

**MGNREGA**  
**IMPACT ON WAGE RATES, FOOD SECURITY AND RURAL**  
**URBAN MIGRATION IN ODISHA**

Dr. G. GANGADHARA RAO, Ph.D.,

SRI N.RAMGOPAL



Agro-Economic Research Centre  
Andhra University  
Visakhapatnam

MARCH, 2013

**MGNREGA**  
**IMPACT ON WAGE RATES, FOOD SECURITY AND RURAL**  
**URBAN MIGRATION IN ODISHA**

**Executive Summary**

**Dr. G. GANGADHARA RAO, Ph.D.,**  
**SRI N.RAMGOPAL**



Agro-Economic Research Centre  
Andhra University  
Visakhapatnam

MARCH, 2013

## PREFACE

Providing employment for rural masses, in a country where agriculture is the mainstay of livelihood is a major challenge for any government in power. Employment in agriculture is very seasonal and at peak times there are shortages of labour too. Facing unemployment in lean season, rural labour starve for days together. Leaving homesteads and their dependents behind, younger generation move along with children to nearby towns in search of any kind of employment. They face untold misery and exploitation in the harsh urban environment. To alleviate their suffering a series of employment generation programmes were initiated by the government since 1980s. The success of these programmes was only partial in meeting the growing demand.

National Rural Employment Guarantee Act, later christened as MGNREGA was passed in the year 2005. It is aimed at empowering rural poor by ensuring legal right to work. Whoever was willing to work was provided 100 days of employment at a minimum wage rate.

With this backdrop Ministry of Agriculture, Government of India asked the Agro-Economic Research Centre, Visakhapatnam along with other centres, to conduct a study enquiring into the quantum of employment generation, its socio-economic characteristics, and wage differentials with other employment activities.

The present study focuses on Odisha's success in NREGA's implementation. Effort was also made to probe into issues relating migration from villages and the quality of community assets created. There can be no second opinion about increased food security by way of higher incomes and reduced urban migration. The less anticipated increase of agricultural labour costs have to be addressed in the earnest as one positive change cannot nullify the other.

I appreciate my colleagues Dr.G. Gangadhara Rao, Director and Sri N. Ramgopal, Research Officer for carefully drafting the report, Dr. K.V. Giribabu, Senior Research Investigator for field investigation and analysis and Sri K. Ramesh, Senior Assistant and Smt. P. Malathi, Senior Assistant for giving final shape to the report. I acknowledge the help of all the officials of Department of Panchayat Raj and Rural Development, Odisha and their cooperation in conducting the study and the sample households for their response.

PROF. S.K.V. SURYANARAYANA RAJU  
Honorary Director

**PROJECT TEAM**

Project Leader : Prof. S.K.V. Suryanarayana Raju

Drafting : Dr. G. Gangadhara Rao  
Sri N. Ramgopal

Data Collection and Analysis : Dr. K.V. Giribabu

Word Processing : Sri K. Ramesh  
Smt. P. Malathi

# CONTENTS

	Preface	i
	Project Team	ii
	Contents	iii
	List of Tables	vi
<b>Chapter – I:</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
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)	2
	e) Jawahar Gram Samridhi Yojana (JGSY)	3
	f) Sampoorna Grameena Rozgar Yojana (SGRY)	3
	g) National Food for Work Programme (NFFWP)	4
	h) National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (MGNREGA)	4
1.2B	Review of Literature	6
1.2C	Studies of MGNREGA in Odisha	8
1.2D	The Problem	9
1.3	Objectives of the Study	10
1.4	Data base and Methodology	10
1.5	An Overview	11
	References	11
<b>Chapter – II:</b>	<b>Manpower Employment Generated under MGNREGA and its Socio-Economic Characteristics</b>	<b>13</b>
2	Introduction	13
2.1	The Functioning of MGNREGS	13
2.2	Total Employment generated under MGNREGS and its socio-economic characteristics	13
2.3	Progress of different projects	18
2.3B	Utilization of Funds on Different Projects	24
	2.3B.1. Rural Connectivity works	24
	2.3B.2. Flood Control and Protection	24
	2.3B.3. Water Conservation and Water Harvesting	24
	2.3B.4. Drought Proofing	25
	2.3B.5. Micro-Irrigation	25
	2.3B.6. Provision of Irrigation facility to land owned by SCs, STs and other Weaker Sections	25
	2.3B.7. Renovation of traditional water bodies	25
	2.3B.8. Land Development	25
2.4	Performance of MGNREGS: Quantitative indicators	26
	2.4.1. Social Audit	31
	2.4.2. Inspections	31
	2.4.3. Complaints	31
	2.4.4. Disbursement of wages through Banks and Post Offices	33
	2.4.5. Un-employment Allowance	33
	2.4.6. Work Projection	35
2.5	Summary	38

<b>Chapter – III:</b>	<b>Household Characteristics: Income and Consumption Pattern</b>	41
	Introduction	41
3.1	Household Profile of the sample	43
3.2	Main Occupation	44
3.3	Household Net Income	45
3.4	Household Consumption	46
3.5	Monthly Consumption Expenditure	48
3.6	Variability (CV) and Gini ratios of income and consumption	48
3.7	Determinants of participation in MGNREGA	48
3.8	Summary	51
<b>Chapter – IV:</b>	<b>Work Profile under MGNREGS, Wage Structure and Migration Issues</b>	53
	Introduction	53
4.1	Work Profile under MGNREGS	53
4.2	Success of MGNREGS in providing 100 days near the village	53
4.3	Nature of Assets Created and Their Durability	54
4.4	Wage differentials under MGNREGS and comparison with minimum wages	55
4.5	Labour Migration issues	56
4.6	Summing Up	58
<b>Chapter – V:</b>	<b>The Functioning of MGNREGA Qualitative Aspects</b>	60
5.1	Household Assets Holdings	60
5.2	Household Status on Borrowings and their Financial Vulnerability	61
5.2.b	Household Strength on Borrowing and other Household Assets of Sample Villages	62
5.3	Qualitative Functioning of MGNREGA from Villages	63
5.4	Some Qualitative Aspects of Food security	68
5.5	Potential benefits of MGNREGA to Sample Villages	69
5.6	MGNREGA and food security of Sample Villages	70
	Summary	71
<b>Chapter – VI:</b>	<b>MGNREGA Impact on Village Economy</b>	72
6.1	Infrastructure Available in the Sample Villages	72
6.2	Occupational Structure in Sample Villages	73
6.3	Wage Rates of Labour in all sample villages: (State level/Overall)	74
6.4	Average Prevailing labour charges for Agricultural Operations in Sample Villages by Overall/State	75
6.5	Qualitative changes in Sample villages during last one year in Odisha	76
6.6	Qualitative Functioning of MGNREGA	78
	Summary	79
<b>Chapter – VII:</b>	<b>Summary and Policy Recommendations</b>	80
7.1	Introduction	80
7.1.1	The Problem	81
7.1.2	Objectives of the study	81
7.1.3	Data base and Methodology	81
7.2.1	Functioning of MGNREGS	82
7.2.2	Employment generated	82
7.2.3	Number of Projects completed and Total amount spent	83
7.2.4	Expenditure on different projects	84
7.2.5	Performance of MGNREGS	85
7.3	Household profile of the sample	86
7.4	Work Profile under MGNREGS, Wage Structure and Migration issues	88
7.5.1	Household Assets Holdings	89
7.5.2	Household Status on Borrowings and their Financial Vulnerability	89

7.5.2.B. Household Strength on Borrowing and other Household Assets of Sample Villages	90
7.5.3 Qualitative Functioning of MGNREGA from Sample Villages	90
7.5.4 Some Qualitative Aspects of Food security	90
7.5.5 Potential Benefits of MGNREGA to sample villages	91
7.5.6. MGNREGS and Food Security of Sample villages	91
7.6.1 Infrastructure Available in the Sample Villages	91
7.6.2 Occupational Structure in Sample Villages	91
7.6.3 Wage Rates of Labour in all sample villages: (State level/Overall)	91
7.6.4 Average Prevailing labour charges for Agricultural Operations in Sample Villages by Overall/State	92
7.6.5 Qualitative changes in sample villages during last one year in Odisha	92
7.6.6 Qualitative Functioning of MGNREGS	92
<b>Policy Recommendations</b>	93
1. Need Streamlining the Scheme Administration	
2. Un-employment Allowance	
3. No Scheme Operation during Agricultural Season	
4. Mechanization of Agriculture and Rural Migration	
5. Implementation of 100 days Employment	94

## **Annexure Tables**

1-17

## List of Tables

<b>No.</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Page</b>
2.1	Employment Generated through MGNREGS and its Socio-Economic Characteristics 2010-2011	15
	Employment Generated through MGNREGS and its Socio-Economic Characteristics 2009-2010	16
	Employment Generated through MGNREGS and its Socio-Economic Characteristics 2008-2009	17
2.2	District-wise works completed/progress under MGNREGA (Number of Projects) – 2011-08	20
2.3	District-wise works completed/progress under MGNREGA (Amount spent) (2010-11, 2009-10, 2008-09)	27
2.4	Social auditing and inspection of MGNREGS Work (2010-11, 2009-10 and 2008-09)	32
2.5	The payment processed through Banks/Post Office (2010-11, 2009-10 and 2008-09)	34
2.6	Un-employment Allowance paid in lieu of not providing employment (2010-11)	36
2.7	Work Projection under MGNREGA for 2010-11 – Odisha	37
3.1	Demographic Profile of the Respondents	42
3.2	Main occupation - (% of total man – days) of sample households - 2009	43
3.3	Annual Income of Sample Households – 2009	45
3.4	Household Consumption Of Food Items (Kgs. Per Capita Per Month)	46
3.5	Monthly Consumption Expenditure of Households	47
3.6	Variability in Consumption and Income of Sample Villages of Selected Districts – 2009	48
3.7	Determinants of Participation in MGNREGS (Logit function)	50
4.1	The work profile under MGNREGS (Reference period – January to December 2009)	54
4.2	Work-wise employed in MGNREGS and the Quality of Assets created – 2009 (% of hhs)	55
4.3	Wage Differentials among different activities in selected villages in selected districts – 2009	56
4.4	Migration incidence in selected districts in MGNREGS - 2009	57
5.1	Assets Holding of Sample Villages in Odisha	60
5.2	Borrowings by Sample Households of Villages in Odisha - 2011	62
5.2B	Household Strength on Borrowing and other Household Assets of sample villages in Odisha - 2011	63
5.3	Qualitative questions related to Functioning of MGNREGA from Sample Villages in Odisha - 2011	64
5.4	Quantitative questions related to MGNREGA functioning Sample Villages in Odisha - 2011	69
5.5	Provide details on the following potential benefits of MGNREGA of sample villages in Odisha - 2011	70
5.6	Qualitative questions related to Food Security of sample villages of Odisha – 2011.	70



6.1	Infrastructure Availability in sample Villages (State level)	72
6.2	Occupational Structure of Sample Villages (State Level)	74
6.3	Wage rates for different activities of all Sample Villages (State Level)	75
6.4	Prevailing labour charges for agricultural operations of Sample Villages (State Level)	76
6.5	Qualitative questions on changes in the villages during last one year (% of HH)	77
6.6	Quantitative questions about the functioning of MGNREGA	78

**List of Box**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Page</b>
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 ODISHA**

## **CHAPTER – I**

### **1.1. Introduction:**

Rural employment grew at the annual rate of 0.58 per cent between 1993-94 and 1999-2000. But, the rate of growth of the rural labour force was much higher. This has resulted in lot of stress on rural households. 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 consequence, the stress was laid on employment and poverty alleviation in the Sixth five Year Plan. This as a backdrop, National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (NREGA) came in to existence in September, 2005. It came into force on February 2, 2006 and was implemented in a phased manner. In phase I it was introduced in 200 of the most backward districts and was expanded in 2007-08 covering another 130 districts in phase II. By April 1<sup>st</sup> 2008 the remaining 274 rural districts were also brought into its fold. From October 2<sup>nd</sup> 2009 National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme (NREGS) has been renamed as Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme (MGNREGS).

MGNREGS seeks to provide at least 100 days of guaranteed wage employment in a financial year to every rural household whose adult members volunteer to do unskilled manual work. Further, it is different from other wage employment programmes as it bestows a legal right and guarantees to the rural population through an act of parliament and not just a scheme like other wage employment programmes. Viewed in a wider perspective, MGNREGA signals a possible reshaping of state priorities in India through a democratic determination to provide real livelihood opportunities for the rural poor. Thus, as a progressive legislation for hitherto excluded groups-women, scheduled castes, scheduled tribes, among others, MGNREGS can help to reclaim the lost faith in the possibility of pro-people governance.

### **1.2 A. Historical Background:**

#### **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 Centre and states. The main objective of this programme was creation of durable assets. As this programme is not targeted to particular segment of the society, 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. Hence the programme

lacked a direct focus on the vulnerable groups for whom it was meant. But it helped in stabilization of wages in the rural areas, containing prices of food grains and the creation of a wide variety of community assets which would in turn help raise the levels of living standards of the rural population.

**b) Rural Landless Employment Guarantee Programme (RLEGP):**

Introduced by the Ministry of Rural Development, Government of India on 15<sup>th</sup> August, 1983 to supplement NREP with the objective of improving and expanding employment opportunities for the rural landless, the programme was providing guarantee of employment to at least one member of every landless household up to 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):**

The programme was launched in the last year of 7<sup>th</sup> 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 contribute to the creation of rural infrastructure. The Centre and states' contribution under this programme was 80 and 20 respectively. This programme was implemented in all villages in the country.

It is widely held that Panchayats habitually violate laid out procedures and use private contractors in execution of works. Under the programme, projects were to be executed by the Government Ministries and agencies without the employment of 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 2<sup>nd</sup> 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 tribals 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.

Over the time planners have realized that improvement of village infrastructure needs to be taken up in a planned manner to make any development programmes meaningful. This could best be done by the village Panchayats who are closest to the ground realities and who can effectively determine and supervise 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):**

In this programme village was made central in the development of rural infrastructure and panchayats were empowered in implementation and execution of works. This programme came into effect from 1<sup>st</sup> 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 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 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. It was initiated in September, 2001. 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):**

The programme provides substantial resources in the form of cash and food grains 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 would be 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. However, 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 (NREGA):**

This programme, passed in the year 2005, heralds a major shift in programme implementation as it empowers the rural poor. 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<sup>@</sup>. 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 for work. If the employment cannot be provided by the authorities then daily un-employment allowance has to be paid.

---

@: Dreze et al. 2006.

#### 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 by Central and State Governments are 75 per cent and 25 per cent 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, 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 daily un-employment allowance will be paid to the applicant.

#### Phases of MGNREGA:

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

Kareemulla (2010) and others suggest "while the scheme anyway achieves its primary objective of employment guarantee, the assets created are generally seen as a by-product. The impact assessment of the scheme works need to be integrated in to the scheme to make it more accountable and useful. Ultimately, the creation of guaranteed employment under NREGS should become a by-product and creation of productive assets as prime objective of the scheme in the long run. The rural markets have been influenced by the massive NREGS and have had a decisive impact on agriculture, which needs to be studied in depth to bring about the labour availability and implication on cost of cultivation".

Deepak shaw (2010) and others found that MGNREGA is successful in terms of asset creation, watershed development, prevention of drought, large scale administration of rural public works and reduction in large scale migration. But in employment generation in terms of man-days generated and the number of households provided 100 days of employment are quite low. However, they conclude MGNREGA is much better scheme than any other employment related programmes.

### **1.2.C Studies of MGNREGA in Odisha :**

Jean Dreze (2007) and others observe from a study they conducted in Balangir, Boudh and Kalahandi districts that most of the transparency safeguards under NREGA have broken down in Odisha. The records were virtually unverifiable and the accountability mechanisms were also very weak. In some sample gram Panchayats in Boudh, corruption levels in NREGA came down than in earlier employment programmes such as Sampoorna Grameena Rozgar Yojana (SGRY) and the National Food for Work Programme. On the positive note they report that the workers in the programme earned close to the statutory minimum wage of Rs 70 per day and the wages were also paid in 15 days. They found evident appreciation of the programme from the workers who also hoped for lower migration levels in future.

Narayana Chandra Nayak (2009) and others who studied NAREGA works in Mayurbhanj and Balasore districts of Odisha report that payments were made on piece rate basis and the average amount of wage earnings in Mayurbhanj were much higher than that in Balasore district. Women were earning

higher wages than their male counterparts. Payments were quite regular and paid mostly within a week. They were made mostly through bank accounts. It was perceived by the respondents that NREGS was highly successful in creating additional employment opportunities and reducing forced migration. It was also observed from the study that the NREGS seemed to have favoured the females along with those belonging to SC and ST communities in respect of days of employment and wages.

Vidhya Das (2010) comments on their research work in Kashipur block of Rayagada district that NREGA programme has provided less than 30 days of employment over the last 3 years and payments have not been made in several instances. There are people in Sirlijodi village who reported that they did not get any work under NREGA for the last two years.

Pradeep Baisakh (2011) questions the success of MGNREGA by saying whether in the four-and-a-half years of its existence, has the scheme brought about any real changes in the lives of Odisha's poor? In 2008-09, only 22.6% of families with job cards were provided jobs. The corresponding figures are 24% in 2009-10, and 20.7% in 2010-11. In terms of providing 100 days of guaranteed employment to families that have availed of a job under the scheme, the figure is abysmally low at 4.4% in 2008-09, 6% in 2009-10, and 3% in the current year. In 2006-07, Odisha provided 57.5 work days to people availing of the scheme. But in the ensuing years, the figures show a downward trend. In 2007-08, it was 37 days, 36 days in 2008-09, 40 days in 2009-10, and 37 days in 2010-11. The recent Comptroller and Auditor General of India (CAG) report reveals that despite the MGNREGS, Odisha witnessed a 116% increase in rural migration. Despite the fact that migrant labourers work in inhuman conditions in other states and face various forms of exploitation (economic, physical, mental and sexual), Odisha's failure to establish the MGNREGS as a credible and sustainable source of livelihood leaves people with no option but to seek employment elsewhere.

#### **1.2. D. 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. As the scheme is in its initial stage, it is necessary 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 is to be brought to the sharp focus to formulate policies. 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 Odisha, 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 Odisha.
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, it's 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 Bargarh, Boudh, Ganjam, Khurda and Mayurbhanj are selected. 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 districts/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 Odisha, 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 are 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 for non-participants of MGNREGA is not available, the non-participating households are selected with analogous 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 the 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. Chayya Datar – “Failure of National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme in Maharashtra” – Economic and Political Weekly, August 25, 2007.
2. Dreze, Jean, Nikhil Dev and Reetika Khera (2008): “Corruption in MGNREGA: Myths and Reality”, The Hindu dated 22, January 2008.
3. Doug Johnson: “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, 2009.
4. Deepak and Shaw and Sovna Mohanty (2010), “Implementation of MGNREGA during Eleventh Plan in Maharashtra: Experiences, Challenges and Ways Forward”. Indian Journal of Agricultural Economics, Vol-65, No-3, July-Sept, 2010 PP 540-551.
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. Jean Dreze, Reetika Khera and Siddharth (2007) “NREGA in Odisha- Ten loopholes and the Silver Lining” Interim Survey Report, 21<sup>st</sup> October, 2007.
7. Karuna Vakati Aakella, Sowmya Kadambi: “Social Audits in Andhra Pradesh: A process in Evaluation” – Economic and Political Weekly, November 24, 2007.

8. Kareemulla K., K. Srinivas Reddy, C.A. Rama Rao, Shalander Kumar and B. Venkateswar. "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) 2009, pp 443-450.
9. Kareemulla K, Shelendar kumar, K.S. Reddy, C.A. Rama rao and B. Venkateswarlu(2010), "Impact of NREGS on rural livelihoods and Agricultural capital formation". Indian Journal of Agricultural Economics, Vol.65. No. 3 July-Sept.,2010, PP 524-539.
10. Krishna Murthy J – "Employment Guarantee and Crisis Response". Economic and Political Weekly, March 4, 2006.
11. Narayana Chandra Nayak, Bhagirath Behera and Pulak Mishra (2009), "An Appraisal of Processes and procedures of NREGS in Odisha: A study of Mayurbhanj and Balasore districts". Report submitted to the Ministry of Rural Development, Government of India.  
Department of Humanities and Social Sciences, IIT Kharagpur.
12. Pinaki Chakraborty - "Implementation of Employment Guarantee: A preliminary Appraisal". Economic and Political Weekly, February 17, 2007.
13. Pradeep Baisakh(2011), "Info-change News & Features", January 2011 [www.infochangeindia.org](http://www.infochangeindia.org).
14. Raghavendra Jha, 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" – APARC working paper 2008/04, Revised May, 2008.
15. Ravi Kumar Ch., D. Rakesh Kumar and S. Seetha Lakshmi: "National Rural Employment Guarantee Act in Andhra Pradesh – Claims and Questions in Operationalization (2007-08)" – WASSAN.
16. Rishabh Khosla: "Caste, Politics and Public Good Distribution in India: Evidence from NREGS in Andhra Pradesh" – Economic and Political Weekly, March 19, 2011. Vol. XLVI, No. 12.
17. 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, Organized by Institute for Human Development (IHD) and Institute of Social Studies Trust (ISST), New Delhi under the Social Protection in Asia (SPA) Programme.
18. Sharma Anil, Prabhu Ghate, Haxmi Joshi and Ajay Sahu (2009) – "study on Evaluating performance of National Rural Employment Guarantee Act" NCAER – PIF Publications.
19. Vidhya Das (2010), "Beneath the Gloss and Glitter: A Report from Kashipur" Economic and Political Weekly, October, 30, 2010 vol. XLV No-44 PP 17-19.
20. Vijay Shankar P.S., Rangu Rao, Nivedita Banerji and Mihir Shah – "Revising the Schedule of Rates: An imperative for MGNREGA". Economic and Political Weekly 29<sup>th</sup> April, 2006.

# **Man Power Employment generated under MGNREGS and its socio-economic characteristics**

## **CHAPTER – II**

### **2. Introduction:**

Implementation of MGNREGS program in phases across all districts by issuing job cards to eligible households including those benefited under Indira Awas Yojana and to those who are disabled, actual provision of work when demanded, number of days of work per household in a year are discussed in this chapter. Different kinds of works taken up in order to provide employment and their progress, amount spent on those across all districts, year-wise are analysed. The process of social auditing and mode of disbursement of wages through post office and Bank accounts to the workers are discussed in the following pages.

### **2.1. The Functioning of MGNREGS:**

The programme was implemented in 3 phases in Odisha. Nineteen districts were covered in the first phase followed by 5 districts in second phase and 6 districts in third phase. About 52.67 lakhs of job cards are issued till the 2008-09. The number increased to 60.25 lakhs by 2010-11 (Table No. 2.1). Highest number (4.10 lakhs) of job cards were issued in Ganjam in 2008-09 followed by Mayurbhanj (4.05), Balasore (2.72) Sundargarh (2.84), Kalahandi (2.64) and Koraput (2.62). Ganjam continued its lead in issuing job cards through 2009-10 and 2010-11 and reached 4.45 lakhs. The other leading districts also carried the trend in the following years.

Among the five selected districts Ganjam and Mayurbhanj led the other districts. Boudh figures last with 82281 job cards in 2010-11. In Mayurbhanj a high percentage of (54.34) job cards were issued to scheduled tribe households. In other selected districts other castes dominate among the job card holders. At the state level the total number of job cards issued has risen from 5267853 in 2008-09 to 6025230 by 2010-11.

### **2.2 Total employment generated under MGNREGS and its socio economic characteristics:**

The highest percentage of households who were provided employment for job card holders could be found Gajapati district (41.93) whereas the lowest percentage was recorded in Nayagarh (3.36) district in 2008-09. Among the selected districts Ganjam recorded the highest percentage of 39.62 and Khurda performed badly with 7.35 per cent of households who could get employment out of the job card holding households. In the later years, Kandhamal recorded highest percentage of employment among job card holders with 51 and 58 in 2009-10 and 2010-11 respectively. In the same years Baleswar and Khurda have done badly with 8 and 15 respectively. At the state level these figures have moved consistently upward from 23 to 33 in 2008-11.

