better edge in getting good wage than for female, whereas female has good increase in wage for construction work rather than the wage of male.

7.6.4. Average Prevailing Labour charges for Agricultural Operations in Sample Villages by Overall/State:

There have been continued acceleration charges for different agricultural operations in study villages in A.P. Out of the charges, the charge for cane-cutting is the highest and followed by threshing of paddy during the study period 2009-2011. The other higher charges of agriculture operations are paddy weeding, transplanting and harvesting of paddy.

7.6.5. Qualitative changes in Sample villages during Last One year in A.P:

There was shortage of agricultural wage labour at some point during last year, as expressed by 70 per cent participants and the same trend was true even after MGNREGA implementation. After implementation of MGNREGA, some workers came back from town to village to work, was reported by 60 per cent participants and the remaining participants indicated the existence of migration to towns. The commutation of agricultural workers in between village and town has increased as responded by 40 per cent participants. All the participants (100 %) unanimously have informed the increase of standard of living.

7.6.6 Qualitative Functioning of MGNREGA in A.P.:

There is 100 per cent shortage of agricultural labour at same point during July, August, November and December. After MGNREGA implementation, there has been shortage of agricultural labour by 100 per cent in September, October and November months. The household consumption increased in pulses and oil by 25 per cent due to the impact of MGNREGA for all the participants. The scheme has certainly impacted positively over the education of children of the participants and they said that there was 20 per cent increase for their children. In the study villages still attached labour has existed as per 40 per cent participants and 60 per cent participants informed no attached labour after the scheme in force. Many participants (62%) suggested to stop the MGNREGA scheme during agricultural peak season. As a whole the scheme was given very good sway on the lives of agricultural labour in the study villages of A.P.

Policy Suggestions

1) 100 days Employment Norm:

Much can be done under this scheme when the works are taken out of the seasons of agricultural activity, when the participants will anticipate the employment. Thus the fulfillment of 100 days employment could be done in an acceptable way across the community. It is still to be achieved 100 days in A.P., provided no damage to farming activity.

2) Long term works:

A fascinating point is that the long term works are to be launched, instead of the other. This will stabilize the availability of works in the vicinity and further it generates durable and long-lasting works which may be envisaged as Rural Connectivity, Water Harvesting, Land development works, Irrigation generating works etc.

3) Unemployment Allowance:

The Unemployment Allowance may scarcely be mull over in the areas where the employment channels are null and void and the labour force is under strains due to the problem of finding employment. Where the poverty is high in the districts for example Ananthpur, there the unemployment allowance becomes a stabilizing factor for consumption of the labour. There is dire need to do some in favour of such labour force in areas in question with good discrimination to avoid wastage of funds of the scheme. But it is found as a whole absent grossly across all districts in A.P.

4) Gram Sabhas, VMCs and Social Audit:

Decision making and useful work generation could be achieved in villages through their interest and pro-active role. A reasonable formal propaganda could ensure interest among villagers. It is observed that the Gram Sabhas are held at low ebb in some districts viz. Guntur, Krishna and Nellore which are well developed. The Village Monitoring Committee activity is to be much promoted to strengthen the coordination of works and payments. Though the social audit is applauded in A.P., there is much lacuna. Still some districts display bottom level performance, however these districts are developed. Hence there is a need of refurbishing the administrative set up in West Godavari, Krishna and Visakhapatnam districts

5) Alternative Payment Channel:

Post offices are doing good service in the payments of MGNREGA rather than banks in the study area. It is high time to ponder over the mobile banking every day or no less than in specified, days and timings. It will generate saving attitude in the rural people and it facilitates to take the wages in time and it generates deposits to the banks. If it is costly affair, it is better to arrange some specified 'Automatic teller Machines' for this purpose, since this scheme has practice of issuing job cards which can be converted into bank debit card or identity card for payment from the teller machine to worker.

6) Mobilization of Savings:

It is better to start some saving mobilizing fund groups for example thrift fund groups among the participants to meet their exigencies and further it reduces the dependency on other sources which charge 24% interest or more based on the need and emergency of participant borrower. They may be given short term life and health insurance coverage within the purview of scheme through the paltry contribution of the participant.

7) Location of works:

To save time and energy of the participants, it would be much sought after the works in the vicinity of participants of the scheme. It is observed that there are some linkages of labour demand with, other works and urban area across all days for middle age group of labour and this scheme is a source of employment to women and to the segment of the more than middle aged labour

8) MGNREGA: A Custodian for Higher Wage from Vicinity and Migration:

There is no change in migration except during no demand in from other areas. Wage of the scheme has been acting as a buffer wage/opportunity wage to the labour and they trade off the supply of labour based on the seasons of agriculture, constructions works from other sources other than the MGNREGA and the demand derived from urban areas due to variety of works in recent past. This appears very rampant for middle aged or able bodied labour. Therefore, the migration aspect has not been curtailed because of the scheme, instead it has in another way continued with higher wages when compared to the previous lower wages. Thus the scheme has affected positively, to have higher level of the bargaining power of the labour

and or changed total demand and supply labour linkages. These linkages ultimately have become positive and resourceful to the manual labour in all the study districts. To this end, cultivators are unable to find labour not only during the seasons of farming but also in other periods through the existing wage of the locality. It is very difficult to conclude that MGNREGA has reduced migration rather than reinforced the wage structure to the labour in other avenues, since all the sample villages of all sample districts of this study exhibit this trend across all the developed and backward districts in A.P. In case of women and aged men, the migration has been sharply declined and they go along the scheme in their villages and they find good wages (not below of scheme wage) in their villages.