Ganjam stood first among all districts in providing employment for 60 days per household and also recorded the highest percentage of 14.36 households who could get more than 100 days of work in 2008-09. Mayurbhanj also performed well with 44 days of work per household and 6.23 per cent of households who could get more than 100 days of work. Other selected districts like Boudh, Baragarh and Khurda have less than 2 per cent of households with more than 100 days of employment. In the same year, Puri performed badly in terms of days of employment per household at 11 per cent while Ganjam continued its lead with 56 days of per household employment in 2009-10, In 2010-11, Rayagada emerged first with 64 days of per household employment. Puri continued its bad performance with respect to days of employment per household in 2009-10 with 14 days while Khurda has taken that place in 2010-11 with 32. In 2008-10 Ganjam performed well at 14 and 13 per cent in providing 100 days of employment. But in 2010-11 Sambalpur occupied that place by providing 100 days of employment for 19 per cent of the house holds. At the state level the average days of per household employment rose from 36 in 2008 to 49 in 2011.

The beneficiaries of land reforms or Indira Awas Yojana who could also get employment under MGNREGS are high in numbers (7.78 per cent) in Khurda district when compared to other selected districts. In Mayurbhanj district roughly 1 per cent of the employed households are also beneficiaries under disabled category. Only Bolangir shares the same position in the state 2008-09. The same category is less than 1 per cent in other selected districts. The same trend continued more or less through 2009-11.

Employment generated in cumulative person days among different sections of society in 2008-11 is analysed below.

Ganjam leads the state in Scheduled Caste (SC) population with 18 per cent and able to provide employment to around 25 per cent of total employed. This trend continued all through 2008-11. Among the employed in 2008-09, Jajpur, Cuttack and Kendrapara districts could provide employment to 38, 36 and 34 per cent for SC workers respectively. In 2009-10 SC workforce formed 32 per cent in Kendrapara, 31 per cent in Jajpur and 28 per cent in Boudh in the total person days of MGNREGA work. Kendrapara with second highest Scheduled Caste population in the state provided 24 per cent of person days to SC workers in 2010-11. Jajpur has done better and could provide 28 per cent of person days to SC's in the same year.



**Table - 2.1**  
**Employment Generated through MGNREGS 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	Bolangir	18.06	23.00	58.94	253147	24.26	99.42	30.46	49.41	9.65	0.83	0.36
2	Boudh	24.69	13.02	62.29	82281	31.61	97.76	19.71	46.99	7.11	0.20	0.07
3	Deogarh	17.82	32.47	49.70	57749	29.16	99.15	18.78	46.38	5.84	0.05	0.04
4	Dhenkanal	22.16	15.33	62.51	171634	35.86	97.92	44.67	54.70	7.94	0.58	0.15
5	Gajapati	8.52	55.32	36.15	122799	55.33	98.51	19.76	48.20	10.08	0.88	0.07
6	Ganjam	22.51	5.61	71.88	445371	28.08	99.76	21.21	49.65	11.28	1.34	0.37
7	Jharsuguda	22.57	41.71	35.71	72765	34.11	100.00	34.52	58.98	18.61	0.78	0.84
8	Kalahandi	19.91	30.44	49.65	285141	29.54	99.28	18.88	42.68	8.45	0.02	0.05
9	Kandhamal	21.71	51.02	27.26	152284	58.16	97.83	24.89	51.52	15.37	4.11	0.15
10	Kendujhar	14.79	43.02	42.19	303096	41.04	99.60	29.11	53.72	15.89	0.24	0.22
11	Koraput	16.91	55.19	27.90	275028	35.45	99.32	18.80	46.98	8.80	1.18	0.08
12	Malkangiri	24.92	60.64	14.44	122000.	48.23	99.44	28.56	59.09	16.59	0.16	0.25
13	Mayurbhanj	14.33	54.12	31.55	428827	34.55	99.67	24.41	50.42	13.69	0.67	0.59
14	Nabarangapur	16.96	55.67	27.37	216554	46.82	99.33	38.16	58.68	13.95	0.94	0.21
15	Naupada	15.15	35.87	48.98	109108	22.43	99.09	18.55	43.73	8.83	0.96	0.27
16	Rayagada	17.57	57.89	24.54	184527	41.09	98.62	26.41	63.83	16.90	1.98	0.13
17	Sambalpur	21.68	36.36	41.95	153568	39.44	99.41	38.03	62.10	19.20	3.88	0.09
18	Sonepur	21.93	9.73	68.34	103722	44.06	98.86	45.70	54.07	8.08	0.42	0.09
19	Sundargarh	11.73	64.96	23.32	309817	30.83	99.23	34.21	46.96	10.77	5.52	0.45
20	Angul	18.96	14.61	66.43	176859	30.63	99.41	46.56	42.52	4.84	7.08	0.15
21	Baleswar	19.11	10.70	70.19	299529	16.47	98.05	33.17	39.96	4.03	0.66	0.85
22	Bargarh	20.63	21.63	57.74	253347	18.39	97.15	26.08	36.72	5.85	0.47	0.04
23	Bhadrak	21.07	1.92	77.02	190385	19.88	99.52	44.52	44.55	2.95	0.51	0.09
24	Jajpur	26.44	8.75	64.81	268163	35.09	96.89	58.12	42.65	4.29	3.40	0.39
25	Cuttack	25.20	5.96	68.84	217669	34.79	99.22	40.20	40.62	3.80	3.74	0.07
26	Jagatsinghpur	25.22	0.70	74.08	130406	38.00	99.63	62.43	49.34	9.55	0.04	0.13
27	Kendrapara	21.20	0.78	78.02	183082	41.99	99.57	54.19	33.78	2.57	0.80	1.29
28	Khurda	20.71	8.45	70.84	100803	15.31	98.88	25.87	32.34	4.13	6.55	0.27
29	Nayagarh	14.51	7.51	77.98	146932	38.98	99.76	29.22	52.50	12.44	0.60	0.07
30	Puri	20.89	0.78	78.33	208637	28.33	98.57	32.80	34.70	2.28	0.02	0.04
	<b>Odisha</b>	19.24	28.21	52.55	6025230	33.27	98.76	28.33	48.71	10.19	1.63	0.28

SOURCE: Website MGNREGA

Contd.,

**Table - 2.1**  
**Employment Generated through MGNREGS 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	Bolangir	18.20	23.15	58.65	244648	24.94	99.33	9.25	43.29	9.46	0.73	0.35
2	Boudh	25.18	12.98	61.84	77688	22.67	98.42	3.32	31.23	1.90	0.12	0.04
3	Deogarh	17.88	32.63	49.49	57029	27.61	98.92	4.88	34.99	2.37	0.10	0.02
4	Dhenkanal	22.38	15.52	62.09	165504	27.69	99.09	2.15	50.63	5.68	0.63	0.11
5	Gajapati	8.63	55.89	35.48	120144	49.93	98.44	15.33	46.84	7.27	0.83	0.06
6	Ganjam	22.59	5.63	71.78	437984	32.39	96.31	1.43	55.77	13.18	1.48	0.46
7	Jharsuguda	22.78	41.85	35.37	71312	22.41	99.46	15.35	40.23	8.96	0.94	0.28
8	Kalahandi	20.08	30.50	49.42	278326	18.31	99.47	2.40	27.96	1.97	0.03	0.05
9	Kandhamal	22.22	51.97	25.81	146028	51.03	97.28	6.13	46.32	9.80	4.61	0.16
10	Kendujhar	15.34	43.31	41.35	287084	21.76	99.68	3.61	30.01	2.97	0.04	0.24
11	Koraput	16.97	55.34	27.69	268983	23.43	99.48	17.55	36.80	4.28	1.18	0.05
12	Malkangiri	25.51	60.51	13.98	117477	22.83	99.58	2.89	37.25	3.26	0.06	0.07
13	Mayurbhanj	14.53	54.13	31.34	419469	25.70	99.56	4.04	47.79	6.01	0.71	1.59
14	Nabarangapur	17.28	55.82	26.90	206976	35.27	99.43	7.19	42.49	6.50	0.87	0.12
15	Nuapada	15.18	35.89	48.94	107990	16.96	98.90	10.36	26.75	1.99	1.13	0.26
16	Rayagada	17.70	58.36	23.94	178174	32.85	96.30	8.04	52.45	10.86	1.84	0.11
17	Sambalpur	22.29	37.00	40.70	142950	20.66	99.35	7.87	37.71	6.60	4.16	0.03
18	Sonepur	22.91	10.23	66.86	96366	27.25	96.49	4.63	41.24	3.80	0.61	0.10
19	Sundargarh	12.05	65.25	22.70	294518	23.64	99.50	2.60	33.80	4.45	6.22	0.07
20	Angul	19.15	14.76	66.08	173792	28.05	99.40	5.35	31.18	2.55	7.70	0.16
21	Baleshwar	19.31	10.88	69.80	292761	8.70	97.97	1.10	24.85	0.58	0.79	0.42
22	Bargarh	20.68	21.63	57.69	249348	16.72	99.61	5.71	29.65	3.54	0.56	0.02
23	Bhadrak	21.39	1.96	76.65	184698	11.86	98.92	3.07	37.76	1.74	0.26	0.06
24	Jajpur	26.61	8.82	64.57	265270	27.06	99.57	4.05	41.95	5.88	4.10	0.37
25	Cuttack	25.53	6.03	68.44	205388	23.07	99.36	1.73	37.36	5.50	4.18	0.02
26	Jagatsinghpur	26.33	0.74	72.92	120099	21.39	99.56	4.44	23.36	2.14	0.03	0.02
27	Kendrapara	21.92	0.82	77.26	167526	15.39	99.48	0.87	17.34	0.41	0.73	0.46
28	Khurda	20.87	8.69	70.44	95570	14.05	98.27	2.67	22.93	1.21	8.13	0.14
29	Nayagarh	15.53	7.93	76.54	126717	20.97	99.52	0.75	28.67	1.78	0.29	0.10
30	Puri	21.07	0.78	78.15	202623	15.26	99.37	5.81	14.00	0.17	0.02	0.02
	<b>Odisha</b>	19.54	28.45	52.01	5802442	24.10	98.71	5.47	39.63	5.92	1.91	0.29

SOURCE: Website MGNREGA

Contd.,

**Table - 2.1**  
**Employment Generated through MGNREGS 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	Bolangir	18.45	23.37	58.19	229725	23.22	98.72	100.00	35.09	3.75	0.70	1.09
2	Boudh	25.73	13.09	61.19	72951	30.88	98.58	100.00	28.05	1.16	0.12	0.08
3	Deogarh	18.07	33.06	48.87	55499	26.97	99.13	100.00	32.20	2.29	0.03	0.03
4	Dhenkanal	23.01	16.15	60.84	152584	16.41	97.73	100.00	32.51	1.71	0.32	0.06
5	Gajapati	8.82	56.47	34.71	112225	41.93	96.86	100.00	38.87	3.95	0.88	0.09
6	Ganjam	23.07	5.70	71.23	410911	39.62	97.54	100.00	59.95	14.36	1.53	0.33
7	Jharsuguda	23.07	42.60	34.33	67637	19.86	98.29	100.00	31.12	3.47	1.02	0.13
8	Kalahandi	20.50	31.10	48.40	264862	18.87	98.48	100.00	27.26	1.47	0.03	0.02
9	Kandhamal	23.45	55.03	21.52	125965	39.59	97.31	100.00	32.04	2.05	4.21	0.17
10	Kendujhar	16.07	44.72	39.21	258460	17.12	98.83	100.00	25.92	1.37	0.03	0.26
11	Koraput	16.96	55.68	27.35	262421	24.33	99.20	100.00	30.51	2.77	0.71	0.05
12	Malkangiri	25.70	61.00	13.31	106292	30.21	98.82	100.00	48.12	5.02	0.03	0.02
13	Mayurbhanj	14.73	54.34	30.93	405087	29.09	99.48	100.00	43.95	6.32	0.70	1.04
14	Nabarangapur	17.61	56.42	25.97	194170	22.96	99.21	100.00	35.75	2.06	0.81	0.15
15	Nuapada	15.10	36.37	48.53	102337	33.05	98.50	100.00	33.80	3.21	1.18	0.05
16	Rayagada	17.90	58.98	23.12	169695	34.69	98.05	100.00	48.71	8.11	1.77	0.10
17	Sambalpur	22.60	37.49	39.91	135203	20.84	98.64	100.00	28.61	2.49	3.40	0.04
18	Sonepur	24.78	11.00	64.22	85925	28.05	93.35	100.00	36.51	2.33	0.65	0.12
19	Sundargarh	12.23	65.39	22.38	284729	19.48	99.33	100.00	24.24	1.05	7.90	0.10
20	Angul	19.62	14.97	65.42	166010	19.12	99.31	100.00	23.47	1.11	7.42	0.23
21	Baleshwar	19.95	11.24	68.81	272204	16.53	98.77	100.00	26.71	0.85	0.83	0.29
22	Bargarh	20.72	21.62	57.66	244440	12.69	98.63	100.00	19.44	0.69	0.47	0.02
23	Bhadrak	22.25	1.97	75.78	169041	23.59	97.64	100.00	35.51	1.03	0.40	0.03
24	Jajpur	28.98	9.64	61.38	227268	24.07	99.06	100.00	23.20	0.68	4.36	0.26
25	Cuttack	27.07	6.32	66.62	151033	11.29	94.82	100.00	19.71	0.59	3.38	0.02
26	Jagatsinghpur	29.11	0.78	70.11	93089	17.00	98.40	100.00	11.06	0.28	0.01	0.00
27	Kendrapara	25.18	0.97	73.85	99651	5.06	99.12	100.00	13.47	0.02	0.91	0.18
28	Khurda	21.08	9.18	69.74	83741	7.35	90.67	100.00	13.96	0.19	7.78	0.08
29	Nayagarh	16.52	8.33	75.16	104818	4.95	89.41	100.00	15.61	0.21	0.33	0.00
30	Puri	22.42	0.88	76.70	159880	3.36	95.56	100.00	10.81	0.13	0.02	0.07
	<b>Odisha</b>	20.03	29.92	50.06	5267853	22.76	98.33	100.00	36.08	4.38	1.73	0.28

**SOURCE:** Website MGNREGA

Sundargarh with 50 per cent of population being tribals doing well in taking care of the community by providing 75, 77 and 73 per cent of person days through 2008-11. Koraput and Mayurbhanj districts similarly have 50 per cent tribal population. They are also performing well in tribal welfare by providing 50 to 65 per cent of person days to tribals in the reference period. There was also stress on provision of employment to women in MGNREGS. Ganjam led the other districts by providing proportionate share of 48, 49 and 50 per cent of person days to women through 2008-11. Overall at the state level Scheduled Caste got 19 per cent, Scheduled Tribes got 35 per cent and women formed 37 per cent share in total person days created during 2008-11. Among the employed households only 4 per cent could get 100 days of employment in 2008-09. But, in later years it has shown an increase as about 6 per cent in 2009-10 and 10 per cent in 2010-11 are benefited with 100 days of employment at state level.

Sundargarh with 8 per cent in 2008-09, Khurda with 8 per cent in 2009-10 and Angul with 7 per cent in 2010-11 were leading the other districts in involving beneficiaries of government schemes like Indira Awas Yojana. But, at the state level the same category could not cross 2 per cent.

Only Bolangir, Mayurbhanj and Kendrapara have recorded more than one per cent share of employment for the disabled. At the state level it is only 0.28 per cent.

### **2.3. Progress of different projects:**

Odisha has spent Rs. 1,17,456.3 lakhs on different projects till 2010-11 under MGNREGS. Out of this a lion's share of 51 per cent has gone for rural Road Connectivity followed by other projects like renovation of traditional water bodies with 19 per cent and Water Conservation Projects with 12 per cent. Similar pattern of expenditure is noticed among the districts except in Sonapur and Baleswar where renovation of traditional Water bodies has taken the priority over rural Road Connectivity (Table 2.2).

In Rural Road Connectivity projects Koraput performed well in 2008-09 with 39 per cent of completed projects. In the next year Gajapati led the other with 36 per cent. In 2010-11 Jajpur has done well as 75 per cent of projects got completed. Angul could complete 50 per cent of projects in the same year. At the state level only 30 per cent of projects could be completed by 2010-11 in this category. One of the components of MGNREGS works is Flood Controls and Protection. Kalahandi district could complete all the works initiated by 2010-11. Angul and Puri followed with 85 per cent and 75 per cent of works completed in the same period. But same districts like Jharsuguda, Malkanagiri, Bargarh and Mayurbhanj have shown dismal performance as no work got completed. At the state level works completed were only 4 per cent in 2008-09 but subsequently it picked up in the next year and 22 per cent were completed. However, it could not maintain the tempo in 2010-11 and ended with only 14 per cent.

Considerable focus was also laid on Water Conservation and Water Harvesting projects. In fact, this category of works occupied third rank in funds allocation. Angul, Gajapati and Ganjam districts were leading others in completion of these works with 71 per cent, 70 per cent and 24 per cent respectively by 2010-11. Ganjam could actually finish 46 per cent in previous year but lagged in 2010-11. The overall picture looks very disappointing as most districts have shown a very bad performance. The position of Bargarh and Mayurbhanj is unenviable as each one has 97 to 100 per cent of works still unfinished. The position of other districts like Dhenkanal, Bolangir, Kandhamal, Rayagada and Baleswar is no better as around 95 per cent of works are still in progress. At the state level only 21 per cent of the projects got completed by 2010-11.

Drought Proofing works do not need much technology and quite suitable for MGNREGS works. But, evidently no enthusiasm is shown in completing these works as no single work was completed in 8 of the 30 districts. In another 5 districts more than 95 per cent works are still being finished. Gajapati and Jajpur districts did better in completing more than 70 per cent of these works. At the state level 20 per cent of initiated works got completed by 2010-11.

Micro-irrigation works got bogged down as one third of the districts reported no single project as completed. Only Gajapati and Cuttack districts reported 56 per cent and 43 per cent of works completed respectively in 2010-11. The state average of works completed in this category is only 16 per cent in 2010-11. Even this is four fold increase from 4 per cent in 2008-09.

To help poor Scheduled Caste farmers reap better yields MGNREGS incorporated some irrigation schemes to benefit their lands. Puri was a bit late entrant as it initiated these schemes only in 2010-11. By this time Malkanagiri district could complete 80 per cent of these irrigation schemes. But in Jharsuguda and Sonapur districts none of the projects could be completed in 2008-11. The state's average of completed works is only 4.32 per cent.

One cannot understate the benefits that farmers used to derive from Traditional Water Bodies like ponds and tanks before the advent of major irrigation projects. In recent times neglect of these resources has caused decreased ayacut and distortions in ecological balance at village level. To reverse this, at least to some extent, MGNREGS allowed allocations for this purpose. In fact, this amount occupies 2<sup>nd</sup> position next only to Road Connectivity.

**Table 2.2 – District wise works completed/progress under MGNREGA (Number of Projects) (2010-11, 2009-10 and 2008-09)**

(In Percentages)

Sl. No	Name of The District	Rural Connectivity						Flood Control and Protection						Water Conservation and Water Harvesting					
		Completed			Ongoing			Completed			Ongoing			Completed			Ongoing		
		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	Bolangir	12.29	9.33	1.95	87.71	90.67	98.05	6.25			93.75	100.00	100.00	4.03	3.45	0.19	95.97	96.55	99.81
2	Boudh	29.63	17.63	3.83	70.37	82.37	96.17	0.00			100.00	100.00	100.00	17.55	9.02		82.45	90.98	100.00
3	Deogarh	25.76	1.42	0.22	74.24	98.58	99.78	37.50			62.50	100.00	100.00	28.20	0.97		71.80	99.03	100.00
4	Dhenkanal	28.41	11.63	1.21	71.59	88.37	98.79	10.00			90.00	100.00	100.00	4.18	0.82		95.82	99.18	100.00
5	Gajapati	48.51	36.81	27.47	51.49	63.19	72.53	55.88	20.00	36.17	44.12	80.00	63.83	69.96	8.47	27.27	30.04	91.53	72.73
6	Ganjam	33.45	34.77	18.54	66.55	65.23	81.46	42.86	61.11		57.14	38.89	100.00	23.99	45.70	11.67	76.01	54.30	88.33
7	Jharsuguda	21.31	34.02	15.58	78.69	65.98	84.42				100.00	100.00	100.00	38.04	8.55	1.74	61.96	91.45	98.26
8	Kalahandi	36.21	5.01	1.56	63.79	94.99	98.44	100.00				100.00	100.00	7.90	2.12	2.04	92.10	97.88	97.96
9	Kandhamal	21.85	7.43	5.71	78.15	92.57	94.29	25.00	3.70	3.57	75.00	96.30	96.43	5.29	0.29	2.10	94.71	99.71	97.90
10	Kendujhar	43.69	19.75	2.23	56.31	80.25	97.77	25.00		0.00	75.00	100.00	100.00	39.11	3.31		60.89	96.69	100.00
11	Koraput	20.22	21.93	38.90	79.78	78.07	61.10	18.75	65.79	5.71	81.25	34.21	94.29	20.82	7.62	1.74	79.18	92.38	98.26
12	Malkangiri	30.45	10.95	36.58	69.55	89.05	63.42				100.00	100.00	100.00	46.88	4.69	27.18	53.12	95.31	72.82
13	Mayurbhanj	37.75	6.95	8.19	62.25	93.05	91.81	6.52	2.94	6.25	93.48	97.06	93.75	43.09	2.38	0.48	56.91	97.62	99.52
14	Nabarangapur	19.61	17.03	11.94	80.39	82.97	88.06	55.56	36.84	15.79	44.44	63.16	84.21	21.83	20.44	1.74	78.17	79.56	98.26
15	Nuapada	32.60	12.76	2.09	67.40	87.24	97.91	33.33	33.33	14.29	66.67	66.67	85.71	15.20	2.95	0.45	84.80	97.05	99.55
16	Rayagada	10.71	16.00	0.22	89.29	84.00	99.78	4.74	16.02		95.26	83.98	100.00	8.80	13.82	0.11	91.20	86.18	99.89
17	Sambalpur	13.57	18.84	8.59	86.43	81.16	91.41	11.76	68.06		88.24	31.94	100.00	25.81	11.44	0.18	74.19	88.56	99.82
18	Sonepur	33.85	2.61	5.98	66.15	97.39	94.02	14.29			85.71	100.00	100.00	19.43	0.34	0.74	80.57	99.66	99.26
19	Sundargarh	28.01	23.16	16.45	71.99	76.84	83.55	9.52	5.26	20.00	90.48	94.74	80.00	21.80	21.42	15.38	78.20	78.58	84.62
20	Angul	50.15	11.42	1.41	49.85	88.58	98.59	85.71			14.29	100.00	100.00	70.89	4.35		29.11	95.65	100.00
21	Baleshwar	33.23	9.88	6.93	66.77	90.12	93.07		1.75	1.92	100.00	98.25	98.08	4.00	16.05	19.00	96.00	83.95	81.00
22	Bargarh	12.43	25.49	0.20	87.57	74.51	99.80				100.00	100.00		1.02	0.52	0.00	98.98	99.48	100.00
23	Bhadrak	20.28	19.44	3.11	79.72	80.56	96.89	12.50			87.50	100.00	100.00	25.37	8.24	1.33	74.63	91.76	98.67
24	Jajpur	75.17	35.18	21.99	24.83	64.82	78.01	23.33	10.34		76.67	89.66	100.00	62.69	13.79	4.19	37.31	86.21	95.81
25	Cuttack	28.22	3.76	0.00	71.78	96.24	100.00	17.65			82.35	100.00	100.00	30.51	6.96		69.49	93.04	100.00
26	Jagatsinghpur	19.52	1.61	0.00	80.48	98.39	100.00	63.64			36.36	100.00	100.00	27.92			72.08	100.00	100.00
27	Kendrapara	2.50	4.97	0.44	97.50	95.03	99.56	8.00			92.00	100.00	100.00	35.08			64.92	100.00	100.00
28	Khurda	14.89	3.14	0.00	85.11	96.86	100.00	25.00			75.00	100.00	100.00	7.69	3.85		92.31	96.15	100.00
29	Nayagarh	15.01	1.75	0.00	84.99	98.25	100.00				100.00			3.31	2.80		96.69	97.20	100.00
30	Puri	26.88	0.00	0.00	73.12	100.00	100.00	75.00			25.00	100.00		31.82			68.18	100.00	100.00
	Total	29.52	17.55	10.32	70.48	82.45	89.68	13.98	22.29	4.44	86.02	77.71	95.56	21.30	8.60	5.09	78.70	91.40	94.91

Contd .....2.,

**Table 2.2 – District wise works completed/progress under MGNREGA (Number of Projects) (2010-11, 2009-10 and 2008-09)**

(In Percentages)

Sl. No	Name of the District	Drought Proofing						Micro Irrigation Works						Irrigation Facility to Land owned by SC & ST					
		Completed			Ongoing			Completed			Ongoing			Completed			Ongoing		
		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	Bolangir	0.98	3.77		99.02	96.23	100.00				100.00	100.00		1.21	0.47	0.06	98.79	99.53	99.94
2	Boudh	0.00			100.00	100.00	100.00				100.00	100.00		16.03	3.87		83.97	96.13	100.00
3	Deogarh	41.67		4.35	58.33	100.00	95.65	10.34	5.19		89.66	94.81	100.00	31.89	0.90		68.11	99.10	100.00
4	Dhenkanal	0.21			99.79	100.00	100.00	2.83			97.17	100.00	100.00	19.57	1.31		80.43	98.69	100.00
5	Gajapati	73.39	33.12	17.86	26.61	66.88	82.14	56.34	25.32	17.86	43.66	74.68	82.14					100.00	100.00
6	Ganjam	21.08	19.57	5.05	78.92	80.43	94.95	34.48	24.34	1.43	65.52	75.66	98.57	13.33	38.14	3.19	86.67	61.86	96.81
7	Jharsuguda	15.64	0.51		84.36	99.49	100.00				100.00	100.00	100.00	0.00			100.00	100.00	100.00
8	Kalahandi	4.43	3.37		95.57	96.63	100.00				100.00	100.00	100.00	4.92			95.08	100.00	
9	Kandhamal	0.04		1.85	99.96	100.00	98.15	9.80		2.27	90.20	100.00	97.73	11.24	0.12		88.76	99.88	100.00
10	Kendujhar	10.49			89.51	100.00	100.00	12.79			87.21	100.00	100.00	35.15	2.72		64.85	97.28	100.00
11	Koraput	46.83		18.29	53.17	100.00	81.71	10.59	21.59	10.00	89.41	78.41	90.00	18.03	12.70	21.01	81.97	87.30	78.99
12	Malkangiri	45.65	9.59	43.65	54.35	90.41	56.35	1.52			98.48	100.00	100.00	79.41	9.76	31.75	20.59	90.24	68.25
13	Mayurbhanj	5.49			94.51	100.00	100.00	19.74	7.69	5.26	80.26	92.31	94.74	31.40	5.50	1.30	68.60	94.50	98.70
14	Nabarangapur	20.84	76.36		79.16	23.64	100.00	0.00			100.00	100.00	100.00	16.39	1.90		83.61	98.10	100.00
15	Nuapada	50.00	15.38	2.33	50.00	84.62	97.67	7.14			92.86	100.00	100.00	21.31	17.26		78.69	82.74	100.00
16	Rayagada	3.85	20.00		96.15	80.00	100.00	3.75	20.87		96.25	79.13	100.00	10.92	4.23		89.08	95.77	100.00
17	Sambalpur	0.00	16.67		100.00	83.33	100.00	0.00	14.29		100.00	85.71	100.00	28.00	8.70	15.55	72.00	91.30	84.45
18	Sonepur	18.94	1.32	0.24	81.06	98.68	99.76	0.00			100.00	100.00	100.00	0.00			100.00	100.00	100.00
19	Sundargarh	32.72	64.41	3.76	67.28	35.59	96.24	13.79		22.22	86.21	100.00	77.78	23.28	12.85	33.33	76.72	87.15	66.67
20	Angul	20.59	9.38		79.41	90.63	100.00	32.35	2.13		67.65	97.87	100.00	40.12	6.00	0.33	59.88	94.00	99.67
21	Baleshwar	16.67	13.79		83.33	86.21	100.00		5.56	5.00	100.00	94.44	95.00	32.53	8.65	2.36	67.47	91.35	97.64
22	Bargarh	12.50			87.50	100.00	100.00		11.86		100.00	88.14	100.00	1.77		0.00	98.23	100.00	100.00
23	Bhadrak	2.86			97.14	100.00	100.00	26.71	25.69	4.65	73.29	74.31	95.35	50.44	4.71	1.45	49.56	95.29	98.55
24	Jajpur	72.73	27.27	20.00	27.27	72.73	80.00	35.19	30.26	4.17	64.81	69.74	95.83	72.39	6.27	11.36	27.61	93.73	88.64
25	Cuttack	42.11			57.89	100.00	100.00	43.40			56.60	100.00	100.00	38.00	16.10		62.00	83.90	100.00
26	Jagatsinghpur	50.00			50.00	100.00	100.00	5.95			94.05	100.00	100.00	48.96	0.37		51.04	99.63	100.00
27	Kendrapara	0.00			100.00	100.00	100.00	7.94			92.06	100.00	100.00	30.40			69.60	100.00	
28	Khurda	2.33	0.75		97.67	99.25	100.00	5.00			95.00	100.00	100.00	10.28	0.60		89.72	99.40	100.00
29	Nayagarh				100.00	100.00					100.00	100.00		5.44	3.29		94.56	96.71	
30	Puri				100.00	100.00	100.00				100.00			53.70			46.30		
Total		20.35	10.14	2.83	79.65	89.86	97.17	15.65	14.28	4.27	84.35	85.72	95.73	32.06	5.54	4.09	67.94	94.46	95.91

Contd .....3

**Table 2.2 – District wise works completed/progress under MGNREGA (Number of Projects) (2010-11, 2009-10 and 2008-09)**

(In Percentages)

Sl. No	Name of the District	Renovation of Traditional Water bodies						Land Development						Any other Activity approved by MRD					
		Completed			Ongoing			Completed			Ongoing			Completed			Ongoing		
		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	Bolangir	8.10	4.08	0.53	91.90	95.92	99.47			16.67	100.00	100.00	83.33	9.14	1.91		90.86	98.09	100.00
2	Boudh	23.57	12.57	2.11	76.43	87.43	97.89												
3	Deogarh	18.68	2.40	0.16	81.32	97.60	99.84	65.91			34.09			60.39	0.74		39.61	99.26	100.00
4	Dhenkanal	18.70	6.62	0.11	81.30	93.38	99.89	4.00			96.00	100.00	100.00	35.56	2.78		64.44	97.22	100.00
5	Gajapati	68.44	24.20	22.73	31.56	75.80	77.27	29.63		16.67	70.37	100.00	83.33	37.79	21.37	20.61	62.21	78.63	79.39
6	Ganjam	41.11	42.92	15.77	58.89	57.08	84.23	50.00			50.00	100.00	100.00	16.32	25.13	2.83	83.68	74.87	97.17
7	Jharsuguda	19.62	13.55	2.09	80.38	86.45	97.91	7.14	9.09		92.86	90.91	100.00	6.25			93.75	100.00	100.00
8	Kalahandi	31.00	1.35	0.58	69.00	98.65	99.42				100.00	100.00	100.00				100.00	100.00	100.00
9	Kandhamal	14.08	3.55	2.72	85.92	96.45	97.28	6.24			93.76	100.00		1.87	4.83	0.68	98.13	95.17	99.32
10	Kendujhar	34.38	9.73	2.59	65.62	90.27	97.41	5.13			94.87			13.94	5.13		86.06	94.87	100.00
11	Koraput	44.40	7.29	11.41	55.60	92.71	88.59	16.73	17.65		83.27	82.35		23.81	20.00		76.19	80.00	100.00
12	Malkangiri	59.82	21.00	35.22	40.18	79.00	64.78	77.90			22.10	100.00	100.00	18.95	7.17	21.76	81.05	92.83	78.24
13	Mayurbhanj	46.07	2.30	1.09	53.93	97.70	98.91	5.26	5.26		94.74	94.74	100.00	24.61	8.15		75.39	91.85	100.00
14	Nabarangapur	5.35	24.83	7.80	94.65	75.17	92.20	16.62			83.38	100.00		10.42	23.66	5.93	89.58	76.34	94.07
15	Nuapada	38.79	5.28	0.74	61.21	94.72	99.26	40.00			60.00	100.00	100.00	4.88	1.23	1.08	95.12	98.77	98.92
16	Rayagada	9.52	10.10		90.48	89.90	100.00	58.67			41.33	100.00	100.00	1.98	42.59		98.02	57.41	100.00
17	Sambalpur	11.03	20.16	5.20	88.97	79.84	94.80							2.00	23.53		98.00	76.47	100.00
18	Sonepur	20.59	0.86	0.90	79.41	99.14	99.10				100.00	100.00	100.00	12.50	0.00		87.50	100.00	100.00
19	Sundargarh	54.37	41.62	19.56	45.63	58.38	80.44	48.55	5.53		51.45	94.47	100.00	10.49	2.05	3.95	89.51	97.95	96.05
20	Angul	34.63	5.42		65.37	94.58	100.00	68.75			31.25	100.00	100.00	12.38			87.62	100.00	100.00
21	Baleshwar	19.40	11.51	7.83	80.60	88.49	92.17				100.00	100.00	100.00	10.53			89.47	100.00	100.00
22	Bargarh	13.67	14.41		86.33	85.59	100.00	13.67	0.45		86.33	99.55	100.00	11.40	8.54		88.60	91.46	100.00
23	Bhadrak	26.39	15.35	0.73	73.61	84.65	99.27	16.00	14.29		84.00	85.71	100.00	21.88	28.57	2.44	78.13	71.43	97.56
24	Jajpur	61.69	36.92	13.79	38.31	63.08	86.21	58.60	29.61	9.68	41.40	70.39	90.32	41.05	22.97	6.45	58.95	77.03	93.55
25	Cuttack	39.52	14.32		60.48	85.68	100.00	17.86	6.38		82.14	93.62	100.00	24.11	1.32		75.89	98.68	100.00
26	Jagatsinghpur	35.32	0.55		64.68	99.45	100.00	30.77	20.00		69.23	80.00	100.00	30.33	7.17		69.67	92.83	100.00
27	Kendrapara	1.57	7.22	0.81	98.43	92.78	99.19				100.00	100.00	100.00	1.59			98.41	100.00	100.00
28	Khurda	9.84	3.85		90.16	96.15	100.00	11.11			88.89	100.00	100.00	33.33	22.22		66.67	77.78	100.00
29	Nayagarh	3.57	2.65		96.43	97.35	100.00				100.00	100.00	100.00				100.00	100.00	100.00
30	Puri	37.60	2.34		62.40	97.66	100.00	38.46			61.54	100.00		13.33			86.67	100.00	
Total		30.95	13.17	6.32	69.05	86.83	93.68	35.10	3.74	1.33	64.90	96.26	98.67	14.72	11.64	5.23	85.28	88.36	94.77

Contd...4.,



**Table 2.2 – District wise works completed/progress under MGNREGA (Number of Projects) (2010-11, 2009-10 and 2008-09)**

(In Percentages)

Sl. No	Name of the District	Bharat Nirman Rajeev Gandhi Sewa Kendra						Total					
		Completed			Ongoing			Completed			Ongoing		
		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	Bolangir	--	--	--	--	--	--	7.40	5.04	0.80	92.60	94.96	99.20
2	Boudh	--	--	--	--	--	--	15.11	9.84	1.36	84.89	90.16	98.64
3	Deogarh	--	--	--	--	--	--	29.65	1.49	0.15	70.35	98.51	99.85
4	Dhenkanal	--	--	--	--	--	--	17.90	7.61	0.73	82.10	92.39	99.27
5	Gajapati	--	--	--	--	--	--	53.95	28.48	25.69	46.05	71.52	74.31
6	Ganjam	--	--	--	--	--	--	32.91	38.06	15.98	67.09	61.94	84.02
7	Jharsuguda	--	--	--	--	--	--	23.71	16.84	6.58	76.29	83.16	93.42
8	Kalahandi	--	--	--	--	--	--	23.90	2.75	1.09	76.10	97.25	98.91
9	Kandhamal	--	--	--	--	--	--	9.42	2.69	3.87	90.58	97.31	96.13
10	Kendujhar	--	--	--	--	--	--	35.50	9.24	1.22	64.50	90.76	98.78
11	Koraput	--	--	--	--	--	--	26.14	14.66	22.55	73.86	85.34	77.45
12	Malkangiri	--	--	--	--	--	--	42.08	8.29	31.42	57.92	91.71	68.58
13	Mayurbhanj	--	--	--	--	--	--	39.47	3.88	2.79	60.53	96.12	97.21
14	Nabarangapur	--	--	--	--	--	--	18.49	20.24	6.12	81.51	79.76	93.88
15	Nuapada	--	--	--	--	--	--	23.09	10.71	1.14	76.91	89.29	98.86
16	Rayagada	--	--	--	--	--	--	10.88	15.01	0.13	89.12	84.99	99.87
17	Sambalpur	--	--	--	--	--	--	19.19	16.60	7.73	80.81	83.40	92.27
18	Sonepur	--	--	--	--	--	--	23.52	1.25	1.52	76.48	98.75	98.48
19	Sundargarh	--	--	--	--	--	--	29.47	26.59	16.67	70.53	73.41	83.33
20	Angul	--	--	--	--	--	--	42.72	7.02	0.41	57.28	92.98	99.59
21	Baleshwar	--	--	--	--	--	--	28.84	9.84	6.76	71.16	90.16	93.24
22	Bargarh	--	--	--	--	--	--	11.03	12.80	0.05	88.97	87.20	99.95
23	Bhadrak	--	--	--	--	--	--	33.12	14.65	2.35	66.88	85.35	97.65
24	Jajpur	--	--	--	--	--	--	70.76	29.51	17.66	29.24	70.49	82.34
25	Cuttack	--	--	--	--	--	--	33.40	8.97	0.00	66.60	91.03	100.00
26	Jagatsinghpur	--	--	--	--	--	--	33.95	1.54	0.00	66.05	98.46	100.00
27	Kendrapara	--	--	--	--	--	--	7.76	4.04	0.46	92.24	95.96	99.54
28	Khurda	--	--	--	--	--	--	11.30	1.97	0.00	88.70	98.03	100.00
29	Nayagarh	--	--	--	--	--	--	9.50	2.12	0.00	90.50	97.88	100.00
30	Puri	--	--	--	--	--	--	36.27	1.89	0.00	63.73	98.11	100.00
	<b>Total</b>	--	--	--	--	--	--	27.31	12.53	7.04	72.69	87.47	92.96

Among the districts, Gajapati with 68 per cent and Jajpur with 62 per cent of completed works performed well while Kendrapara with 2 per cent and Mayurbhanj with 4 per cent struggled to keep pace. Overall it is only 31 per cent at state level. Yet, the pace has doubled from previous year of 2009-10.

Boudh and Sambalpur districts have no Land Developments works on record. Bolangir Kalahandi, Sonepur, Baleswar, Kendrapara and Nayagarh could not complete any on-going works through 2008-11. The highest at 78 per cent of completed works was recorded by Malkanagiri. Thirty five per cent of Land Development works got complete through 2008-11 at the state level.

When all the works put together at state level only 7 per cent were completed in 2008-09. But this climbed to 27 per cent by 2010-11. However, overall completion reflects a tardy progress of works under MGNREGS .

### **2.3.B Utilization of Funds on Different Projects:**

#### **2.3.B 1.Rural Connectivity:**

In the total funds allocated under this project in 2008-11, 17 to 25 per cent is spent on finishing the pending projects and the remaining balance is spent in the on-going in the year at the state level. Only in Jajpur larger amounts of 53 to 63 per cent of allocated funds were spent to complete the projects(Table 2.3).

#### **2.3.B 2.Flood Control and Protection:**

Smaller proportion of funds under this scheme, 9 per cent in 2008-09 to 15 per cent in 2009-10 were spent for completion of projects while major amounts 85 to 91 per cent were deployed in running projects in 2008-11. Only Angul, Jagatsinghpur and Puri had spent larger amounts in 2010-11 to complete the projects. In one third of the districts no amounts were spent to complete the projects and the projects were still on-going. Malkanagiri, however, did not report any projects under this head.

#### **2.3.B. 3.Water Conservation and Water Harvesting:**

Under this scheme 9 to 18 per cent of funds were spent to complete the projects while 82 to 91 per cent got allocated and spent for on-going projects in 2008-11 at state level. However, in the districts of Gajapati and Angul larger share of 75 and 80 per cent of funds were spent in finishing the projects. But in Jagatsinghpur, Kendrapara and Puri no amount was spent to complete the pending projects in 2008-10. Only in 2010-11 some amounts were spent for this purpose. In 9 districts in 2008-09 nothing was spent to complete the projects and total funds were spent on on-going projects.

#### **2.3.B .4.Drought Proofing:**

Funds for this scheme are doubled from 2009-10 and stands at Rs. 3,762 lakhs. About 6 districts i.e., Boudh, Dhenkanal, Sambalpur, Kendrapara Nayagarh and Puri have shown funds allocated only for on-going projects as no project under this head got completed in 2008-11. As state level only 4 per cent was spent in 2008-09 for completion of projects. It improved to 24 in 2009-10 but fell again to 15 per cent in the next year 2010-11.

#### **2.3. B.5. Micro Irrigation:**

Funds spent on this scheme increased from 1450 lakhs in 2008-09 to 2,464 lakhs by 2010-11. In 11 districts no projects was completed in 2008-11 and hence no money was spent to complete projects. All the funds in these districts remained on on-going projects. In Boudh, Nayagarh and Puri this scheme was taken up only in 2010-11. A fair amount of 23 per cent was spent on completed projects while large amounts were spent in on-going projects in 2008-09 and 2010-11.

#### **2.3. B .6.Provision of Irrigation facility to land owned by SCs and STs and other Weaker Sections:**

A large amount of Rs. 7,282 lakhs were spent under this programme in 2010-11 in the state. This was almost five fold increase from 2008-09. Gajapati and Sonapur districts did not report this programme in 2008-11. Jharsuguda spent some amount in 2008-09, but never got completed. The programme has shown steady progress in 2008-11 as amount spent on completed projects increased from 9 per cent to 32 per cent.

#### **2.3. B.7. Renovation of traditional water bodies:**

Amount spent under this head in 2010-11 was 22014 lakhs. This is 50 per cent increase from previous year at the state level. Only 20 per cent of the fund was spent to complete the pending projects while the balance amount was spent on on-going projects in 2010-11. The exception being Gajapati district where 75 per cent of the fund was spent on completed projects.

#### **2.3. B.8. Land Development:**

Land Development activity under MGNREGS was given a fillip when funds were increased more than 4 times from Rs. 615 lakhs to Rs. 2639 lakhs in 2010-11. But it does not reflect in the completed works. Only 21 per cent of the amount was spent for completion where as 79 per cent of money was gone for on-going works at the state level. But, number of districts who have spent 100 per cent of fund on on-going works decreased from 17 in 2008-09 to 9 in 2010-11. Only Malkanagiri could spend 81 per cent of allocated money to complete the programmes.

#### **2.4 Performance of MGNREGS: Quantitative indicators:**

Muster roll verification is periodically taken up to bring transparency and to see that the needy are really given employment when needed. In 2008-09 only 5 districts, i.e., Bolangir, Sambalpur, Sonapur, Jagatsinghpur and Nayagarh could carryout 100 per cent verification. Khurda lagged behind with only 12 per cent. In the following year, 2009-10 eight districts could verify all the muster rolls while Naupada fared badly by finishing only 7 per cent. In 2010-11, 12 out of 30 districts successfully completed verification of all the muster rolls. At the state level the tally increased from 72 per cent in 2008-09 to 84 by 2010-11.

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

(In Percentages)

Sl. No	Name of the District	Rural Connectivity						Flood Control and Protection						Water Conservation and Water Harvesting					
		Completed			Ongoing			Completed			Ongoing			Completed			Ongoing		
		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	Bolangir	10.54	14.90	0.79	89.46	85.10	99.21				100.00	100.00	100.00	7.72	14.80	2.98	92.28	85.20	97.02
2	Boudh	7.16	12.52	12.09	92.84	87.48	87.91				100.00	100.00	100.00	10.17	6.20	6.53	89.83	93.80	93.47
3	Deogarh	12.86	9.39	5.69	87.14	90.61	94.31				100.00	100.00	100.00	8.51	8.80	0.14	91.49	91.20	99.86
4	Dhenkanal	6.82	15.31	3.72	93.18	84.69	96.28				100.00	100.00	100.00	2.41	5.67		97.59	94.33	100.00
5	Gajapati	52.94	52.67	37.15	47.06	47.33	62.85	75.91	22.62	73.69	24.09	77.38	26.31	75.62	21.30	42.28	24.38	78.70	57.72
6	Ganjam	9.27	25.62	31.64	90.73	74.38	68.36		2.04	7.12		97.96	92.88	15.18	42.76	17.86	84.82	57.24	82.14
7	Jharsuguda	17.98	38.22	15.71	82.02	61.78	84.29						100.00	26.59	37.23	3.88	73.41	62.77	96.12
8	Kalahandi	23.69	7.56	2.93	76.31	92.44	97.07		0.00			100.00	100.00	4.76	4.41	2.89	95.24	95.59	97.11
9	Kandhamal	9.64	14.18	13.62	90.36	85.82	86.38		10.93	1.15	100.00	89.07	98.85	5.99	7.84	24.54	94.01	92.16	75.46
10	Kendujhar	22.94	31.58	2.28	77.06	68.42	97.72		0.00		100.00	100.00	100.00	12.09	16.03		87.91	83.97	100.00
11	Koraput	13.53	33.43	49.06	86.47	66.57	50.94	1.69	26.70	28.04	98.31	73.30	71.96	21.66	21.41	7.48	78.34	78.59	92.52
12	Malkangiri	18.58	16.89	38.49	81.42	83.11	61.51							45.51	12.94	26.96	54.49	87.06	73.04
13	Mayurbhanj	20.35	17.30	12.93	79.65	82.70	87.07		9.49	0.12	100.00	90.51	99.88	22.15	7.76	2.69	77.85	92.24	97.31
14	Nabarangapur	20.33	14.89	35.35	79.67	85.11	64.65	38.24	44.63	32.49	61.76	55.37	67.51	15.66	20.65	14.12	84.34	79.35	85.88
15	Nuapada	16.25	31.51	3.62	83.75	68.49	96.38	0.00			100.00		100.00	14.37	23.16	0.37	85.63	76.84	99.63
16	Rayagada	6.21	14.63	0.21	93.79	85.37	99.79	1.87	18.56		98.13	81.44	100.00	6.87	15.83	0.11	93.13	84.17	99.89
17	Sambalpur	10.90	17.41	11.53	89.10	82.59	88.47	35.57	53.02		64.43	46.98	100.00	19.40	19.24	0.30	80.60	80.76	99.70
18	Sonepur	14.10	12.21	13.39	85.90	87.79	86.61				100.00	100.00	100.00	11.74	7.85	8.76	88.26	92.15	91.24
19	Sundargarh	9.74	41.61	18.86	90.26	58.39	81.14	5.33	22.06		94.67	77.94	100.00	8.79	39.52	19.91	91.21	60.48	80.09
20	Angul	47.05	16.46	3.38	52.95	83.54	96.62	85.75	0.00		14.25	100.00	100.00	80.01	27.64		19.99	72.36	100.00
21	Baleshwar	7.21	27.01	8.04	92.79	72.99	91.96		9.01	2.35	100.00	90.99	97.65	0.15	20.08	11.21	99.85	79.92	88.79
22	Bargarh	10.87	14.90	0.64	89.13	85.10	99.36				100.00	100.00		0.56	2.89	0.00	99.44	97.11	100.00
23	Bhadrak	7.25	25.53	8.36	92.75	74.47	91.64				100.00	100.00	100.00	11.13	7.01	2.93	88.87	92.99	97.07
24	Jajpur	62.51	77.76	53.08	37.49	22.24	46.92		12.39	24.55	100.00	87.61	75.45	40.63	69.71	20.17	59.37	30.29	79.83
25	Cuttack	22.88	9.65		77.12	90.35	100.00	4.38			95.62	100.00	100.00	37.25	3.69		62.75	96.31	100.00
26	Jagatsinghpur	28.07	15.00		71.93	85.00	100.00	76.42			23.58	100.00	100.00	50.71			49.29	100.00	100.00
27	Kendrapara	2.56	12.43	0.34	97.44	87.57	99.66	9.85			90.15	100.00	100.00	19.94			80.06	100.00	100.00
28	Khurda	13.45	10.02		86.55	89.98	100.00				100.00	100.00		6.01	18.91		93.99	81.09	100.00
29	Nayagarh	12.88	5.23		87.12	94.77	100.00				100.00			2.29	25.56		97.71	74.44	100.00
30	Puri	32.83			67.17	100.00	100.00	99.71			0.29	100.00		27.02			72.98	100.00	100.00
Total		19.27	25.59	16.68	80.73	74.41	83.32	11.47	15.32	8.67	88.53	84.68	91.33	18.10	18.31	8.54	81.90	81.69	91.46