9) Impact on Agriculture and the Alternative:

A significant fact is divulged through this study regarding labour linkages and cultivation. As such it is important and pertinent to note the dependence of cultivator on manual labour to be reduced through mechanization and to shift to new methodologies, since the scheme has very extensive affect on the availability of labour over cultivation and its wage structure. This is apparent through the phenomenon observed from the sample villages. While it is highly suggested that the scheme may be kept under pending during peak agricultural seasons by villagers, it would be better to readjust the schedule of works of the scheme with variations based on the agricultural cropping pattern, rainfed cultivation and irrigation levels of the districts in question. At least, a district may be taken as a unit to do this exercise, as this makes flexible to administer the scheme.

Sl.No.	Co-ordinators Comments	Action taken
1	<p>Chapter 2: Table 2.1, authors are suggested to present Cumulative Person days generate (Till the reporting month) for SCs, STs, Women and Others along with total as was suggested by the Table/Chapter Scheme. In Table 2.2, numbers of works completed/ongoing are presented in percentage. It is percentage of what? In the original Table Scheme, we had asked for presenting the total number of projects completed, on-going in each of the work category. Therefore authors are suggested to stick to the original plan and present these tables and discussion on the numbers of projects completed and on-going (percentage does not make any meaning as it is unclear percentage of what is presented in the tables.). Same is the case with amount spent in table 2.3. Authors are requested to present total amount spent in Rs, lakh on completed and ongoing projects. In Table 2.4, authors are requested to present total number of muster roles used and their % verified; total no of GP and % where social audit held; total works taken up and % works inspected at district and block level; and numbers of complaints received and their % disposed of. Table 2.5, please present the absolute numbers of bank accounts opened in bank and post office, amount of wages disbursed through bank/post office, total numbers of accounts and amount disbursed. In Table 2.6, unemployment allowance due could not be 0 in all the districts and state. Kindly recheck the numbers from the website. Table 2.7, present the numbers district wise and not the percentage of state total.</p>	<p>Yes done in the similar way</p>
2	<p>Kindly check the chapter and table plan sent earlier. Except Chapter that is based on secondary data all other chapters are based on primary data. In the table plan, it was clearly mentioned that analysis shall not be district level but it would be total beneficiary and non- beneficiary and total. Except three tables in Chapter 4, namely work profile under NREGA; activity, in which employed under NREGA and the quality of assets created: migration incidents recorded; All other tables should be with respect to beneficiary, non-beneficiary and total. The authors have not followed the Chapter/Table Scheme, and have done the whole analysis, at the district level for the five selected districts and have not presented data related to the whole state for beneficiary, non beneficiary and total. This does not fit in our overall plan and therefore all the chapters viz; Chapter 3. Chapter 4, Chapter 5 and Chapter 6 also the conclusion chapter need to be rewritten following the Chapter and Table plan provided to all the agro centres earlier. The soft copy of the chapter/Table plan is being sent once again. It is strictly instructed to follow the given structure so that we are able to include Andhra Pradesh in the consolidate report.</p>	<p>Yes done in the similar way</p>

3	<p>Chapter 4, Table 4.1: while providing information on numbers of members per hh employed and number of days employed during the year include another category of men as that of women and sum total of men + women should supposedly be equal to aggregate. Also in this table provide another row with details of percentage of HH employed 100 or more days, selected district wise. For calculating number of members per hh employed, you need to aggregate total members employed in a particular district and divide them by total number of households selected under NREGA beneficiary for that districts (you can give total figure in the parenthesis and indicate the same below the table). The aggregate number should be total of men +women. The aggregate number of days employed in Chittoor is 39.88 days while women days employed is shown as 39.00 how is that possible when by definition total (men + women) should be equal to aggregate. The breakup of other districts and other categories is also apparently not correct. (No of Days in a particular district = total no of days employed /no of total beneficiary household in that district) kindly follow this formula for calculating number of days. The aggregate total of all districts column is not given that needs to be included in the three tables in Chapter 4 where district level information is asked.</p>	Yes done in the similar way
4	<p>Chapter 5, Table 5.2: Total loan – sum total loan by source should match with sum total loan by purpose which not matching in the report, make correction.</p>	Yes done in the similar way

(Dr. G. Gangadhara Rao)