Contd .....2.,

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

Sl. No	Name of the District	Drought Proofing						Micro Irrigation Works						Irrigation Facility to Land owned by SC & ST					
		Completed			Ongoing			Completed			Ongoing			Completed			Ongoing		
		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	Bolangir	1.53	0.96		98.47	99.04	100.00				100.00	100.00		1.13	1.22	0.14	98.87	98.78	99.86
2	Boudh	0.00	0.00		100.00	100.00	100.00				100.00			6.66	46.61		93.34	53.39	100.00
3	Deogarh	69.89		1.20	30.11	100.00	98.80	1.93	12.98	1.06	98.07	87.02	98.94	35.93	5.99	0.90	64.07	94.01	99.10
4	Dhenkanal				100.00	100.00	100.00	4.40	0.00		95.60	100.00	100.00	17.26	1.89		82.74	98.11	100.00
5	Gajapati	81.26	50.49	18.94	18.74	49.51	81.06	72.49	47.81	25.55	27.51	52.19	74.45						
6	Ganjam	33.53	32.39	7.51	66.47	67.61	92.49	33.30	29.79	15.31	66.70	70.21	84.69	12.33	34.63	40.43	87.67	65.37	59.57
7	Jharsuguda	20.27	14.93		79.73	85.07	100.00				100.00	100.00	100.00						100.00
8	Kalahandi	1.75	11.73	2.26	98.25	88.27	97.74				100.00	100.00	100.00	9.64			90.36	100.00	
9	Kandhamal	0.00		3.60	100.00	100.00	96.40	10.86		8.57	89.14	100.00	91.43	16.55	6.45	4.33	83.45	93.55	95.67
10	Kendujhar	3.89			96.11	100.00	100.00	8.38	26.60		91.62	73.40	100.00	27.39	24.14		72.61	75.86	100.00
11	Koraput	3.76	1.47	3.37	96.24	98.53	96.63	10.89	49.41	10.65	89.11	50.59	89.35	22.34	49.42	41.67	77.66	50.58	58.33
12	Malkangiri	0.00	9.34	36.00	100.00	90.66	64.00				100.00	100.00	100.00		0.00	33.42		100.00	66.58
13	Mayurbhanj	2.35			97.65	100.00	100.00	12.72	13.09	6.83	87.28	86.91	93.17	24.25	8.26	3.15	75.75	91.74	96.85
14	Nabarangapur	29.51	100.00	5.40	70.49		94.60				100.00	100.00	100.00	20.28	7.82	100.00	79.72	92.18	
15	Nuapada		90.91			9.09	100.00		57.31		100.00	42.69	100.00	21.29	52.71		78.71	47.29	100.00
16	Rayagada		41.79		100.00	58.21	100.00	2.41	21.95		97.59	78.05	100.00	9.13	21.57		90.87	78.43	100.00
17	Sambalpur				100.00	100.00	100.00				100.00	100.00	100.00	31.60	23.49	17.55	68.40	76.51	82.45
18	Sonepur	13.01	20.96	3.65	86.99	79.04	96.35				100.00	100.00	100.00						
19	Sundargarh	29.58	33.74	1.97	70.42	66.26	98.03	2.60	31.36	16.16	97.40	68.64	83.84	18.54	23.44	43.55	81.46	76.56	56.45
20	Angul	5.62	6.73		94.38	93.27	100.00	26.67	10.46		73.33	89.54	100.00	35.68	22.83	1.29	64.32	77.17	98.71
21	Baleshwar	1.06	52.65		98.94	47.35	100.00		57.85	12.24	100.00	42.15	87.76	32.86	59.90	12.24	67.14	40.10	87.76
22	Bargarh	38.04			61.96	100.00	100.00		10.75		100.00	89.25	100.00	0.00			100.00	100.00	100.00
23	Bhadrak	1.96			98.04	100.00	100.00	8.44	16.58	7.94	91.56	83.42	92.06	48.63	21.75	2.06	51.37	78.25	97.94
24	Jajpur	75.34	97.34	97.31	24.66	2.66	2.69	23.90	58.26	45.01	76.10	41.74	54.99	70.00	78.22	37.46	30.00	21.78	62.54
25	Cuttack	18.25	7.74		81.75	92.26	100.00	50.05			49.95	100.00	100.00	40.60	41.66		59.40	58.34	100.00
26	Jagatsinghpur	2.95			97.05	100.00		1.24			98.76	100.00	100.00	52.44	6.54		47.56	93.46	100.00
27	Kendrapara				100.00			7.45			92.55	100.00	100.00	27.96	12.39		72.04	87.61	
28	Khurda	0.10	12.49		99.90	87.51	100.00				100.00	100.00	100.00	16.35	11.01		83.65	88.99	100.00
29	Nayagarh				100.00	100.00					100.00			3.19	82.81		96.81	17.19	
30	Puri				100.00	100.00	100.00				100.00			56.59			43.41	100.00	
Total		14.84	24.40	4.13	85.16	75.60	95.87	11.63	22.65	7.29	88.37	77.35	92.71	32.23	27.16	9.14	67.77	72.84	90.86

Contd .....3

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

Sl. No	Name of the District	Renovation of Traditional Water bodies						Land Development						Any other Activity approved by MRD					
		Completed			Ongoing			Completed			Ongoing			Completed			Ongoing		
		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	Bolangir	15.20	15.81	0.41	84.80	84.19	99.59			6.53	100.00	100.00	93.47	0.61	0.36		99.39	99.64	100.00
2	Boudh	17.75	14.25	4.89	82.25	85.75	95.11												
3	Deogarh	2.40	7.71	3.44	97.60	92.29	96.56	68.06			31.94			18.67	0.92		81.33	99.08	100.00
4	Dhenkanal	8.70	8.38	0.15	91.30	91.62	99.85				100.00	100.00	100.00	3.16			96.84	100.00	100.00
5	Gajapati	75.90	49.78	32.54	24.10	50.22	67.46	35.23			64.77	100.00	100.00	29.90	60.17	29.39	70.10	39.83	70.61
6	Ganjam	31.01	45.64	31.26	68.99	54.36	68.74	42.97			57.03	100.00	100.00	3.86	5.87	2.77	96.14	94.13	97.23
7	Jharsuguda	8.37	28.96	6.03	91.63	71.04	93.97	12.98	14.48		87.02	85.52	100.00	26.78			73.22	100.00	100.00
8	Kalahandi	17.98	3.18	2.29	82.02	96.82	97.71				100.00						100.00	100.00	100.00
9	Kandhamal	7.79	17.78	11.98	92.21	82.22	88.02	18.78			81.22	100.00		0.19	6.05	3.41	99.81	93.95	96.59
10	Kendujhar	19.86	14.80	2.35	80.14	85.20	97.65	2.02			97.98	100.00		16.82	3.09		83.18	96.91	100.00
11	Koraput	42.72	28.95	23.20	57.28	71.05	76.80	5.42	27.73		94.58	72.27		25.87	24.24		74.13	75.76	100.00
12	Malkangiri	45.41	31.30	21.55	54.59	68.70	78.45	80.97	33.58		19.03	66.42	100.00	6.40	18.63	26.94	93.60	81.37	73.06
13	Mayurbhanj	17.28	13.03	5.56	82.72	86.97	94.44	9.59	6.42		90.41	93.58	100.00	4.08	4.49	0.59	95.92	95.51	99.41
14	Nabarangapur	12.85	14.60	8.32	87.15	85.40	91.68	1.50			98.50	100.00		10.85	6.09	6.73	89.15	93.91	93.27
15	Nuapada	23.21	41.39	1.93	76.79	58.61	98.07				100.00		100.00		3.00	2.46	100.00	97.00	97.54
16	Rayagada	2.38	21.80		97.62	78.20	100.00	44.27			55.73	100.00		2.25	24.38		97.75	75.62	100.00
17	Sambalpur	10.61	33.62	14.55	89.39	66.38	85.45								14.97		100.00	85.03	100.00
18	Sonepur	14.49	7.46	3.09	85.51	92.54	96.91				100.00	100.00	100.00	3.64		9.62	96.36	100.00	90.38
19	Sundargarh	14.55	48.11	16.42	85.45	51.89	83.58	42.04	22.27		57.96	77.73	100.00	16.73	3.14	5.91	83.27	96.86	94.09
20	Angul	32.43	30.12		67.57	69.88	100.00	50.50	100.00		49.50		100.00	23.13	13.55		76.87	86.45	100.00
21	Baleshwar	5.26	38.89	21.86	94.74	61.11	78.14		0.00		100.00	100.00	100.00		23.14	6.87	100.00	76.86	93.13
22	Bargarh	8.65	15.86		91.35	84.14	100.00		9.41		100.00	90.59	100.00	3.78	10.83		96.22	89.17	100.00
23	Bhadrak	7.72	22.74	0.37	92.28	77.26	99.63	7.09	42.23		92.91	57.77	100.00	6.92	26.73	6.90	93.08	73.27	93.10
24	Jajpur	55.61	75.76	54.78	44.39	24.24	45.22	54.32	84.44	67.32	45.68	15.56	32.68	36.39	49.33		63.61	50.67	100.00
25	Cuttack	27.61	6.95		72.39	93.05	100.00	14.37	27.49		85.63	72.51	100.00	18.23	8.37		81.77	91.63	100.00
26	Jagatsinghpur	23.45	9.74		76.55	90.26	100.00	32.34			67.66	100.00	100.00	4.33	11.36		95.67	88.64	100.00
27	Kendrapara	1.76	8.99	2.82	98.24	91.01	97.18	0.00			100.00	100.00	100.00	3.41			96.59	100.00	100.00
28	Khurda	11.84	5.12		88.16	94.88	100.00	16.69			83.31	100.00		21.68	47.93		78.32	52.07	100.00
29	Nayagarh	3.06	11.50		96.94	88.50	100.00				100.00	100.00	100.00				100.00	100.00	
30	Puri	37.56	1.38		62.44	98.62	100.00	53.72			46.28	100.00		28.69			71.31	100.00	100.00
Total		20.04	23.08	14.83	79.96	76.92	85.17	21.18	48.24	7.39	78.82	51.76	92.61	9.89	17.05	9.14	90.11	82.95	90.86

Contd .....4.,

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

Sl. No	Name of the District	Bharat Nirman Rajeev Gandhi Sewa Kendra						Total					
		Completed			Ongoing			Completed			Ongoing		
		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	Bolangir	--	--	--	--	--	--	10.39	13.37	0.83	89.61	86.63	99.17
2	Boudh	--	--	--	--	--	--	8.54	12.04	8.20	91.46	87.96	91.80
3	Deogarh	--	--	--	--	--	--	17.16	8.76	3.13	82.84	91.24	96.87
4	Dhenkanal	--	--	--	--	--	--	6.55	12.09	2.36	93.45	87.91	97.64
5	Gajapati	--	--	--	--	--	--	55.43	50.74	36.10	44.57	49.26	63.90
6	Ganjam	--	--	--	--	--	--	17.54	32.91	29.50	82.46	67.09	70.50
7	Jharsuguda	--	--	--	--	--	--	18.35	35.80	11.56	81.65	64.20	88.44
8	Kalahandi	--	--	--	--	--	--	17.51	6.33	2.71	82.49	93.67	97.29
9	Kandhamal	--	--	--	--	--	--	7.69	13.06	13.91	92.31	86.94	86.09
10	Kendujhar	--	--	--	--	--	--	21.03	25.14	1.92	78.97	74.86	98.08
11	Koraput	--	--	--	--	--	--	14.75	29.08	29.24	85.25	70.92	70.76
12	Malkangiri	--	--	--	--	--	--	20.97	18.17	30.94	79.03	81.83	69.06
13	Mayurbhanj	--	--	--	--	--	--	19.41	13.03	8.61	80.59	86.97	91.39
14	Nabarangapur	--	--	--	--	--	--	19.04	19.99	20.69	80.96	80.01	79.31
15	Nuapada	--	--	--	--	--	--	16.41	32.94	2.61	83.59	67.06	97.39
16	Rayagada	--	--	--	--	--	--	6.24	16.56	0.14	93.76	83.44	99.86
17	Sambalpur	--	--	--	--	--	--	12.59	19.60	11.01	87.41	80.40	88.99
18	Sonepur	--	--	--	--	--	--	13.48	10.39	10.24	86.52	89.61	89.76
19	Sundargarh	--	--	--	--	--	--	13.20	40.79	18.61	86.80	59.21	81.39
20	Angul	--	--	--	--	--	--	42.31	19.70	1.64	57.69	80.30	98.36
21	Baleshwar	--	--	--	--	--	--	15.21	32.57	13.22	84.79	67.43	86.78
22	Bargarh	--	--	--	--	--	--	8.34	14.42	0.41	91.66	85.58	99.59
23	Bhadrak	--	--	--	--	--	--	14.56	24.39	6.38	85.44	75.61	93.62
24	Jajpur	--	--	--	--	--	--	58.36	75.70	51.95	41.64	24.30	48.05
25	Cuttack	--	--	--	--	--	--	26.17	10.44		73.83	89.56	100.00
26	Jagatsinghpur	--	--	--	--	--	--	27.32	12.00		72.68	88.00	100.00
27	Kendrapara	--	--	--	--	--	--	3.81	10.22	0.85	96.19	89.78	99.15
28	Khurda	--	--	--	--	--	--	12.12	9.22		87.88	90.78	100.00
29	Nayagarh	--	--	--	--	--	--	7.03	7.43		92.97	92.57	100.00
30	Puri	--	--	--	--	--	--	35.77	0.68		64.23	99.32	100.00
	Total	--	--	--	--	--	--	19.37	24.30	14.31	80.63	75.70	85.69



#### **2.4.1 Social Audit:**

The process of social audit aims at discriminating all the details related to particular projects, days of employment and wages paid to the job card holders. A greater level of transparency is achieved in the process by eliminating many leakages (Table 2.4).

In 2008-09 only 3900 Gram Panchayats (GP) out of 6474 reported social auditing in their villages, only 11 districts could complete social audit in all the villages. But, as many as 10 districts could conduct the process in less than 2 per cent of the villages. In the following year 2009-10, 16 districts carried out social auditing in all the villages. But the dismal performance is confined to only 3 districts i.e., Naupada, Sambalpur and Kendujhar. In the latest year, 2010-11, many districts realised the necessity and 27 districts fully complied with social auditing. Even the remaining three districts have reported more than 97 per cent compliance. At the state level 97 per cent of all GPs conducted social audit by 2010-11.

#### **2.4.2 Inspections:**

Various kinds of works taken up under MGNREGA are inspected to plug loopholes and maintain quality in execution. While most of the inspections are conducted at Block level, a few are also done at district level.

In 2008-09 a total number of 84374 works were taken up at the state level. Out of these 60 per cent were inspected at block and 19 per cent were inspected at district level. In 2009-10, 72 per cent at block level and 19 per cent at district level were inspected. But in 2010-11, the total number of works taken up increased to 255970. Majority of these works i.e., 60 per cent were inspected at block level where as only 11 per cent of works were examined at district level.

Naupada and Khurda reported no works or inspections at all in 2008-09. In 2010-11, Kendujhar did not report any fresh works and no inspection was taken up.

#### **2.4.3 Complaints:**

A grievance redressal mechanism is incorporated in to protect wage workers. Any grievance shall be enquired and action initiated within seven days by the Panchayat secretary/field assistant at village level, programme officer at mandal level and district programme co-ordinator at the district level.

**Table 2.4 – Social auditing and inspection of MGNREGS 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	Bolangir	96.43	90.81	100.00	100.00	98.60	1.05	9.99	100.00	9.85	100.00	100.00	100.00	69.60	200.00	1.05	0.24	0.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
2	Boudh	100.00	10.00	39.15	100.00	100.00	0.00	10.14	8.52	9.98	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	1479.37	0.00	1.59	100.00	50.00		
3	Deogarh	70.76	100.00	63.28	99.27	100.00	100.00	9.99	11.34	20.25	64.22	58.06	74.63	97.20	200.00	200.00	100.00	0.83	0.83	84.85		100.00
4	Dhenkanal	36.19	36.19	85.14	100.00	100.00	76.88	3.30	1.12	6.85	1.94	11.27	51.31	295.13	100.00	96.48	2.01	0.50	1.56	0.00	44.44	44.44
5	Gajapati	68.79	75.30	32.80	97.20	84.50	68.22	10.03	13.43	5.45	46.20	69.86	54.14	103.70	176.74	100.00	357.33	89.91	152.71	36.63		100.00
6	Ganjam	100.00	96.45	94.61	100.00	100.00	100.00	10.41	11.09	22.20	100.00	100.00	98.09	200.00	100.00	100.00	572.71	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	
7	Jharsuguda	100.00	100.00	47.80	100.00	100.00	100.00	10.02	9.98	10.04	100.00	100.00	89.96	100.00	100.00	100.00	1.28	0.00	1.28	0.00	59.38	100.00
8	Kalahandi	83.61	98.01	82.99	100.00	99.27	80.95	3.70	7.94	4.19	99.93	52.92	11.89	100.00	99.27	100.00	1.05	0.37	260.07	97.01	52.11	58.24
9	Kandhamal	50.67	46.69	71.47	100.00	100.00	92.16	0.24	0.51	0.51	1.33	1.40	1.96	200.00	0.00	105.23	1.31		1.24	65.63	4.55	100.00
10	Kendujhar	91.17	77.47	77.47	100.00	1.05	1.05		11.05	11.05		100.00	100.00	108.78	100.00	100.00	0.00	1.05	0.00	0.00	51.11	51.11
11	Koraput	100.00	53.29	76.59	100.00	100.00	100.00	10.71	0.00	0.00	40.00	39.54	45.60	201.04	295.13	295.13	0.30	0.15	0.45			
12	Malkangiri	78.29	76.23	45.82	100.00	100.00	99.07	59.14	50.95	19.69	8.49	50.95	39.00	100.00	155.56	75.93	0.00	23.81	3.66	96.48	74.29	
13	Mayurbhanj	78.61	94.28	59.79	100.00	100.00	1.31	8.98	1.78	2.56	83.02	67.00	30.85	132.06	200.00	34.82	173.30	608.90	1208.27	66.67	96.97	100.00
14	Nabarangapur	53.15	34.16	27.78	100.00	100.00	100.00	9.03	5.79	7.29	90.35	83.47	90.92	100.00	100.00	100.00	0.59	0.00	0.00			100.00
15	Nuapada	97.90	6.88	49.67	100.00	0.00	100.00	3.51			90.00			112.10	100.00	200.00	1.83	0.00	0.00			75.00
16	Rayagada	96.02	96.48	89.33	100.00	100.00	100.00	2.47	100.00	8.53	100.00	2.88	98.25	100.00	95.53	109.36	50.00	0.00	0.00	98.70		100.00
17	Sambalpur	95.26	100.00	100.00	100.00	0.00	50.68	90.96	8.81	9.15	9.04	88.65	98.31	200.00	0.00	100.00	0.00		0.00		77.78	95.00
18	Sonepur	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	10.00	9.99	9.83	100.00	100.00	100.00	200.00	100.00	100.00	49.74	2.08	100.00	100.00		100.00
19	Sundargarh	47.37	37.18	59.25	100.00	100.00	82.44	3.55	1.54	89.91	97.46	101.97	5.52	100.00	100.00	113.36	0.00	0.00	0.00	28.57		94.44
20	Angul	60.91	88.01	94.28	100.00	99.52	50.00	2.61	5.38	10.02	26.29	64.22	100.00	100.00	110.53	200.00	75.72	90.48	100.00	69.36		100.00
21	Baleshwar	97.20	87.66	90.11	100.00	98.62	100.00	4.55	6.08	7.45	88.18	92.87	82.56	0.00	98.96	100.00	1475.43	791.61	545.67	76.79	94.83	90.57
22	Bargarh	100.00	99.04	82.87	100.00	100.00	100.08	100.00	91.86	0.00	100.00	100.00	82.90	200.00	100.00	122.58	0.00	0.00	0.00	97.62		100.00
23	Bhadrak	97.00	95.00	64.34	100.00	100.00	100.00	10.02	90.00	9.99	89.98	10.00	90.01	100.00	200.00	100.00	100.00	0.78	36.27	89.47	82.35	94.44
24	Jajpur	90.00	95.00	79.90	100.00	100.00	99.29	11.15	11.03	75.01	100.00	100.00	65.01	150.55	100.00	100.00	100.00	562.86	0.00	96.34		
25	Cuttack	100.00	32.19	92.90	100.00	71.64	0.00	26.51	9.96	55.10	100.00	100.00	55.10	69.60	100.00	100.00	287.43	209.94	0.00		100.00	100.00
26	Jagatsinghpur	100.00	100.00	100.00	101.48	68.56	0.00	24.20	44.11	23.03	18.82	23.00	100.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.52		0.00	79.82		100.00
27	Kendrapara	100.00	100.00	98.53	100.00	40.43	0.00	9.13	7.57	12.90	100.00	100.00	100.00	97.20	43.91	100.00	52.61	22.77	3.91	100.00	100.00	
28	Khurda	100.00	100.00	11.50	100.00	83.33	0.00	10.04	100.00		10.04	100.00		295.13	83.33	13.69		0.00	0.00	50.00	75.00	
29	Nayagarh	100.00	100.00	100.00	99.27	69.27	0.00	8.98	96.58	17.50	91.02	6.08	90.00	103.70	174.86	116.20	0.28	0.32	0.00	84.85	15.38	
30	Puri	100.00	82.53	44.53	100.00	52.17	2.17	24.69	9.51	113.51	100.00	0.00	0.00	200.00	100.00	97.39	0.87	0.43	0.00	0.00		
	Total	84.17	79.38	72.46	97.20	83.01	60.24	11.93	19.03	19.38	60.49	71.79	60.76	100.00	116.20	117.92	179.52	140.36	83.04	36.63	82.59	90.57

In 2008-09 a total number of 768 complaints were received at state level. Out of this ninety per cent were disposed. In the following year 2009-10, out of 631 total complaints 83 per cent were resolved. The number of complaints increased to 1452 by 2010-11 in proportion to increased number of works. But, percentage of resolved cases dropped to 37 per cent on the overall. Bolangir, Ganjam, Sonepur and Kendrapara have succeeded in disposing all pending complaints in that year.

#### **2.4.4 Disbursement of wages through Banks and Post Offices:**

Wages are paid to the labourers through bank and post office accounts to avoid corruption. Workers are asked to open accounts either with a bank or a post office in their village. No minimum balance is required and the credited amount is immediately allowed to be withdrawn.

In 2008-09 a total amount of Rs. 22929 lakhs of rupees were paid as wages. Out of this 80 per cent is paid through Bank accounts and remaining 20 per cent was paid through post office accounts. A vast majority of these accounts are individual and yet, some joint accounts are also held. The phenomenon is dominant among post office accounts as 20 per cent of the accounts are joint held. However, at the state level 88 per cent are individual and 12 per cent are jointly held. In the following year 2009-10, post office accounts have increased and formed 46 per cent of total accounts. Again, the proportion of joint accounts are lesser at 9 per cent when compared with post office accounts where it is 21 per cent. On an average only 15 per cent are joint accounts in the year. Overall 54 per cent of wages are paid through banks and the remaining amount through post offices. By 2010-11 the proportion of joint accounts decreased to 8 per cent at the state level. The post offices also geared up to the occasion and are taking considerable work load in disbursing the wages. About 43 per cent of the amount is paid through this channel (Table 2.5).

#### **2.4.5 Un-employment Allowance:**

In MGNREGS, if a worker demanded work and if it is not provided within 15 days he is eligible to receive un-employment allowance in 15 days. Though many such instances where employment could not be provided in stipulated time, no un-employment allowance was paid in any district. Navrangpur reported 5613 days where allowance should be paid. Jagatsinghpur reported very low incidence of 49 days in 2010-11. Overall, no un-employment allowance is paid (Table 2.6).

**Table 2.5 – The 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	Bolangir	1.61	5.03	5.72	4.19	8.29	7.10	1.24	1.37	1.63	0.03	0.16	1.07	1.52	3.30	4.11	2.40	4.52	5.87
2	Boudh	0.10	0.33	0.33	0.09	0.18	0.51	1.82	2.17	1.27	2.01	2.60	3.34	0.50	1.20	0.70	0.92	1.30	1.09
3	Deogarh	0.12	0.38	0.30	0.47	1.16	1.00	0.46	0.52	0.66	0.45	0.84	3.53	0.20	0.44	0.44	0.46	1.01	1.51
4	Dhenkanal	0.42	1.47	0.95	2.56	2.72	1.66	5.11	5.96	3.79	3.67	4.19	1.61	1.51	3.60	2.07	3.04	3.41	1.65
5	Gajapati	0.87	2.90	2.38	3.25	3.50	2.10	1.88	2.19	3.58	1.75	4.34	5.17	1.10	2.56	2.85	2.61	3.89	2.73
6	Ganjam	8.26	17.80	15.41	11.25	18.09	23.90	0.25	0.67	0.61	0.01	0.37	1.55	6.41	9.69	9.59	6.42	9.87	19.36
7	Jharsuguda	0.14	0.49	0.58	0.00	0.00	0.55	0.68	0.79	1.30	2.90	2.98	5.77	0.26	0.63	0.87	1.24	1.38	1.61
8	Kalahandi	1.05	3.68	4.68	3.04	2.49	1.27	2.81	2.81	4.36	3.40	4.27	1.61	1.46	3.27	4.55	3.19	3.32	1.34
9	Kandhamal	0.61	2.12	1.48	0.22	3.03	1.51	11.49	8.10	4.68	9.03	12.16	5.44	3.12	4.95	2.74	4.01	7.26	2.31
10	Kendujhar	1.79	6.10	6.70	8.97	3.18	1.66	2.13	2.43	3.26	5.95	6.32	13.20	1.87	4.36	5.35	7.67	4.64	4.00
11	Koraput	1.47	3.01	1.80	6.12	3.15	1.56	2.54	3.84	2.91	3.94	5.12	3.85	1.72	3.40	2.24	5.18	4.06	2.02
12	Malkangiri	0.25	0.88	1.04	3.55	3.73	5.46	1.98	2.31	3.81	4.18	0.40	0.00	0.65	1.56	2.13	3.82	2.19	4.35
13	Mayurbhanj	7.74	20.23	24.00	13.88	15.43	24.18	5.75	6.71	11.05	0.88	0.78	3.94	7.28	13.83	18.91	8.29	8.64	20.07
14	Nabarangapur	0.49	1.51	1.22	1.92	3.14	1.18	6.35	4.15	4.44	13.97	10.45	4.52	1.85	2.76	2.49	7.10	6.53	1.86
15	Nuapada	0.33	1.14	0.71	0.08	0.12	0.59	1.82	2.12	0.50	2.00	1.86	1.01	0.67	1.61	0.62	0.90	0.93	0.68
16	Rayagada	2.42	8.20	9.18	5.57	5.29	8.24	4.63	4.89	5.95	4.10	2.94	8.82	2.93	6.63	7.91	4.94	4.20	8.36
17	Sambalpur	0.80	1.54	1.49	2.77	1.04	1.59	3.81	5.79	5.10	5.38	3.77	0.44	1.49	3.55	2.91	3.89	2.31	1.36
18	Sonepur	0.17	0.58	0.67	0.63	0.63	0.88	3.73	4.35	5.61	4.93	4.24	4.30	0.99	2.36	2.62	2.47	2.31	1.57
19	Sundargarh	0.73	2.36	2.55	1.38	1.65	2.92	11.52	12.16	11.72	9.04	10.91	6.87	3.23	7.00	6.16	4.67	5.94	3.72
20	Angul	0.60	2.02	1.88	1.00	2.30	1.28	7.28	8.37	9.07	4.01	4.16	9.76	2.15	5.03	4.71	2.29	3.16	3.00
21	Baleshwar	1.70	0.80	3.75	3.51	2.30	4.65	0.89	0.03	1.66	0.16	0.29	1.89	1.51	0.43	2.93	2.07	1.37	4.09
22	Bargarh	0.43	1.52	1.80	0.24	0.49	1.20	3.31	3.87	5.22	4.12	5.96	4.98	1.10	2.63	3.15	1.91	3.03	1.97
23	Bhadrak	0.78	1.84	1.32	1.90	1.83	2.11	3.06	1.97	1.78	1.45	0.29	0.02	1.31	1.90	1.50	1.71	1.11	1.69
24	Jajpur	2.07	3.26	2.09	3.33	5.46	0.80	7.80	4.88	3.03	4.79	6.27	0.35	3.39	4.03	2.46	3.96	5.83	0.71
25	Cuttack	59.51	4.51	5.00	6.10	5.79	1.27	0.02	0.03	0.12	0.00	0.00	5.06	45.76	2.39	3.08	3.48	3.10	2.05
26	Jagatsinghpur	1.06	1.80	1.69	3.58	1.79	0.42	0.66	0.31	0.09	0.83	0.19	0.00	0.97	1.10	1.06	2.40	1.04	0.34
27	Kendrapara	2.46	1.59	0.85	4.99	1.70	0.26	0.73	1.92	0.16	0.42	0.10	0.09	2.06	1.75	0.58	3.02	0.96	0.22
28	Khurda	0.39	0.54	0.04	0.56	0.41	0.00	0.67	1.57	0.09	0.52	0.70	0.00	0.46	1.02	0.06	0.54	0.54	0.00
29	Nayagarh	0.64	0.80	0.12	2.23	0.36	0.04	4.22	2.54	2.53	4.75	2.78	1.81	1.47	1.62	1.07	3.31	1.48	0.40
30	Puri	1.00	1.59	0.27	2.64	0.74	0.10	1.37	1.18	0.00	1.32	0.57	0.00	1.08	1.40	0.16	2.07	0.66	0.08
Total		100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

#### **2.4.6. Work Projection:**

Work projection for 2010-11 is discussed in Tabel-2.7. Ganjam district seems to be lagging behind with 16 per cent of the total works in the state falling under the category of spill over works from previous year. Kendujhar district followed it with 12 per cent of works carried from previous year. Mayurbhanj district reported 8 per cent of works while Sundergarh and Jajpur districts followed with around 6 per cent. Puri district did not have any spill over works (Table 2.7).

For the works taken up during 2010-11, Gajapati district took the lead with 56 per cent of total works. No other district reported even 5 per cent of new works. Sundergarh and Rayagada districts have taken up around 4 per cent of works in the reference year.

Some of the works taken up in 2010-11 are likely to spill over in to the next financial year i.e., 2011-12. Under this category a higher number of 11 per cent is reported from Ganjam and Kendujhar districts. Though a massive percentage of 56 per cent of works are reported to be taken up in Gajapati district, only 0.86 per cent are likely to spill over to next financial year.

In the total person days to be generated in 2011-12, Ganjam leads other districts by reporting 33 per cent of the share. It is followed by Mayurbhanj district with 11 per cent.

**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	Bolangir	748	0	0
2	Boudh	203	0	0
3	Deogarh	140	0	0
4	Dhenkanal	937	0	0
5	Gajapati	1169	0	0
6	Ganjam	432	0	0
7	Jharsuguda	765	0	0
8	Kalahandi	552	0	0
9	Kandhamal	484	0	0
10	Kendujhar	2225	0	0
11	Koraput	2460	0	0
12	Malkangiri	148	0	0
13	Mayurbhanj	1333	0	0
14	Nabarangapur	5613	0	0
15	Nuapada	1330	0	0
16	Rayagada	1852	0	0
17	Sambalpur	554	0	0
18	Sonepur	0	0	0
19	Sundargarh	592	0	0
20	Angul	192	0	0
21	Baleshwar	1861	0	0
22	Bargarh	0	0	0
23	Bhadrak	589	0	0
24	Jajpur	567	0	0
25	Cuttack	207	0	0
26	Jagatsinghpur	49	0	0
27	Kendrapara	597	0	0
28	Khurda	382	0	0
29	Nayagarh	238	0	0
30	Puri	326	0	0
<b>Total</b>		<b>26545</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

**SOURCE:** [www.nrega.nic.in](http://www.nrega.nic.in)

**Table 2.7 – Work Projection under MGNREGA for 2010-11 – Odisha**

(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	Bolangir	1.69	2.66	1.56	0.01		2.66	0.00	0.00	0.00
2	Boudh	1.31	0.31	1.67	0.00		0.72	0.00	0.00	0.00
3	Deogarh	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.00		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
4	Dhenkanal	5.55	0.84	3.69	0.00		2.43	0.01	0.00	0.01
5	Gajapati	0.63	55.89	0.86	0.01		1.66	0.00	0.00	0.00
6	Ganjam	15.75	2.35	10.69	99.75		32.94	1.66	0.01	1.07
7	Jharsuguda	1.61	0.14	1.22	0.00		3.11	0.00	0.00	0.00
8	Kalahandi	4.14	0.76	4.75	0.01		1.84	27.54	33.66	29.72
9	Kandhamal	4.37	1.58	6.53	0.01		2.99	0.01	0.00	0.01
10	Kendujhar	11.50	2.34	10.71	0.01		6.25	0.01	0.00	0.01
11	Koraput	3.95	0.43	1.26	0.00		1.81	0.00	0.00	0.00
12	Malkangiri	0.97	1.83	2.82	0.01		1.50	0.00	0.00	0.00
13	Mayurbhanj	7.78	3.12	6.66	0.02		11.19	0.00	0.00	0.00
14	Nabarangapur	4.64	0.88	4.37	0.00		1.82	0.00	0.00	0.00
15	Nuapada	0.64	1.81	0.96	0.01		0.48	0.03	0.00	0.02
16	Rayagada	3.39	3.86	7.96	0.01		2.12	0.00	0.00	0.00
17	Sambalpur	4.14	1.68	2.84	0.02		1.94	0.00	0.00	0.00
18	Sonepur	5.88	0.28	4.38	0.00		0.92	0.00	0.00	0.00
19	Sundargarh	6.72	3.98	9.17	0.05		5.24	0.01	0.00	0.01
20	Angul	3.74	1.67	3.65	0.00		2.20	0.00	0.00	0.00
21	Baleshwar	0.24	2.06	0.40	0.01		1.44	32.57	31.02	32.02
22	Bargarh	1.39	1.07	2.20	0.01		2.18	0.00	0.00	0.00
23	Bhadrak	0.99	1.95	2.01	0.01		2.72	14.22	27.42	18.91
24	Jajpur	6.02	1.87	2.91	0.01		1.93	0.00	0.00	0.00
25	Cuttack	0.52	0.54	0.49	0.00		1.31	0.00	0.00	0.00
26	Jagatsinghpur	1.32	1.87	2.00	0.01		3.27	0.00	0.00	0.00
27	Kendrapara	0.61	1.52	1.66	0.01		1.29	23.93	7.85	18.21
28	Khurda	0.29	1.45	1.43	0.00		0.85	0.00	0.00	0.00
29	Nayagarh	0.19	0.50	0.61	0.00		0.78	0.00	0.00	0.00
30	Puri	0.00	0.76	0.52	0.00		0.40	0.00	0.00	0.00
<b>Total</b>		<b>100.00</b> <b>(103465)</b>	<b>100.00</b> <b>(215315)</b>	<b>100.00</b> <b>(90878)</b>	<b>100.00</b> <b>(67039354)</b>		<b>100.00</b> <b>(358325724)</b>	<b>100.00</b> <b>(494559694)</b>	<b>100.00</b> <b>(272763102)</b>	<b>100.00</b> <b>(767322796.3)</b>

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

## 2.5. Summary:

The programme was implemented in 3 phases in Odisha. Nineteen districts were covered in the first phase followed by 5 districts in second phase and 6 districts in third. Overall at the state level Scheduled Caste got 19 per cent, Scheduled Tribes got 35 per cent and women formed 37 per cent share in total person days created during 2008-11. Among the employed households only 4 per cent could get 100 days of employment in 2008-09. But, in later years it has shown an increase as about 6 per cent in 2009-10 and 10 per cent in 2010-11 are benefited with 100 days of employment at state level.

Odisha has spent Rs. 1,17,456.3 lakhs on different projects till 2010-11 under MGNREGS . Out of this a lion's share of 51 per cent has gone for rural Road Connectivity followed by other projects like renovation of traditional water bodies with 19 per cent and Water Conservation Projects with 12 per cent. Similar pattern of expenditure is noticed among the districts except in Sonepur and Baleswar where renovation of traditional Water bodies has taken the priority over rural road connectivity.

MGNREGA allowed allocations for restoration of traditional water bodies. In fact, this amount occupies 2<sup>nd</sup> position next only to road connectivity. About 31 per cent of the works could be completed by end of 2010-11.

Thirty five per cent of Land Development works got completed through 2008-11 at the state level. When all works were put together at state level only 7 per cent were completed in 2008-09. But this climbed to 27 per cent by 2010-11. However, overall completion reflects a tardy progress of works under MGNREGS.

In the total funds allocated under Rural Connectivity project in 2008-11, 17 to 25 per cent is spent on finishing the pending projects and the remaining balance is spent in the on-going in the year at the state level. Smaller proportion of funds under flood control, i.e., 9 per cent in 2008-09 to 15 per cent in 2009-10 were spent for completion of projects while major amounts 85 to 91 per cent are deployed in running projects in 2008-11. In one third of the districts no amounts were spent to complete the projects and the projects were still on-going. Malkanagiri, however, did not report any projects under this head.

Under water conservation and water harvesting scheme 9 to 18 per cent of funds were spent to complete the projects while 82 to 91 per cent got allocated and spent for on-going projects in 2008-11 at state level.

Funds for drought proofing scheme are doubled from 2009-10 and stands at Rs. 3,762 lakhs by 2010-11. As state level only 4 per cent was spent in 2008-09 for completion of projects. It improved to



24 in 2009-10 but fell again to 15 per cent in the next year 2010-11. Funds spent for micro irrigation scheme increased from 1450 lakhs in 2008-09 to 2,464 lakhs by 2010-11. In 11 districts no projects were completed in 2008-11 and hence no money was spent to finish these projects.

A large amount of Rs. 7,282 lakhs were spent under the programme of irrigation facility for SC and ST farmers in 2010-11 in the state. This was almost 5 fold increase from 2008-09. The programme has shown steady progress in 2008-11 as amount spent on completed projects increased from 9 per cent to 32 per cent.

Amount spent under the head of renovation of traditional water bodies in 2010-11 was 22014 lakhs. This is 50 per cent increase from previous year at the state level. Only 20 per cent of the fund was spent to complete the pending projects while the balance amount was spent on on-going projects in 2010-11.

Land Development activity under MGNREGS was given a fillip when funds were increased more than 4 times from Rs. 615 lakhs to Rs. 2639 lakhs in 2010-11. But it does not reflect in the completed works. Only 21 per cent of the amount was spent for completion where as 79 per cent of money was gone for on-going works at the state level.

In 2008-09 only 3900 Gram Panchayats (GP) out of 6474 reported social auditing in their villages, only 11 districts could complete social audit in all the villages. But, as many as 10 districts could conduct the process in less than 2 per cent of the villages. In the following year 2009-10, 16 districts carried out social auditing in all the villages. But the dismal performance is confined to only 3 districts i.e., Naupada, Sambalpur and Kendujhar. In the latest year, 2010-11, many districts realised the necessity and 27 districts fully complied with social auditing. Even the remaining three districts have reported more than 97 per cent compliance. At the state level 97 per cent of all GPs conducted social audit by 2010-11.

In 2008-09 a total number of 84374 works were taken up at the state level. Out of these 60 per cent were inspected at block and 19 per cent were inspected at district level.

Overall 54 per cent of wages are paid through banks and the remaining amount through post offices. By 2010-11 the proportion of joint accounts decreased to 8 per cent at the state level. The post offices also geared up to the occasion and are taking considerable work load in disbursing the wages. About 43 per cent of the amount is paid through this channel. No un-employment allowance was paid in any district.

For the works taken up during 2010-11, Gajapati district took the lead with 56 per cent of total works. No other district reported even 5 per cent of new works. Sundergarh and Rayagada districts have taken up around 4 per cent of works in the reference year.

In the total person days to be generated in 2011-12, Ganjam leads other districts by reporting 33 per cent of the share. It is followed by Mayurbhanj district with 11 per cent.

\*\*\*\*\*

# Household Characteristics: Income and Consumption pattern

## CHAPTER – III

### Introduction:

Household characteristics of the sample households, their main occupation, household income and consumption are discussed in this chapter. Determinants of participation of MGNREGA are also analyzed here. As discussed earlier the sample comprises of 200 participants of MGNREGS and 50 non-participants.

### 3.1. Household profile of the sample:

An imbalance is noticed in Male –Female ratio both in beneficiary and non-beneficiary sample. The percentage of males is 51 in beneficiary and 54 in non-beneficiary sample while in the females it is 48 and 45 respectively. Overall, it is 52 for males and 48 for females. The percentage of workers in the age group of 16-60 is large in non-beneficiary sample at 85 while it is 76 in beneficiary sample. Persons below 16 years are higher among beneficiaries at 22. There is not much difference in the proportion of persons in the above 60 category between beneficiary and non-beneficiaries. While 97 per cent of the respondents in beneficiary category are heads of the household, it is 100 per cent in non-beneficiaries. Overall 98 per cent of the sample respondents are head of the households.

In an indication that MGNREGS is really nearer to the target, the percentage of illiterates, which is an outcome of poverty and backwardness, is high in beneficiaries at 35 per cent (Table 3.1). Non-participants of MGNREGS have only 19 per cent illiterates among the family. Overall figure is 32 per cent. Even in primary, secondary and pre-graduate education the same group has a clear edge over beneficiaries as the figures reflect 50, 20 and 10 per cent respectively. The beneficiaries have 46, 18 and 0.46 per cent in the corresponding categories. The overall figures show more or less the same sequence except that the people studied up to graduation are a bit more and stands at 2.46 per cent. Other Backward Castes dominate the overall sample at 45 per cent followed by 38 per cent Scheduled Castes and 13 per cent Scheduled Tribes. Only 3 per cent belong to General Category. In non-beneficiaries Other Backward castes overwhelmingly dominate at 70 per cent. Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes are lower in number in non-participants. But, in beneficiary group Scheduled Castes represent at 44 per cent followed by Other Backward castes at 39 per cent and Scheduled Tribes share is 14.5 per cent. These numbers reflect that MGNREGS has reached the targeted groups as desired.

**Table 3.1 Demographic Profile of the Respondents**

(% hhs)

Characteristics		Beneficiaries Total	Non –Beneficiaries Total	Overall
No. of households		200	50	250
Household size (numbers)		4.35	4.52	4.39
Average number of earners		2.53	2.68	2.62
Gender (% of members)	Male	51.32	54.42	51.96
	Female	48.68	45.58	48.04
Age group of the members (%)	<16	21.93	12.39	19.96
	16-60	75.55	84.96	77.48
	Above 60	2.53	2.65	2.55
Identity of respondent (%)	Head	97.50	100.00	98.00
	Others	2.50	0.00	2.00
Education status of the members (%)	Illiterate	35.48	19.03	32.09
	Up to Primary	45.69	50.44	46.67
	Up to Secondary	18.25	20.35	18.69
	Up to Graduates	0.46	10.18	2.46
	Above Graduates	0.11	0.00	0.09
Caste (% of households)	Others	0.00	0.00	0.00
	SC	44.00	16.00	38.40
	ST	14.50	8.00	13.20
	OBC	39.00	70.00	45.20
	General	2.50	6.00	3.20
Card holding	AAV	11.50	0.00	9.20
	BPL	72.00	24.00	62.40
	APL	9.00	46.00	16.40
	None	7.00	30.00	11.60
Decision maker (% of households)	Male	87.00	94.00	88.40
	Female	13.00	6.00	11.60
Main occupation (% of working members)	Farming	36.05	44.25	37.74
	Self business	0.11	9.73	2.10
	Salaried and pensioners	0.92	1.33	1.00
	Wage earners	19.40	2.21	15.86
Involved in migration during year 2009 (% of members)	Yes	3.00	8.00	4.00

**Source:** Field Survey - 2009

Among the beneficiaries, 11.5 per cent are also beneficiaries under Indira Awas Yojana Non-participants of MGNRGS do not have any benefits under the IAY. Seventy two per cent of participant sample fall under below poverty line category, where as the non-participants are only 24 per cent. As a consequence more non-participants (46 per cent) fall under above poverty line group. In the participants the corresponding figure is 9 per cent. Overall 62 per cent are under BPL group and 16 per cent are APL group. As elsewhere, 87 per cent of decision makers in beneficiary and 94 per cent non-beneficiary sample are males. Overall it is 88 per cent. Workers dependent on farming are more in non-beneficiary group at 44 per cent followed by 10 per cent of workers engaged in self-business. In the beneficiary sample, though the main occupation is farming with 36 per cent engaged in it 19 per cent are also deriving their income from daily wages. On the overall, 37 per cent depend on farming and 16 per cent

on daily wages. Migration for work is more at 8 per cent in non-beneficiaries and only 3 per cent of beneficiaries report the same. Overall it is 4 per cent.

### 3.2. Main Occupation:

In contrast to non-participants of MGNREGS, where they also cultivate some land, workers in the scheme are mostly landless poor. Hence, 45 per cent of them have Agricultural Casual Labour as main occupation. 27 per cent are engaged in non-agricultural casual labour. A small percentage of 5 per cent are employed on this over farms. Only 4 per cent of beneficiaries are self-employed in non-farming activities. About 19 per cent of the beneficiaries have reported MGNREGS as their main occupation (Table 3.2).

**Table 3.2: Main Occupation - (% of Total Man-days) of sample Households - 2009**  
(Per hh)

Occupation	Beneficiaries	Non beneficiaries	Aggregate
Agricultural casual labour	44.83	17.92	37.43
Non agricultural casual labour	27.24	20.34	25.34
Work for public work programme other than NREGA	0.13		0.09
Self employed in non farming	3.74	16.84	7.34
Self employed in agriculture	4.88	35.08	13.18
Self employed in live stock	0	4.73	1.31
Regular/salary job	0	0	0
Worked as a migrant worker	0	5.11	1.41
Worked under NREGA	19.18	0	13.9
Any other work	0	0	0
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00

**SOURCE:** Field Survey 2009.

In non-beneficiary category 35 per cent of man-days are engaged in agriculture on own farms. It is followed by non-agricultural casual labour taking a share of 20 per cent. About 18 per cent are engaged in agricultural casual labour. Seventeen per cent are employed in self non-farming activities. This group are also engaged in livestock rearing forming 5 per cent of the total man-days. One notable feature is workers in this group have also reported working as migrant labour (5 per cent). But this migration is completely arrested in MGNREGS beneficiaries.

When the total sample is analysed agricultures casual labour remains as the main stay of sustenance for 37 per cent depend on it. Non-agricultural labour follows at 25 per cent. When 13 per cent reported self-employment in agriculture an equal number are participating in MGNREGS works for livelihood. A minute percent of 1.4 reported working as migrants.

### **3.3. Household Net Income:**

In the household net income of beneficiaries, income from MGNREGS constitutes only 13 per cent. The other major sources of income are wages from agriculture (36 per cent) and wages from non-agriculture (37 per cent). Only 6 per cent of the income comes from agriculture/livestock. They also derive 4 per cent of their income from self-employment in non-farming activities.

Higher co-efficients of variation are observed in cases of self employed non-farming activity and agriculture/Livestock activity. This means no fixed amounts of income can be derived in these activities.

Most of the non-participants, in the MGNREGS sample hold some agricultural lands. So they receive 60 per cent of their income from agriculture/livestock. About 17 per cent of income comes from wages on non-agriculture. Relatively a smaller number of 8 per cent is receiving their income from agricultural wages. Almost the same proportion of income is accruing from wages as migrant labour. About 6 per cent of the income comes from self-employed non-farming activities (Table 3.3). Except in agricultural labour work, higher co-efficients of variation are reported in other activities of which income from migrant workers showed higher variation than the other activities. The inference is that the wages derived at migration sites mostly depends on the season and nature of work.

Main sources of income on the aggregate are agriculture/livestock (28 per cent) followed by wages from non-agriculture (29 per cent) and wages from agriculture (27 per cent). About 8 per cent of the income is received from MGNREGS works. A minute, 3 per cent of income comes from work as migrant labour. Another 4 per cent comes from self-employment on non-farming activities. Workers participating in MGNREGS reported an average income of Rs. 36,433 per household. The non-participants reported roughly 3 times more, i.e., Rs. 102194. The aggregate per household income for the entire sample is Rs. 49,586. When the aggregate income from all households is taken together, higher variations of co-efficients are reported by all activities except income from MGNREGS and agricultural activities.

**Table 3.3: Annual Net Income of Sample Households – 2009****(Rs/Per hh)**

	Odisha (State)					
	Average Income	CV	Average Income	CV	Average Income	CV
	Beneficiaries		Non Beneficiaries		Aggregate	
<b>Income from work under NREGA</b>	4906 (13.46)	26.21	0	0	3926 (7.91)	56.49
<b>Income from wages in agriculture</b>	14424 (35.59)	46.24	8479 (8.30)	64.41	13235 (26.69)	95.69
<b>Income from wages non agriculture</b>	13427 (36.85)	94.95	17839 (17.46)	138.7	14309 (28.86)	118.11
<b>Income from wages in PWP</b>	27 (0.07)	2.00	0	0	21 (0.04)	300
<b>Income from wages as migrant workers</b>	0	0	7760 (7.59)	223.61	1552 (3.13)	300
<b>Income from self employed in non farming</b>	1488 (4.08)	151.75	6300 (6.16)	134.87	2450 (4.54)	134.86
<b>Income from agriculture/livestock</b>	2162 (5.93)	115.64	61816 (60.49)	161.36	14093 (28.42)	193.8
<b>Income from regular job/salary/pension</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Income from sale of assets/rent/transfer etc.</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	36433 (100.00)	0	102194 (100.00)	0	49586 (100.00)	0

SOURCE: Field Survey 2009.

**3.4. Household Consumption:**

To know the impact of MGNREGS on standard of living of the beneficiaries their consumption levels of various food items is standard and given in Table 3.4.

The consumption of rice as well as total cereals is more in the beneficiary group. Wheat, sugar and liquid milk are slightly less consumed among beneficiaries when compared to non-beneficiaries. Total pulses and Poultry meat consumption is reportedly higher among MGNREGS participants. But, it is the opposite for the consumption of fruits and vegetables.

**Table 3.4: Household Consumption of food items (KG.S per capital per month)**

	Beneficiaries	Non-Beneficiaries	Aggregate	NSS <sup>2*</sup> 1993-94 In Kgs	NSS <sup>2*</sup> 1999-00 In Kgs	NSS <sup>2*</sup> 2004-05 In Kgs
<b>Rice</b>	14.41	12.98	14.11	8.11	13.62	12.80
<b>Wheat</b>	0.20	0.29	0.22	0.26	0.49	0.45
<b>Other cereals</b>	0.59	1.12	0.70	0	0	0
<b>Total cereals</b>	15.20	14.39	15.03	0	15.09	13.98
<b>Total pulses</b>	0.72	0.59	0.70	0.30	0.46	0.50
<b>sugar</b>	0.54	0.62	0.56	0.33	0.61	0
<b>Edible oils<sup>1</sup></b>	0.60	0.61	0.60	0.18	0	0.28
<b>Liquid Milk<sup>1</sup></b>	0.89	1.22	0.96	0.26	0.64	0.78
<b>Milk Products</b>	0.02	0.02	0.02	0	0	0
<b>Spices<sup>2</sup></b>	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.7	0.30	0
<b>Poultry - meet</b>	0.96	0.78	0.92	0.01	0.03	0.05
<b>Fruits</b>	0.04	0.20	0.07	1.36	1.48	1.86
<b>Vegetables</b>	4.87	6.13	5.13	2.75	6.67	5.36
<b>Confectionery</b>	--	--	--	0	2.73	1.46

1. Edible Oil and liquid milk is in litres

2. Spices in gms.

Cereals and Pulse, edible oil and liquid milk consumption is higher both among beneficiary and non-beneficiary group when compared with NSS 2004-05 data. Similarly Poultry meat, consumption of fruits, consumption of vegetables is higher among non-beneficiaries and lower in the beneficiary group when analysed against NSS 2004-05 data.

### 3.5 Monthly Consumption Expenditure:

The monthly consumption expenditure of non-participants of MGNREGS is twice as high when compared to the beneficiary group, where it is Rs. 553. The expenditure of non-beneficiaries is consistently higher, though small, as almost all food items except on rice. This figure is much more significant when non-food expenditure is compared. It is almost more than double the beneficiary figure of 350 Rs. In both the groups, i.e., the beneficiary and non-beneficiary, except for rice all other food expenditure is lower than the NSS 2004-05 data. Non-food expenditure has sharply risen in the sample



**Table 3.5: Monthly Consumption Expenditure of Households**

Food Items	Beneficiaries			Non Beneficiaries			Aggregate			NSS 2004-05 Rs.
	Average Rs.	%	Coefficient of variation	Average Rs.	%	Coefficient of variation	Average Rs.	%	Coefficient of variation	
Rice	66.98	12.11	5.58	56.62	5.08	50.46	64.91	9.75	28.02	99.45
Wheat	1.74	0.31	23.61	2.17	0.19	22.61	1.83	0.27	23.11	5.09
Other cereal	4.89	0.88	117.97	7.00	0.63	81.75	5.31	0.80	99.86	0.04
Total cereals	73.65	13.32	12.10	74.98	6.72	22.98	73.91	11.11	17.54	112.69
Pulses	14.98	2.71	51.70	17.24	1.55	29.27	15.43	2.32	40.49	11.63
Sugar	19.30	3.49	25.83	21.36	1.92	48.48	19.71	2.96	37.15	6.01
Cook oil	7.05	1.27	45.16	8.20	0.74	57.83	7.28	1.09	51.50	16.17
Spice	3.54	0.64	41.04	4.23	0.38	22.98	3.67	0.55	32.01	6.51
Milk	13.69	2.48	60.13	21.12	1.89	55.72	15.18	2.28	57.93	8.16
Meat	21.28	3.85	38.15	22.25	1.99	53.85	21.47	3.23	46.00	0
Fruit	0.59	0.11	91.29	3.92	0.35	59.99	1.25	0.19	75.64	5.29
Vegetables	26.61	4.81	22.01	28.53	2.56	12.05	26.99	4.06	17.03	37.30
Confectionary	22.99	4.16	68.60	18.03	1.62	56.19	22.00	3.31	62.40	0
<b>Total Food</b>	<b>203.66</b>	<b>36.83</b>	<b>15.21</b>	<b>219.85</b>	<b>19.71</b>	<b>7.35</b>	<b>206.90</b>	<b>31.09</b>	<b>11.28</b>	<b>245.58</b>
Education	41.69	7.54	44.74	176.67	15.84	73.62	68.68	10.32	59.18	10.27
Cloth	149.15	26.97	45.83	198.26	17.84	53.68	158.97	23.89	49.76	14.08
Foot	29.44	5.32	45.31	42.42	3.80	46.90	32.03	4.81	46.11	0.02
Other	78.77	14.25	14.37	410.00	36.76	89.67	145.02	21.79	52.02	8.54
Fuel	50.28	9.09	55.14	68.10	6.11	50.56	53.84	8.09	52.85	47.13
<b>Total Non-food</b>	<b>349.32</b>	<b>63.17</b>	<b>36.25</b>	<b>865.45</b>	<b>80.29</b>	<b>68.17</b>	<b>458.55</b>	<b>68.91</b>	<b>52.21</b>	<b>153.31</b>
GRANDTOTAL	552.98	100.00	23.05	1115.30	100.00	53.53	665.45	100.00	38.29	398.89

**SOURCE:** Field Survey 2009.

\* NSS Round 2004-05.

when compared to NSS 2004-05 data. It is double in the beneficiary group and more than 4 times in non-beneficiary group. The details are presented in Table 3.5. This increase is mostly noticed in education and clothing. Especially expenditure on education is four times higher in non-beneficiary group than in the beneficiary group.

### 3.6 Variability (CV) and Gini ratios of income and consumption:

The average per household incomes of beneficiary and non-beneficiary sample households are reported to be Rs. 36,433 and Rs. 1,02,194 respectively. On the other hand the per household consumption for beneficiary and non-beneficiary households are Rs. 18,201 and Rs. 35,690 during the year 2009 (Table 3.6).

**Table 3.6: Variability in Consumption and Income of sample Villages of selected districts -2009**

Description	Rs.		
	Beneficiary	Non-Beneficiary	Total
Average household Income during	36433	102194	49586
Average household Consumption during	18201	35690	21778
Co-efficient of variation in Income	5.4	9.32	4.79
Co-efficient of variation in consumption	2.3	3.26	3.72
Gini co-efficient of Income	0.23579	0.463832	0.273858
Gini Co-efficient of Consumption	0.141672	0.306416	0.210352

The Co-efficient of variation of consumption is reported higher in case of non-beneficiary households than the beneficiary households which means there is a wide variation of consumption among the non-beneficiary households than beneficiary households. Moreover, the Gini co-efficient of incomes indicates 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. On the other hand, the Gini-co-efficients of consumption also reported similar situation as in case of Gini Co-efficients of income between beneficiary and non-beneficiary households. On the whole the aggregate of sample households exhibited more inequality in the income which resulted in more inequality in consumption.

### 3.7 Determinants of participation in MGNREGA:

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.

**Table-3.7: Determinants of participation in MGNREGS (Logit function)**

(Dependent variable: Dummy household participation in MGNREGS)

Variable name	coefficient	"t" value	Marginal effect	Odds ratio
Employment other than MGNREGA(X <sup>1</sup> )	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.082
Household income other than MGNREGA(X <sup>2</sup> )	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.082
Household size(X <sup>3</sup> )	0.054	0.3724	0.000	0.077
Land ownership Dummy(X <sup>4</sup> )	-0.086	0.2507	0.021	0.089
Value of household asset(X <sup>5</sup> )	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.082
Dummy BPL card holding(X <sup>6</sup> )	-0.28	0.5611	-0.645	0.108
Dummy SC(X <sup>7</sup> )	1.894***	1.9586	-2.111	0.012
Dummy ST(X <sup>8</sup> )	2.908**	2.0536	-8.817	0.004
Dummy OBC(X <sup>9</sup> )	0.145	0.1674	-0.162	0.071
constant	2.504	2.2825		
No. Of observations	250			
Log likelihood	142.203			
Pseudo R <sup>2</sup>	0.335			

The results of the logit Regression are presented in the Table 3.7. Out of the total nine explanatory variables employed in the regression analysis, only two variables are found to be statistically significant. They are 1) dummy SC and 2) Dummy ST. Among these two variables of caste groups, ST category has reported larger number of household participation than the other caste category. The Dummy OBC caste group showed a positive sign but not significant. This indicates that the participation of OBC category in the MGNREGA works is comparatively lesser than the other two caste groups.

The negative and non-significance of explanatory variable "Dummy BPL card holding" indicates that the BPL card holders are not at all interested in participating in MGNREGA works due to the availability of works at higher wage rates. On the other hand the variable of "House hold income other than MGNREGA" and the variable of "value of house hold asset" have totally no impact over the "Dummy participation of households in MGNREGA works. This means that though the households are getting works with higher wage rates elsewhere 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 MGNREGAs. As regards to the odds ratios, no caste group has shown significant impact on the participation of households in MGNREGA.

In a nutshell, the Logit function explains the willingness of the households to participate in MGNREGA works inspite of getting works elsewhere.

### **3.8 Summary:**

In beneficiary group scheduled castes represent at 44 per cent followed by other backward castes at 39 per cent. Scheduled Tribes share is 14.5 per cent. These numbers reflect that MGNREGS has reached the targeted groups as desired. Seventy two per cent of participant sample fall under below poverty line category, where as the non-participants are only 24 per cent. As a consequence more non-participants (46 per cent) fall under above poverty line group. In the participants the corresponding figure is 9 per cent. On the overall, 37 per cent depend on farming and 16 per cent on daily wages. Migration for work is more at 8 per cent in non-beneficiaries and only 3 per cent of beneficiaries report the same. Overall it is 4 per cent. In contrast to non-participants of MGNREGS, where they also cultivate some land, workers in the scheme are mostly landless poor. Hence, 45 per cent of them have Agricultural Casual Labour as main occupation. 27 per cent are engaged in non-agricultural casual labour. A small percentage of 5 are employed over farms. Only 4 per cent of beneficiaries are self-employed in non-farming activities. About 19 per cent of the beneficiaries have reported MGNREGS as their main occupation. In non-beneficiary category 35 per cent of man-days are engaged in agriculture on own farms. It is followed by non-agricultural casual labour taking a share of 20 per cent. About 18 per cent are engaged in agricultural casual labour. Seventeen per cent are employed in self non-farming activities. This group is also engaged in livestock rearing forming 5 per cent of the total man-days. One notable feature is workers in this group have also reported working as migrant labour (5 per cent). But this migration is completely arrested in MGNREGS beneficiaries. When the total sample is analysed agriculture casual labourer remains as the main stay of sustenance for 37 per cent depend on it. Non-agricultural labour follows at 25 per cent. When 13 per cent reported self-employment in agriculture an equal number are participating in MGNREGS works for livelihood. A minute percent of 1.4 reported working as migrants. In the household net income of beneficiaries, income from MGNREGS constitutes only 13 per cent. The other major sources of income are wages from agriculture (36 per cent) and wages from non-agriculture (37 per cent). Only 6 per cent of the income comes from agriculture/livestock. They also derive 4 per cent of their income from self-employment in non-farming activities. Most of the non-participants, in the MGNREGS sample hold some agricultural lands. So they receive 60 per cent of their income from agriculture/livestock. About 17 per cent of income comes from wages on non-agriculture. Relatively a smaller number of 8 per cent is receiving their income from

agricultural wages. Almost the same proportion of income is accruing from wages as migrant labour. About 6 per cent of the income comes from self-employed non-farming activities.

The Gini- Coefficients of variation 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 were involved. On the other hand the Gini Co-efficients of consumption also reported similar situation as in the case of Gini-Coefficients of income between beneficiary and non-beneficiary households. On the whole, the aggregate of sample households exhibited more inequality in the income which resulted in more inequality in consumption.

\*\*\*\*\*

## **Work Profile under MGNREGS, Wage Structure and Migration issues**

### **CHAPTER – IV**

#### **Introduction:**

The work profile of the sample households of MGNREGS is discussed in this chapter. The number of members per household who worked during the year, number of days worked community wise, wage rate obtained for each member and the distance they had to commute from their village are analyzed by selected district-wise in the following pages. In addition to this the proportion of worker participation across different schemes is examined. The perception of the sample households of the quality of the assets created under MGNREGS is recorded. If there were instances of migration for work, the distance they had to travel and nature of employment they were engaged in was also analyzed below.

#### **4.1. Work Profile under MGNREGS:**

Among the sample households, per household participation of family members is highest in SC Community in Ganjam district (1.90) followed by Mayurbhanj (1.85) and Bargarh (1.60) districts. Next to Scheduled castes, other backward communities are also participating in good number in MGNREGS. Boudh reported 1.75 members per household followed by Khorda (0.98) and Ganjam (0.80) districts in this category. Bargarh reported highest participation of 1.10 in Scheduled Tribes. Overall, SC participation is highest (1.29) followed by OBCs (0.87) and STs (0.36) when per household family member participation in the scheme is considered (Table 4.1).

#### **4.2. Success of MGNREGS in providing 100 days near the village:**

Days employed per household in a year are highest in Ganjam followed by Mayurbhanj and Boudh districts. In Ganjam SCs and OBCs reported 53.9 and 37.7 days per year. Even in Mayurbhanj SCs worked 23.23 days and OBCs 17.08 days. But in Boudh district a different pattern is seen. OBCs have the highest participation at 38.35 days followed by SCs at 16.60 days. Among the districts, only in Bargarh STs reported higher participation. They reported 23.30 days per household. Overall SC households reported 25.73 days, OBCs 23.24 and STs 8.72 days in a year. But, these figures are nowhere near to the promised 100 days of work in a year.

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

Characteristics		Boudh	Mayurbhanj	Khorda	Ganjam	Bargarh	Odisha (State)
No. of members per HH employed during the year	Aggregate	2.65	2.70	1.70	2.70	3.05	2.56
	General	0.10	0.10	0.08			0.06
	SC	0.70	1.85	0.38	1.90	1.60	1.29
	ST	0.10	0.33	0.28		1.10	0.36
	OBC	1.75	0.45	0.98	0.80	0.35	0.87
	Women	1.32	1.29	0.81	1.55	1.26	1.24
No. of days per HH employed during the year	Aggregate	58.10	58.43	27.90	91.63	57.85	58.78
	General	1.20	2.53	1.75			1.10
	SC	16.60	23.23	3.88	53.90	31.03	25.73
	ST	1.95	15.60	2.75		23.30	8.72
	OBC	38.35	17.08	19.53	37.73	3.53	23.24
	Women	28.91	27.98	13.25	52.50	23.86	29.30
Wage rate obtained (Rs.)	Aggregate	90	88.20	96.43	65.98	90.44	82.89
	General	90	100.69	100.41	-	90.62	98.26
	SC	90	77.83	104.35	65.75	91.15	78.36
	ST	90	95.94	99.28		90.00	92.71
	OBC	90	93.36	91.40	66.31	90.00	83.49
	Women	90	90.35	103.48	62.20	90.64	80.76
Average distance from residence where employed (Kms)		2	1	1	2	1	1.2

**Source:** Field Survey 2009.

#### **4.3. Nature of Assets Created and Their Durability:**

In Boudh and Baragarh districts 50 per cent of respondents reported working in rural road connectivity work. In Ganjam district 70 per cent were employed on works for provision of irrigation to SC farmers. 43 per cent in Mayurbhanj were engaged in the same activity. Though higher budget was allocated for renovation of traditional water bodies there was no similar proportion of workers engaged in this activity in the sample districts. Only 30 per cent in Boudh, 25 per cent in Mayurbhanj and 5 per cent in Ganjam were employed in this work.

Overall, the highest number of 33 per cent is employed in Rural road Connectivity works followed by 30 per cent in Provision of Irrigation facility for SC farmers, 18 per cent in Water Conservation and Water Harvesting, 12 per cent in Renovation of Traditional Water Bodies and 8 per cent in Flood Control and Protection (Table 4.2). Highest number of 75 per cent in Ganjam and 63 per cent in Boudh districts responded favourably by saying 'very good' for quality of assets created in MGNREGS.



**Table 4.2 – Work-wise employed in MGNREGS and the  
Quality of Assets created – 2009 (% of hhs)**

Characteristics		Boudh	Mayurbhanj	Khorda	Ganjam	Bargarh	State/aggre
Name of the activity under which employed	Rural Connectivity	50.00	15.00	32.50	17.50	50.00	33.00
	Flood control and protection			17.50		20.00	7.50
	Water conservation and water harvesting	20.00	17.50	12.50	7.50	30.00	17.50
	Drought proofing						
	Micro irrigation works	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Provision of irrigation facility to land owned by SC & STs		42.50	37.50	70.00		30.00
	Renovation of traditional water bodies	30.00	25.00		5.00		12.00
	Land Development						
Any other activity approved by the Min. of Rural Development	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Quality of the assets created through MGNREGS activity	Very good	62.50			75.00		27.50
	Good	25.00	70.00	45.00	25.00	87.50	50.50
	Bad	12.50	30.00	55.00		12.50	22.00
	Worst	-	-	-	-	-	-
Average unemployment allowance received by the household for not getting work under MGNREGS after registration (Rs. Per hh)		0	0	0	0	0	0

**Source:** Field Survey 2009.

An overwhelming percentage of 88 in Bargarh and 70 per cent in Mayurbhanj, 45 per cent in Khorda and 25 per cent each in Boudh and Ganjam districts responded by declaring 'good' about the quality of assets created. Overall, half of the sample households felt the quality 'good' while a little more than a quarter (27 per cent) said 'very good'. Only 22 per cent were disappointed and said that the quality was 'bad'. It may be noted that no un-employment allowance was paid under MGNREGS in the sample districts.

#### **4.4. Wage differentials under MGNREGS and comparison with minimum wages:**

When wage rates of MGNREGS are analyzed, workers in Khorda obtained high wage rates when compared to other districts. Workers in Scheduled Caste Community received a high wage rate of Rs.104.35 followed by General Category with Rs.100.41. In Mayurbhanj district workers in General

Category earned a high wage of Rs.100.69 when compared with others. Boudh reported a uniform wage rate of 90 Rs. across all communities. In fact this is the minimum wage rate for unskilled labour declared by the Government of Odisha for the year 2009. The picture of Bargarh with reference to wage rates is more or less same as of Boudh; Ganjam surprisingly reported lower wages across all communities with an aggregate of Rs.65.98 when compared with other districts. When the aggregate wage rate of selected districts is analyzed the figure comes to Rs.87.92, much lower than Rs.90, the minimum wage rate of Odisha. Respondents in the sample reported finding work nearer to the village under the scheme. They had to travel only one or two kilometers for work.

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

Occupation		Odisha (State)					
		Beneficiaries		Non-Beneficiaries		Aggregate	
		Avg. (Rs.)	C.V.	Avg. (Rs.)	C.V.	Avg. (Rs.)	C.V.
Wage rate in agricultural casual labour	Male	120	25.14	96.87	13.49	100.44	23.33
	Female	100	20.21	90.00	12.00	80.00	20.00
Wage rate in non-agricultural casual labour	Male	200	50.43	220	22.34	210.00	35.00
	Female	127	43.48	150	20.00	135	31.25
Wage rate in public work programmes	Male	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Female	-	-	-	-	-	-
Wage rate earned by migrant workers	Male	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Female	-	-	-	-	-	-
Wage rate under MGNREGS	Male	87.92	17.34	-	-	87.92	17.34
	Female	87.92	17.34	-	-	87.92	17.34
Any other work	Male	0	-	0	-	0	-
	Female	0	-	0	-	0	-
	Female	0	-	0	-	0	-

**Source:** Field Survey 2009.

#### **4.5. Labour Migration issues:**

MGNREGS aims at providing employment near the residing villages so that workers need not migrate to distant places for work. Information regarding migration issues of the sample households is discussed in Table 4.4. Very few people have reported out-migration after registering for work MGNREGS. Even these people returned to their villages once the works got underway. Mayurbhanj has reported 0.30 members per household in this category followed by 0.25 in Boudh, 0.20 in Khorda and 0.18 in Ganjam districts.

**Table 4.4 – Migration incidence in selected districts in MGNREGS - 2009**

Characteristics	Boudh	Mayurbhanj	Khorda	Ganjam	Bargarh	State/aggre.
No. of members migrated from the village because of not getting work under MGNREGS even after registration (per household)	0.25	0.3	0.2	0.18	0.15	1.08
No. of out-migrated members returned back to village because of getting work in MGNREGS (per household)	0.25	0.3	0.2	0.18	0.15	1.08
In the case some members returned back to the village to work under MGNREGS where were they earlier working (% of returned members)	Nearby Village					
	Nearby Town	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.18	0.1
	%	80.00	33.33	50.00	100.00	66.67
	Same District	0.05	0.2	0.1	0	0.05
	%	20.00	66.67	50.00	0.00	33.33
	Same State					
	Other State					
In the case of some members returned back to the village to work under MGNREGS which activity earlier working in (% of returned members)	Const/manufacturing/mining	0.05	0.1	0.15	0.18	0.1
	%	20.00	33.33	75.00	100.00	66.67
	Trading/services and transport	0.2	0.2	0.05		0.05
	%	80.00	66.67	25.00	0.00	33.33
	Private work/self business					
	Other government work					
	Agriculture labour					
Year in which shifted (% of shifted hh)	Any other					
	Shifted last year	0.2	0.15	0.1		0.05
	%	80.00	50.00	50.00	0.00	33.33
	Shifted before last year	0.05	0.15	0.1	0.18	0.1
%	20.00	50.00	50.00	100.00	66.67	
Is your family better off now compared to previous occupation (% of shifted hh)		0.25	0.3	0.2	0.18	0.15
		100	100	100	100	100

**Source:** Field Survey 2009.

In Ganjam all these workers used to work in nearby town and 80 per cent in Boudh had reported the same. About 67 per cent in Bargarh, 50 per cent in Khorda fall under this category. Some respondents have to travel little far- away places for work, but these are also towns in the same district. About 67 per cent in Mayurbhanj, 50 per cent in Khorda and 33 per cent in Bargarh reported the same. Overall 63 per cent could find work in the nearby town while 37 per cent had to go little farther town in the same district.

When they migrated to other places, what kind of work did they participate in? This question was posed to the respondents. About 67 per cent in Bargarh, 100 per cent in Ganjam, 75 per cent in Khorda and 33 per cent in Mayurbhanj districts reported that they worked in construction and manufacturing industry. All the others in the respective districts worked in services and trading sectors. In Boudh, it was highest at 80 per cent when compared with other districts. Overall 54 per cent worked in manufacturing and construction while the remaining 46 per cent confined to services and transport. Majority of these workers, 100 per cent in Ganjam, and 67 per cent in Bargarh shifted a year ago. Half of the workers in Mayurbhanj and Khorda and 80 per cent in Boudh shifted during last year. Overall, a majority of 54 per cent shifted a year ago. Beneficiaries under MGNREGS unanimously reported leading better lives now than in previous occupation.

#### **4.6 Summary:**

Among the sample households, per household participation of family members was highest in SC Community (1.29) followed by OBCs (0.87) and STs (0.36). Days employed per household in a year was highest in SC households (25.73) followed by OBCs (23.24) and STs (8.72). But, these figures were nowhere near the promised 100 days of work in a year.

Highest number of 33 per cent was employed in rural Road Connectivity works followed by 30 per cent in Provision of Irrigation facility for SC farmers, 18 per cent in Water Conservation and Water Harvesting, 12 per cent in Renovation of Traditional Water Bodies and 8 per cent in Flood Control and Protection. Highest number of 75 per cent in Ganjam and 63 per cent in Boudh responded favourably by saying 'very good' for quality of assets created in MGNREGS. Half of the sample households felt the quality 'good' while a little more than a quarter (27 per cent) said 'very good'. Only 22 per cent were disappointed and said that the quality was 'bad'. It may be noted that no un-employment allowance was paid under MGNREGS in the sample districts.

When wage rates of MGNREGS are analyzed, workers in Khorda obtained high wage rates when compared to other districts. Workers in Scheduled Caste Community received a high wage rate of Rs

104.35 Rs. followed by General Category with Rs 100.41. When the aggregate wage rate of selected districts was analyzed the figure comes to Rs 87.92, much lower than Rs 90, the minimum wage rate declared by Odisha.

Respondents in the sample reported finding work nearer to the village under the scheme. They had to travel only one or two kilometers for work. Very few people had reported out- migration after registering for work with MGNREGS. Even these people returned back to their villages once the works got underway.

On the whole, 54 per cent worked in manufacturing and construction while the remaining 46 per cent confined to services and transport. Majority of these workers, 100 per cent in Ganjam, 67 per cent in Bargarh shifted a year ago. Half of the workers in Mayurbhanj and Khorda and 80 per cent in Boudh shifted during last year. Overall, a majority of 54 per cent shifted a year ago. Beneficiaries under MGNREGS unanimously reported leading better lives now than in previous occupation.

\*\*\*\*\*

## The Functioning of MGNREGA-Qualitative Aspects

### CHAPTER - V

An attempt is made in this chapter to bring into limelight the relative picture of participants and non-participants in asset holding, borrowings and strength of householder in the asset generation. It is further examined the qualitative functioning of the scheme and accrued benefits from scheme in case of food security, reduction in migration and economic independence to women

#### 5.1.: Household Assets Holdings:

Asset holding is the source of prosperity and stable life to any individual. In rural area, the assets are generally land, housing and gold ornaments for all people. It is estimated asset holding of participants of MGNREGA and non-participants. It is given the average of 10 villages of five districts in Odisha of each parameter to know the difference between beneficiary and non-beneficiary of MGNREGA (Table 5.1.) It is given average of per household. The per household land is 12 times less to participations compared to non-beneficiary. Housing property is more than two times less to participant compared to non-beneficiary. In case of live stock, we cannot find much variation but it is three times less for beneficiary than that of non-beneficiary. The possession of agricultural implements is at very low ebb to the participants and it shows that they are not in the line of having agricultural apparatus which is useful for cultivation.

**Table - 5.1: Assets Holding of Sample Villages in Odisha**  
(Rs. Per household)

	<b>Beneficiary</b>	<b>Non-Beneficiary</b>	<b>Aggregate</b>
Land	22838	293300	76930
House property	43955	103900	55944
Live stock	2058	6490	2944
Agricultural implements	1000	40600	8121
Consumer assets	851	9294	2540
Business assets	28	9160	1855
Ornaments	2556	15560	5157
Utensils	662	1486	827
Others	1518	13688	3952
Total	84467	493478	158269

**Source:** Field Survey - 2011

In case of consumer assets and business assets, the beneficiaries are far off to them, while non-beneficiaries do have higher amounts which may play some role to exercise either good consumption or good business in the area in question.

In the traditional society of rural India, ornaments are considered as a property of women and these reflect the level of wealth in the hands of women. The assets of ornaments of beneficiaries are nearly six times low compared to non-beneficiaries, which indicate the level of women independence in the study villages. The household utensils will inform the level of comfort to the householders or its members. In this study, it is found that beneficiary shows very low possession. 'Other Assets' also displays eight times lower than that of non-participants of MGNREGA.

Thus, the participants are very vulnerable from every aspect of asset estimation comparatively with non-beneficiary. In average per household total "Asset Holding" is six times low. It obviously exhibits how much the participants are poor when compared to non-participants of MGNREGA.

## **5.2 Household Status on Borrowings and their Financial Vulnerability:**

The availability of institutional finance or borrowings to rural people is still much required across India. The non-institutional finance/borrowings by rural people will cost them more by exorbitant interest rates. It is presented the borrowings of sample households of sample villages of Odisha (Table 5.2)

It is very interesting fact that the beneficiaries of MGNREGA received institutional loan (Rs.1245/-) at 15 times low compared to their counterpart. They are in the shackles of traders-cum-money lenders and further they are compelled to be under landlord employment, as their exigencies might have led to that extent of settlement of finances. The beneficiaries do not have good sources of loan either from friends or 'others'. The non-participants of MGNREGA are not in the clutches of traders-cum-money lenders and landlord employment. There is distinct deviation in the sources of loan between these two groups.

The purpose of loan shows the dichotomy of consumption in between beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries. The latter used the loan much for asset generation and spent very less for current consumption (Rs.240/-) notwithstanding the former repors much for consumption asset. The rate of interest is 24 per cent and the above for both groups as such the exorbitant interest rates are predominant.

**Table 5.2: Borrowings by Sample Households of villages in Odisha - 2011**  
(Rs. Per household)

Occupation		Beneficiaries	Non-Beneficiaries	Aggregate
Source of Loan	Institutional Loan (Banks)	1245	19,480	4892
	Traders-cum-money lenders	10	-	8
	Commission Agent	-	240	48
	Landlord Employment	670	-	536
	Friends/Relatives	-	200	40
	Others	20	-	15
Purpose of Loan	Daily Consumption	603	240	530
	Social Ceremony	110	-	88
	Purchase of Land, Live Stock or Other Assets	1232	19,680	4922
	Consumer Durables	--	--	--
	Construction	--	--	--
	Health Treatment	--	--	--
	Others	--	--	--
Rate of Interest (Percent per Annum)		24%	24%	24%

Source: Field Survey - 2011

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

The household strength on borrowing and other household assets is given in the table 5.2B. There is no wage work to those whom the workers are indebted. The participants of scheme have low (66%) availability of co-operative credit compared to non-beneficiaries and they had very limited family membership in co-operative societies, while the availability of informal credit from other society/SHG in village is very high to the participants of scheme. All family members of both groups (100 %) are members of such societies.

The possession of accounts by beneficiary in bank, post office and in other institution is low (42%) compared to non-beneficiary (50%). In the rural area, still the institutional transactions by rural people are limited and there is dire need of institutional activity in this segment. The above fact further corroborates with the lack of possession of stocks, bonds, shares or any other similar assets in the study villages by either group (2% and 20%). The life insurance is still to cover much rural area, as the participants and non-participants have 6 per cent and 38 per cent respectively.



**Table - 5.2B: Household Strength on Borrowing and other Household Assets of Sample Villages in Odisha - 2011**

(% of households)

Occupation	Beneficiary	Non Beneficiary	Aggregate
Doing wage work to those whom they are indebted	-	-	-
Availability of co – operative credit society in village	66.00	70.00	68.00
Family member being member of such society	16.00	38.00	27.00
Availability of informal credit society/SHG in village	92.00	78.00	85.00
Family member being member of such society	100.0	100.0	100.0
Having account in a bank/post office/other institution	42.00	50.00	56.00
Having any stock/bond/shares/other similar assets	02.00	20.00	11.00
Having life insurance policy	06.00	38.00	20.00

Source: Field Survey - 2011

### 5.3. Qualitative Functioning of MGNREGA from Sample Villages:

The qualitative functioning of MGNREGA in Odisha is given Table 5.3. There is no corruption (100%) for issuing job card to participant but some irregularities akin to job card maintenance are there. The entries (20%) even after working in the scheme did not take place. The fake information or incomplete information or missing information took place for all participants (100%). Overwritten entries and signature column are blank to all participants (100%), despite of these lapses, there one facility left with participants is the job card with the participants (100%).

After the application made for work, the concerned authority arranged work and issued receipt for work application. The work was arranged within 15 days. There was no gender discrimination (100%) for wage amount and the amount paid on task- basis (100%). The work measurement took place on team basis (100%) and the period of payment was within a fortnight. The payment was done in bank to participants (100%) and the bank account was in their names only.

Whenever the wages were not paid through bank, the payment took place to all labour (80%) but the payment sometimes was made in public or private places (20%). There was no any complaint regarding delay as said by participants (100%). There were no delays, less payment, task comparison, problems in access of bank/post office in the study villages in Odisha as expressed by the participants.

**Table 5.3: Qualitative questions related to Functioning of MGNERGA from Sample Villages in Odisha - 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	20	80	-
	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	100		
	If applied, did you get a dated receipt for the application	100		
	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	--	100	-
Payments of wages	Are the wage rates same for men and women	100		
	Wage rates higher for men			
	Wage rates higher for women			
	Wage paid on daily wage basis			
	Wage paid on piece rate/task -wage basis	100		
Measurement of work	Work was measured by individuals work			
	Work was measured by team measurement	20	80	
	Work was measured by collective measurement	60		
Period of wage payment	Wages were paid within a fortnight	100		
	Wage were paid within a month			
	Wages were paid more than a month			
	Wages were paid after one year			

Contd....

**Table 5.3: Qualitative questions related to Functioning of NERGA from Sample Villages in Odisha - 2011**

(Percentage of HH)

<b>Aspect</b>	<b>Variable</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Not sure</b>
In case of wages were not paid through bank	Wage paid in front of all labourers	80	20	
	Wages paid on the worksite			
	Wages paid in panchayat bhawan			
	Wages paid on other public/private place		20	
	Wages paid on some ones private residence			
Complaints regarding wage payment	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 com-pared to the wages paid		100	
	Faced problems in accessing post office/bank accounts		100	
	On what basis wages were calculated not clear		100	
	Others			
Details of Worksite facilities	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 5.3 Qualitative questions related to Functioning of MGNERGA from Sample Villages in Odisha - 2011**

**(Percentage of HH)**

<b>Aspect</b>	<b>Variable</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Not sure</b>
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, progaramme 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			
	The structure created may last up to five year			
	The structure created may last up to ten year	20		
	The structure created may last more than ten year	80		
	Is it worth creating the structure	100		
	Was the structure created adequate	100		
	No structure needed more attention to be able to last long		100	
How has NREGA has affected labour Migration?	Did any your family members migrated out for job after implementation of NERGA (year 2005 onwards)	50		
	If yes, only one member of the family migrated	50		
	More than one member of the family migrated		100	
	Are wages higher in city or other states than NERGA	80	100	
	Any family member migrated as wage labourer with dissatisfaction from NERGA	50		
	If yes only one member of the family migrated	50		
	More than one member of the family migrated			

Contd....

**Table 5.3: Qualitative questions related to Functioning of NERGA from Sample Villages in Odisha - 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	100		
	NERGA gave generates 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 through out 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

All the facilities referred by scheme are procured. Gram Panchayat sanctioned the amount with proper details and the drinking water facility, period of rest, child care facility and first aid kit were

available at work site. The monitoring is good by administration and no other complaint is lodged relating to work site to Gram Panchayat. All participants (100%) expressed that the work done was very useful to the villages.

The created structures would last more than ten years (80%) and some (20%) informed below ten years, while all the participants (100%) reported that the structures (100%) created were worthy and adequate and further there was no need of more attention to be placed for good durability or the longevity for the works created under the scheme (100%).

The labour migration has not been completely curtailed. Some labour (50%) from the families migrates to towns but only one member from family did this. More than one member from families did not take place in study villages. The wages in city are higher than the wages of MGNREGA (80% participants reported). Only because of less wage or dissatisfaction due to wage, some labour (50%) migrated to city by one member of family.

The respondents (100%) are fully aware of the scheme. They know very well about the: 1) right to work and get employed within 15 days 2) application procedure 3) right minimum wages and 4) level of minimum wages 5) wage cultivation method 6) work site facilities 7) muster roll at work site and 8) the permissible works to the participants. Despite well versed about items, the participants (100%) are not aware of unemployment allowance in the study villages of Odisha.

There is no second opinion in the participants over the potential benefits accrued from MGNREGA. They (100%) reported that the scheme enhanced food security and it provided protection against extreme poverty and it also reduced distress migration and indebtedness. The scheme successfully generated economic independence to women and purchasing power in the vicinity. There is 100% food security to all the participants and their families.

#### **5.4 Some Qualitative Aspects of Food security:**

The qualitative functioning of MGNREGA has been analyzed in the sample villages through the opera designed questionnaire (Table 5.4). The participants of the scheme reported that there was neither type of payment to get job card. There is no bribe for the procuring of job card by participants. Further, they informed that the job cards were kept with them only and there was no practice of dispossession of job cards by them and no other practice of keeping of job cards with others than the job card holders was not existed in the study villages at overall/state level.

**Table 5.4 Qualitative Questions Related to MGNREGA functioning of Sample villages in Odisha 2011**

(% 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	No
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	No
5	Provide description of the work and its starting date?
Answer	During the Months as good decided and no data available
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	--
8	Provide details of family members migrated to city with dissatisfaction of NREGA and why?
Answer	--

**Source:** Field Survey - 2011

The Panchayat Raj monitored the whole function of MGNREGA in the study villages. No complaints were lodged. As per the prescribed schedule of the government works were conducted in the villages but they were unable to say the dates but they informed months- Feb, March, April, May and June. The participants divulged that the migration of family members to town was there due to high wage in nearest towns. The migration is a selective one by the agricultural labour based on their physical fitness. They referred works like construction, moving cart loads, etc., which were fit for the middle aged people. They express that the aged and women prefer MGNREGA, while others made commutation. There was no much back to village to work in MGNREGA, as these labour were work specific in the towns. The families which possess the members with good physique were prone to migration to get higher wage rather than dissatisfaction over the scheme.

### **5.5 Potential Benefits of MGNREGA to Sample Villages:**

The potential benefits of MGNREGA are in the expected and aimed lines in the study villages of Odisha (Table 5.5). There is 100% food security established to the participants across study villages. The protection from poverty and reduction of distress migration was reported at 90% and 92% respectively. There is economic independence to women who are participants of MGNREGA and the reduction to indebtedness took place. Thus there is potential accrual of benefits to the farmers.

**Table - 5.5: Provide details on the following potential benefits of MGNREGA of Sample Villages in Odisha - 2011**

(Percentage of HH)

Component	Yes	No
NREGA enhance food security	100.0	-
NREGA provided protection against extreme poverty	90.00	10.00
NREGA gave greater economic independence to women	82.00	18.00
NREGA helped to reduce distress migration	92.00	8.00
NREGA helped to reduced indebtedness	79.00	21.00

Source: Field Survey - 2011

### 5.6 MGNREGA and food security of Sample villages:

MGNREGA is aimed at providing food security to rural people through employment. This has been accomplished in the study villages of Odisha (Table 5.6). The families of participants did not face insufficient food security or any other deprivations. They face protection in meeting expenditure for (44%) education and medical (56%). They encounter in-sufficient wage (56%) in other activities and the lack of work in time (44%). To achieve and develop the scheme implementation, as suggested by participants, there is need of increase of number of days of scheme (56%) and arranging availability of works nearer to village (44%). All the participants (100%) unanimously expressed that there should be compulsory work allocation particularly to landless agricultural labour.

**Table - 5.6: Qualitative questions related to food security of Sample villages of Odisha – 2011**

(Percentage of HH)

<b>1</b>	Do you feel that your family does not have sufficient food for the whole year give reasons
<b>Answer</b>	No
<b>2</b>	Have you faced any deprivations other than food insufficiency? If yeas, explain
<b>Answer</b>	No
<b>3</b>	What were the main difficulties you and your family faced during the last year?
<b>Answer</b>	44% education, 56% Medical
<b>4</b>	What is the most important thing your household lacks
<b>Answer</b>	56% In Sufficient wage rates in other activity, 44 % Availability of other works in time
<b>5</b>	What is the suggestion for amelioration
<b>Answer</b>	56 % Increase in number of working days, 44% Availability of other works nearer to village
<b>6</b>	Any suggestions to improve NREGA functioning
<b>Answer</b>	100 % Compulsory work allocation for exclusively landless

Source: Field Survey – 2011



**Summary:**

It is apparent that the participants are vulnerable in possessing the assets. Even for agricultural implements, they are not in a position to engage cultivation with the available.

They lack business assets as well as gold ornaments and household utensils. If it is seen the financial sources, they are in the fetters of traders-cum-money lenders, because of their compelling needs of the day. The beneficiaries are much prone to take loan for consumption purpose rather than the other ones. One welcome feature is that there is no attached labour in the study villages. The access for financial institutions is very limited to them when compared to non-beneficiaries. A visible corruption is not referred by the participants but they report some lapses in the administration, for example overwritten entries, leaving signature column blank etc. Work was arranged at the request and within the stipulated period without gender discrimination and the payment was made through banks without any delay or problem. All the facilities referred by scheme are obtained. The created structures are viewed as useful for long period. The labour migration has not completely curtailed, since the wages are high in town. Participants, as informed, are aware of the rights of scheme and its mandatory provisions. There is no unemployment allowance in the study villages. They viewed that the scheme reduced extreme poverty, distress migration, indebtedness and economic dependence of the women. There is 100% food security to all the participants. To develop the scheme implementation, as suggested by participants, there is need of increase of number of days of scheme (56%) and arranging availability of works nearer to village (44%). All the participants (100%) unanimously expressed that there should be compulsory work allocation particularly to landless agricultural labour.

\*\*\*\*\*

## MGNREGA IMPACT ON VILLAGE ECONOMY

### CHAPTER - VI

In this chapter the impact of MGNREGA over village economy has been estimated through the estimation of occupational shift, the change in wage rates of agricultural labour, qualitative changes in sample villages during last one year and qualitative functioning of MGNREGA in the selected districts of Odisha. This analytical exposure may facilitate for policy formulation in near future. It estimates the utility to villages and the significance of the scheme in the study area for the development of village economy.

#### 6.1 Infrastructure Available in the Sample Villages

Any scheme or programme is to be aimed at changing the village economy to further its development. For MGNREGA, it is studied its impact over village economy (Table 6.1). Road connectivity is 100 % available within village to all the 10 sample villages in 5 selected districts in Odisha. The density of railway line is very low in Odisha. It is reported that no village has rail connectivity in this study but 90% of sample villages have nearest village connectivity and the average distance of 10 villages is 21.50 kms.

**Table 6.1: Infrastructure Available in the Sample Villages (State level)**

	<b>Within Village</b>	<b>Nearest Village</b>	<b>If Nearest Village average distance (Kms)</b>
Road connectivity	100	--	--
Railway connectivity	--	90	21.50
Land line or mobile connectivity	100	--	--
Post office	50	50	4.00
Co-operative credit society	60	40	5.00
Regional rural bank	10	90	6.50
Commercial bank	10	90	7.20
Agricultural produce market	20	80	6.75
Self help group centre	80	20	4.00
School primary	100	--	--
School secondary	50	50	3.10
School higher secondary	30	70	5.50
Primary health centre	30	70	5.85
Hospital/dispensary	10	90	9.78
Gram panchayat office	60	40	2.50
Fair price shop	70	30	3.00
Any other (anganwadi)	--	--	--

**Source:** Field Survey 2011

All the villages have landline or mobile connection across sample villages. It exhibits that villages are well informed in time without any delay for any transaction or programme of the village across selected districts in Odisha. In case of post office there are 50% villages possess post office

and the overall distance for the 50% non-post office villages is 4 kms. This infrastructure lacks due to the coverage of post office is an expensive one to the department for every village. The co-operative society is available within village to 60% villages and the remaining 40% villages are at the average distance of 5 kms. The Regional Rural Bank (RRB) is located in one village (10% of total villages) and the other 9 villages or 90% do not have RRBs, but these villages are at the distance of 6.50 kms.

Commercial Bank is located in 10% villages and the remaining villages have access at 7.20 kms. Thus the villages have much distance to banking facility. It is important to sell the farmer's produce at nearest market place to avoid much transport cost. In the selected sample villages in Odisha, 20% villages have agricultural produce market and the other villages are at 6.75kms distance to the market. The Self Help Group (SHG) is located in many villages (80 per cent) and the 20 per cent villages do not have SHG in their villages.

Level of Education is symbol of development and a source for better use of resources and better life. The primary school is available in all the villages while secondary schools are available for 50 per cent villages within the village and the 50 per cent villages are nearer to their neighboring village and the distance is 3.10 kms. The higher secondary is available for 30 per cent villages within the village and for the remaining 70 per cent villages are with 5.50 kms average distance.

The Primary Health Centre is located within village for 30 per cent villages and the 70 per cent villages have the nearest village with the average distance of 5.85 kms. Only 10 per cent villages have hospital/dispensary within the village and the other villages receive service of hospital from the nearest villages and the average distance is 9.78 kms for all the 90 per cent villages of the selected villages across five selected districts in Odisha. The Gram Panchayat office is located within village for 60 per cent villages and for the 40 per cent villages, it is 2.50 kms average distance to these villages. The Fair Price Shop is located within village for 70 per cent villages and the remaining villages are nearer to the other villages at 3.00 kms average distance.

If the infrastructure availability to the village economy is observed, the rail connectivity (21.50 kms), Hospital (9.78 kms) and Commercial Bank (7.20 km) are much distant in Odisha. No other items under 'any other' is identified in the study villages in Odisha.

## **6.2 Occupational Structure in Sample villages:**

The occupational structure of country shows the major dependence of workers in different sectors and its sub-groups. It is estimated the occupational structure of the sample villages of five selected districts (Table 6.2). The dependence on agriculture has been declined during 2001-09, as the cultivators and agricultural labour show declining trend by 26.46 to 24.89 and 63.93 to 63.42 respectively. The non-farm activities have increased in the study villages.

**Table 6.2: Occupational Structure of Sample Villages (State Level)**

	(% hh)	
<b>Occupation</b>	<b>Reference Period 2009</b>	<b>2001</b>
1.Cultivators	24.89	26.46
2.Agricultural labour	63.42	63.93
3.Household small industry	2.39	2.21
4.Other manufacturing/mining	1.25	--
5.Construction	3.11	4.80
6.Trade, commerce and business	1.82	1.16
7.Transport and communication	0.80	0.46
8.Other services	2.31	0.97
9.Total	100.00	100.00

**Source:** Field Survey 2011

The participation of households in household small industry has increased during 2009-01 by 0.11 per cent. There was no participation of households in 2001 in 'other manufacturing/mining, but the trend was changed by 2009. The households displayed 1.25 per cent occupational share in manufacturing/mining in 2009 in study area. A new shift in 'other services' has reported towards non-farm activities. Significantly 'other services' demonstrates higher growth during the study period in Odisha. Thus there is appreciable budge of households from agriculture to non-agricultural occupations, which is a desirable and acceptable swing to the development of economy of Odisha.

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

In the wage rate scenario of rural labour force, a complete sea change has taken place in the study villages in five selected districts in Odisha (Table 6.3). It is estimated the wage shift between 'before MGNREGA (2005)' and the 'reference period 2009'. Both wage rates of male and female have increased, while the wage rates of female are still lower than that of wage rates of male. Though the wage rates in agriculture for male are high to the wage rates of female, the gap of wage rate in between them had been reduced by 2009. The gap of wage rates for non-agricultural wages of male and female increased during 2005-09. This means that the wage curve has become much positive to male workers in non-agricultural sector. The similar trend appears for construction workers. In case of 'other skilled' workers, the wage rates increased much to electricians rather than plumber and workers of pump set boring. This indicates the skill set of electrician has led to higher wages in rural Odisha, particularly in study area.

**Table 6.3 Wage Rates for Different Activities of all Sample Villages (State Level)**

(In Rs.)

Activity		Reference Period 2009		Before NREGA (2005)	
		Male	Female	Male	Female
Prevailing agricultural wages		128	92	84.5	58.5
Prevailing non agricultural wages		156.5	102.5	113	75
Construction		156	96	106	75.5
Mining		--	--	--	--
Other skilled work	Electrician	215.5	--	135	--
	Plumber	161	--	123	--
	Pump-set boring	92.5	--	78	--

**Source:** Field Survey 2011**6.4. Average Prevailing Labour charges for Agricultural Operations in Sample Villages by Overall/State:**

Agricultural operations and their costs are important to decide the total costs of cultivation of a farmer. These costs are very significant variables in the estimation of net return of the cultivator. In this analysis, it is taken 'three points of time' to compare and estimate the trend of costs of agricultural operations of ten sample villages of five selected districts of Odisha (Table 6.4.)

There has been acceleration of costs for all agricultural operations in the study area during study period at overall/state. The per acre cultivation costs are estimated as per the farmer response. Out of costs/charges of agricultural operations, harvesting of paddy and transplanting are the highest charges out of all and ploughing and weeding have also shown much charges compared to others. During 2001-05 the increase of charges took place at high growth to threshing, ploughing and weeding, while the charges displayed much rise for winnowing, ploughing and leveling during 2005-09.

**Table 6.4: Prevailing Labour Charges for Agricultural Operations of Sample Villages (State Level)**

(Rs./Acre)

Activity	Reference Period 2009	Before NREGA	
		2005	2001
Ploughing	809	539	377
Leveling	595	405	303
Weeding	807	607	445
Paddy Transplanting	1629	1229	904
Harvesting of Wheat	--	--	--
Harvesting of Paddy	1815	1400	1080
Harvesting of Grams	1575	1150	875
Harvesting of Pigeon Pea	--	--	--
Harvesting of Ragi	--	--	--
Harvesting of Jowar	--	--	--
Harvesting of Maize	--	--	--
Cane-Cutting	--	--	--
Harvesting other Crops	--	--	--
Digging of Potatoes	--	--	--
Threshing of paddy	395	275	179
threshing of wheat	--	--	--
winnowing of wheat/paddy	375	240	172

Source: Field Survey 2011

### 6.5. Qualitative changes in Sample villages during Last One year in Odisha:

The development policies of government (either State Government or Central Government) may give impact on the rural economy. There will be some quantitative and qualitative changes in the villages due to these programmes, schemes and policy oriented administration. It is estimated the qualitative changes in sample villages in selected five districts of Odisha (Table 6.5.). There was no shortage of agriculture/wage labour at any point in last year as the participants answered 'no' by 80 per cent. In case of shortage of agricultural labour, many participants viewed that there was no such shortage for agricultural activities. There is lot of discussion regarding the costs increase in agriculture due to MGNREGA. Therefore, it is collected the participants view regarding costs expressed in different way. The participants by 70 per cent viewed that the costs of agriculture increased and further they divided themselves in giving their observations as: 20 percent increase of costs by 10 per cent participants, 20 per cent to 50 per cent increase of costs by 30 per cent participants and 50 per cent to 75 per cent increase of costs by 30 per cent participants. Finally, it could be inferred that after implementation of MGNREGA, the cost of cultivation has been increased enormously.

One of the objectives of the scheme is to reduce migration to towns. The 10 percent participants reported that the migration was not curtailed to towns. All the participants by 100 per cent accepted the fact that the wage rate offered in town is higher than the wage rate of MGNREGA.

All the participants by 100 per cent reported that some labour came back to work in MGNREGA, but some others were still moving to towns due to wage difference. Very surprising fact

is that the participants by 100 per cent reported that there was no change in migration to towns even after MGNREGA. The increase of wages of casual labour has increased after MGNREGA and further all the participations by 100 per cent responded regarding no decrease of wages after MGNREGA. No stagnancy in wages of labour took place after MGNREGA.

**Table - 6.5. Qualitative Questions on Changes in the Village during last One Year (% of HH)**

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

**Source:** Field Survey 2011

Residing in the village and making commutation to town to work and earn has taken place for neither short period nor longer period and this fact was accepted by 80 per cent participants. After implementation MGNREGA, the incomes and consumption of participants increased but this was accepted by 50 per cent participants. The 60 per cent of the participants reported that more children from their villages attended for schools. It has enhanced the regularity in schooling of children of participants. MGNREGA has changed the situation of attached labour in agriculture in Odisha as expressed by 50% participants. The awareness of villages has increased in leaps and bounds. All the participants (90%) are in view that MGNREGA has generated awareness for the schemes which are being implemented in their villages.

## 6.6 Qualitative Functioning of MGNREGA:

The nature of functioning of MGNREGA qualitatively in the study will enable the repercussions of the scheme in the rural area in Odisha. It is studied the perception of participants (Table 6.6). There was a shortage of 20 per cent of agricultural wage labour during July and August months of agricultural seasons. Due to the implementation of MGNREGA, there was shortage of agricultural labour by 20 per cent during July and August in 2008-09. The scheme has very positive impact on the existing wages of casual labour during the last five years. The high wages to this labour took place by 30 per cent. The standard of living has increased in the study villages at 20 per cent and their consumption of pulses and oils increased by 22 per cent. The regular attendance of children of participants of MGNREGA took place and these are able to increase purchases of books at 15 per cent compared to the previous level.

The Gram Sabha has generated the awareness of villagers by 36 per cent over the government schemes. The suggestions of participants are important for policy formulation and future action over programme in the administration. Many (52%) participants favoured for increase of wages and 100 days maintenance. Further, they suggested stopping the scheme during agricultural peak season, since the wages are sufficient and it is useful for agricultural production.

**Table 6.6 - Qualitative Questions about the Functioning of MGNREGA**

	<b>OPINION</b>	<b>Answers in %</b>
<b>Q1.</b>	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, by 20%
<b>Q2.</b>	After implementation of NREGA has there been a shortage of agriculture labour? If yes in which years/months?	20% of shortage of labour in July, Aug in 2008-09
<b>Q3.</b>	Give details of change in wages of casual labour during the last 5 years after NREGA	Increased by 30 %
<b>Q4.</b>	In what way the standard of living improved in your village since the introduction of NREGA?	Increased by 20 %
<b>Q5.</b>	In what way the household consumption improved in your village since the introduction of NREGA	purchase pulses and oils by 22 %
<b>Q6.</b>	In what way NREGA has impacted the children education	Children going to School & Purchase of Books by 15 %
<b>Q7.</b>	In what way NREGA has impacted the trends of attached labour in agriculture	30% attached labour and 6% attached labour
<b>Q8.</b>	In what way NREGA has improved villagers awareness towards government schemes	36% of Grama Sabha
<b>Q9.</b>	Your suggestions to improve the implementation of NREGA for the benefits of both labourers as well as cultivators?	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. NREGA increase of wage rates by 52.35%</li> <li>2. NREGA work 100 days continuing by 52.70%</li> <li>3. Agriculture Peak Season NREGA work should stop by 58.90 %</li> </ol>

**Source:** Field Survey 2011



## **Summary:**

'Rail Connectivity' to all the study villages is not there, while these villages are located at the average distance of 21.50 kms. Though the telephone connection is there, only half of the villages are not covered with post office but all the villages with primary school. Hospital (9.78 kms) and Commercial Bank (7.20 kms) are much distant in study villages in Odisha. The non-farm activities increased in the study villages during 2001-09. Significantly 'other services' demonstrates higher growth among all the sub-groups of non-farm during the study period in Odisha. It is estimated the wage shift between 'before MGNREGA (2005)' and the 'reference period 2009'. Though the wage rates in agriculture for male were high to the wage rates of female, the gap of wage rate in between them had been reduced by 2009. The wage curve has become much positive to male workers in non-agricultural sector. Though the technical expertise has given much growth for wage hike in rural Odisha, the charges of agricultural operations in study villages has also enormously increased after MGNREGA. All the participants by 100 per cent reported that some labour came back to work in MGNREGA, but some others were still moving to towns due to wage difference. No stagnancy in wages of labour took place after MGNREGA. The 60 per cent of the participants reported that more children from their villages attended for schools. It has enhanced the regularity in schooling of children of participants. MGNREGA has changed the situation of attached labour in agriculture in Odisha as expressed by 50% participants. Many (52%) participants favoured for increase of wages and 100 days maintenance of the scheme. Further, they suggested stopping the scheme during agricultural peak season, since the wages are sufficient and it is useful for agricultural production.

\*\*\*\*\*

## **Summery and policy recommendations**

### **Chapter- VII**

#### **7.1 Introduction:**

Rural employment grew at the annual rate of 0.58 per cent between 1993-94 and 1999-2000. But, the rate of growth of the rural labour force was much higher. This has resulted in lot of stress on rural households. 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 consequence, the stress was laid on employment and poverty alleviation in the Sixth five Year Plan. This as a backdrop, National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (NREGA) came in to existence in September, 2005. It came into force on February 2, 2006 and was implemented in a phased manner. In phase I it was introduced in 200 of the most backward districts and was expanded in 2007-08 covering another 130 districts in phase II. By April 1<sup>st</sup> 2008 the remaining 274 rural districts were also brought into its fold. From October 2<sup>nd</sup> 2009 National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme (NREGS) has been renamed as Mahatma Gandhi National Employment Guarantee Scheme (MGNREGS).

MGNREGS seeks to provide at least 100 days of guaranteed wage employment in a financial year to every rural household whose adult members volunteer to do unskilled manual work. Further, it is different from other wage employment programmes as it bestows a legal right and guarantees to the rural population through an act of parliament and not just a scheme like other wage employment programmes. Viewed in a wider perspective, MGNREGS signals a possible reshaping of state priorities in India through a democratic determination to provide real livelihood opportunities for the rural poor. Thus, as a progressive legislation for hitherto excluded groups, women, scheduled castes, scheduled tribes, among others, MGNREGS can help to reclaim the lost faith in the possibility of pro-people governance.

#### 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 by Central and State Governments are 75 per cent and 25 per cent respectively.

### **7.1.1 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. As the scheme is in its initial stage, it is necessary 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 MGNREGS works and the impact on the rural incomes is to be brought to the sharp focus to formulate policies. 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 Odisha, with the following objectives:

### **7.1.2 Objectives of the study:**

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

### **7.1.3 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 Bargarh, Boudh, Ganjam, Khurda and Mayurbhanj are selected. 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 districts/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 MGNREGS 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 Odisha, 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 are 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 for non-participants of MGNREGS is not available, the non-participating households are selected with analogous design of MGNREGS workers. To analyze the incomes and consumption aspects of the participants, Gini ratio's and to analyze the determinants of participation in MGNREGS, the Logit function are adopted to find the variations across selected groups of workers and villages.

### **7.2.1 Functioning of MGNREGS:**

Highest number (4.10 lakhs) of job cards were issued in Ganjam in 2008-09 followed by Mayurbhanj (4.05), Balasore (2.72) Sundargarh (2.84), Kalahandi (2.64) and Koraput (2.62). Ganjam continued its lead in issuing job cards through 2009-10 and 2010-11 and reached 4.45 lakhs. Among the five selected districts Ganjam and Mayurbhanj led the other districts. Boudh figures last with 82281 job cards in 2010-11. In Mayurbhanj a high percentage of (54.34) job cards were issued to scheduled tribe households. In other selected districts other castes dominate among the job card holders. At the state level the total number of job cards issued has risen from 5267853 in 2008-09 to 6025230 by 2010-11.

### **7.2.2 Employment generated:**

The highest percentage of households who were provided employment for job card holders could be found Gajapati district (41.93) whereas the lowest percentage was recorded in Nayagarh (3.36) district in 2008-09. Among the selected districts Ganjam recorded the highest percentage of 39.62 and Khurda performed badly with 7.35 per cent of households who could get employment out of the job card holding households. In the later years, Kandhamal recorded highest percentage of employment among job card holders with 51 and 58 in 2009-10 and 2010-11 respectively. At the state level these figures have moved consistently upward from 23 to 33 in 2008-11.

Ganjam stood first among all districts in providing employment for 60 days per household and also recording the highest percentages of 14.36 households who could get more than 100 days of work in 2008-09. Mayurbhanj also performed well with 44 days of work per household and 6.23 per cent of households who could get more than 100 days of work. At the state level the average days of per household employment rose from 36 in 2008 to 49 in 2011.

Ganjam leads the state in Scheduled Caste population with 18 per cent and able to provide employment to around 25 per cent of total employed. This trend continued all through 2008-11.

Sundargarh with 50 per cent of population being tribals doing well in taking care of the community by providing 75, 77 and 73 per cent of person days through 2008-11. Koraput and Mayurbhanj districts similarly have 50 per cent tribal population. They were also performing well in tribal welfare by providing 50 to 65 per cent of person days to tribals in the reference period. There was also stress on provision of employment to women in MGNREGS. Ganjam led the other districts by providing proportionate share of 48, 49 and 50 per cent of person days to women through 2008-11. Overall at the state level Scheduled Caste got 19 per cent, Scheduled Tribes got 35 per cent and women formed 37 per cent share in total person days created during 2008-11. Among the employed households only 4 per cent could get 100 days of employment in 2008-09. But, in later years it has shown an increase as about 6 per cent in 2009-10 and 10 per cent in 2010-11 are benefited with 100 days of employment at state level.

### **7.2.3 Number of Projects completed and Total amount spent:**

Odisha has spent Rs. 1,17,456.3 lakhs on different projects till 2010-11 under MGNREGS. Out of this, a lion's share of 51 per cent has gone for Rural Road Connectivity followed by other projects like Renovation of Traditional Water Bodies with 19 per cent and Water Conservation Projects with 12 per cent. At the state level only 30 per cent of projects could be completed by 2010-11 in Rural Road Connectivity Works. One of the components of MGNREGS works is Flood Controls and Protection. At the state level works completed were only 4 per cent in 2008-09 but subsequently it picked up in the next year and 22 per cent were completed. However, it could not maintain the tempo in 2010-11 and ended with only 14 per cent. Considerable focus was also laid on Water Conservation and Water Harvesting projects. In fact, this category of works occupied third rank in funds allocation. The overall picture looks very disappointing as most districts have shown a very bad performance. The position of Bargarh and Mayurbhanj is unenviable as each one has 97 to 100 per cent of works still unfinished. The position of other districts like Dhenkanal, Bolangir, Kandhamal, Rayagada and Baleswar is no better as around 95 per cent of works are still in progress. At the state level only 21 per cent of the projects got completed by 2010-11. Drought Proofing works do not need much technology and quite suitable for MGNREGS works. But, evidently no enthusiasm was shown in completing these works as no single work was completed in 8 of the 30 districts. In another 5 districts more than 95 per cent works were still being finished. At the state level 20 per cent of initiated works got completed by 2010-11. Micro-irrigation works got bogged down as one third of the districts reported no single project as completed. The state average of works completed in this category was only 16 per cent in 2010-11. Even this was fourfold

increase from 4 per cent in 2008-09. To help poor Scheduled Caste farmers reap better yields MGNREGS incorporated some irrigation schemes to benefit their lands. Puri was a bit late entrant as it initiated these schemes only in 2010-11. By this time Malkanagiri could complete 80 per cent of these irrigation schemes. The state's average of completed works is only 4.32 per cent. In Renovation of Water Bodies like tanks, Gajapati with 68 per cent and Jajpur with 62 per cent of completed works performed well while Kendrapara with 2 per cent and Mayurbhanj with 4 per cent struggled to keep pace. Overall it was only 31 per cent at state level. Yet, the pace had doubled from previous year of 2009-10. When all works put together at state level only 7 per cent could be completed in 2008-09. But this climbed to 27 per cent by 2010-11. However, overall completion reflects a tardy progress of works under MGNREGS.

#### **7.2.4 Expenditure on different projects:**

In the total funds allocated under Road connectivity projects in 2008-11, 17 to 25 per cent is spent on finishing the pending projects and the remaining balance was spent on the on-going in the year at the state level. Smaller proportion of funds under Flood control and protection scheme, 9 per cent in 2008-09 to 15 per cent in 2009-10 were spent for completion of projects while major amounts of 85 to 91 per cent were deployed in running projects in 2008-11. In one third of the districts no amounts were spent to complete the projects and the projects were still on-going. Under water conservation and water harvesting scheme 9 to 18 per cent of funds were spent to complete the projects while 82 to 91 per cent got allocated and spent for on-going projects in 2008-11 at state level. In 9 districts in 2008-09 nothing was spent to complete the projects and total funds were spent on on-going projects. Funds for Drought proofing scheme were doubled from 2009-10 and stands at Rs. 3,762 lakhs. As state level only 4 per cent was spent in 2008-09 for completion of projects. It improved to 24 in 2009-10 but fell again to 15 per cent in the next year 2010-11. Funds for Micro-irrigation scheme increased from 1450 lakhs in 2008-09 to 2,464 lakhs by 2010-11. In 11 districts no project was completed in 2008-11 and hence no money was spent to complete projects. A fair amount of 23 per cent was spent on completed projects while large amounts were spent in on-going projects in 2008-09 and 2010-11. A large amount of Rs. 7,282 lakhs were spent under Irrigation for SC and ST farmers and other Weaker Sections' programme in 2010-11 in the state. This was almost 5 fold increase from 2008-09. The programme had shown steady progress in 2008-11 as amount spent on completed projects increased from 9 per cent to 32 per cent. Amount spent under Renovation of Traditional Water Bodies in 2010-11 was 22014 lakhs. This is 50 per cent increase from previous year at the state level. Only 20 per cent of the fund was spent to complete the pending projects while the balance amount was spent on on-going projects in 2010-11. The exception being Gajapati district where 75 per cent of the fund was spent on completed projects. Only 21 per cent of the amount for Land development was spent for completion where as 79 per cent of money was gone for on-going works at the state level. But, number of districts who have spent 100 per cent of

fund on on-going works decreased from 17 in 2008-09 to 9 in 2010-11. Only Malkanagiri could spend 81 per cent of allocated money to complete the programmes.

### **7.2.5 Performance of MGNREGS:**

Muster roll verification is periodically taken up to bring transparency and to see that the needy are really given employment when needed. In 2008-09 only 5 districts could carry out 100 per cent verification. In the following year, 2009-10 eight districts could verify all the muster rolls. In 2010-11, 12 out of 30 districts successfully completed verification of all the muster rolls. At the state level the tally increased from 72 per cent in 2008-09 to 84 by 2010-11.

In 2008-09 only 3900 Gram Panchayats (GP) out of 6474 reported social auditing in their villages, only 11 districts could complete social audit in all the villages. But, as many as 10 districts could conduct the process in less than 2 per cent of the villages. In the following year 2009-10, 16 districts carried out social auditing in all the villages. But the dismal performance is confined to only 3 districts i.e., Naupada, Sambalpur and Kendujhar. In the latest year, 2010-11, many districts realized the necessity and 27 districts fully complied with social auditing. Even the remaining three districts had reported more than 97 per cent compliance. At the state level 97 per cent of all GPs conducted social audit by 2010-11.

In 2008-09 a total number of 84374 works were taken up at the state level. Out of these 60 per cent were inspected at block and 19 per cent were inspected at district level. In 2009-10, 72 per cent at block level and 19 per cent at district level were inspected. But 2010-11, the total number of works taken up increased to 255970. Majority of these works i.e., 60 per cent were inspected at block level where as only 11 per cent of works were examined at district level. In 2008-09 a total number of 768 complaints were received at state level. Out of this ninety per cent were disposed. In the following year 2009-10, out of 631 total complaints 83 per cent were resolved. The number of complaints increased to 1452 by 2010-11 in proportion to increased number of works. But, percentage of resolved cases dropped to 37 per cent on the overall. Bolangir, Ganjam, Sonepur and Kendrapara have succeeded in disposing all pending complaints in that year.

Wages were paid to the labourers through bank and post office accounts to avoid corruption. Workers were asked to open accounts either with a bank or a post office in their village. No minimum balance was required and the credited amount was immediately allowed to be withdrawn. In 2008-09 a total amount of Rs. 22929 lakhs of rupees were paid as wages. Out of this 80 per cent is paid through Bank accounts and remaining 20 per cent was paid through post office accounts. A vast majority of these accounts were individual and yet, some joint accounts were also held. The phenomenon was dominant among post office accounts as 20 per cent of the accounts were jointly held. However, at the

state level 88 per cent were individual and 12 per cent were jointly held. In the following year 2009-10, post office accounts had increased and formed 46 per cent of total accounts. Again, the proportion of joint accounts were lesser at 9 per cent when compared with post office accounts, where it was 21 per cent. On an average only 15 per cent were joint accounts in the year. Overall 54 per cent of wages were paid through banks and the remaining amount through post offices. By 2010-11 the proportion of joint accounts decreased to 8 per cent at the state level. The post offices also geared up to the occasion and were taking considerable work load in disbursing the wages. About 43 per cent of the amount is paid through this channel.

In MGNREGS, if a worker demanded work and if it is not provided within 15 days he is eligible to receive un-employment allowance in 15 days. Though there were many such instances where employment could not be provided in stipulated time, no un-employment allowance was paid in any district. Navrangpur reported 5613 days where allowance should be paid. Jagatsinghpur reported very low incidence of 49 days in 2010-11. Overall, no un-employment allowance was paid.

For the reference year 2010-11, Ganjam district seems to be lagging behind with 16 per cent of the total works in the state falling under the category of spill over works from previous year. Gajapati district took the lead in new works with 56 per cent of total works. No other district reported even 5 per cent of new works in the reference year. Some of the works taken up in 2010-11 were likely to spill over in to the next financial year i.e., 2011-12. Under this category a higher number of 11 per cent was reported from Ganjam and Kendujhar districts. Though 56 per cent of works were reported to be taken up in Gajapati district, only 0.86 per cent was likely to spill over to next financial year.

In the total person days to be generated in 2011-12, Ganjam leads other districts by reporting 33 per cent of the share. It is followed by Mayurbhanj district with 11 per cent.

### **7.3 Household profile of the sample:**

As 97 per cent of the respondents in beneficiary category are heads of the household, it is 100 per cent in non-beneficiaries. Overall 98 per cent of the sample respondents were heads of the household.

In an indication that MGNRGS was really nearer to the target, the percentage of illiterates, which was an outcome of poverty and backwardness, was high in beneficiaries at 35 per cent. Non-participants of MGNRGS had only 19 per cent illiterates among the family. Overall figure was 32 per cent. Other backward castes dominate the overall sample at 45 per cent followed by 38 per cent scheduled castes and 13 per cent scheduled tribes. Only 3 per cent belonged to General Category. In non-beneficiaries



other backward castes overwhelmingly dominate at 70 per cent. Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes were lower in number in non-participants. But, in beneficiary group scheduled castes represent at 44 per cent followed by other backward castes at 39 per cent. Scheduled Tribes share was 14.5 per cent. These numbers reflect that MGNREGS had reached the targeted groups as desired.

Among the beneficiaries, 11.5 per cent were also beneficiaries under Indira Awas Yojana. Non-participants of MGNREGS do not have any benefits under the IAY. Seventy two per cent of participant sample fall under Below Poverty Line category, where as the non-participants were only 24 per cent. As a consequence more non-participants (46 per cent) fall under above poverty line group. In the participants the corresponding figure was 9 per cent. Overall 62 per cent were under BPL group and 16 per cent were APL group. As elsewhere, 87 per cent of decision makers in beneficiary and 94 per cent non-beneficiary sample were males. Overall it was 88 per cent. Workers dependent on farming were more in non-beneficiary group at 44 per cent followed by 10 per cent of workers engaged in self-business. In the beneficiary sample, though the main occupation was farming with 36 per cent engaged in it, 19 per cent were also deriving their income from daily wages. Overall, 37 per cent depend on farming and 16 per cent on daily wages. Migration for work was more at 8 per cent in non-beneficiaries while only 3 per cent of beneficiaries report the same. Overall it was 4 per cent.

In contrast to non-participants of MGNREGS, where they also cultivate some land, workers in MGNREGS were mostly landless poor. Hence, 45 per cent of them had Agricultural Casual Labour as main occupation. 27 per cent were engaged in non-agricultural casual labour. A small percentage of 5 were employed on their own farms. Only 4 per cent of beneficiaries were self-employed in non-farming activities. About 19 per cent of the beneficiaries had reported MGNREGS as their main occupation.

When the total sample was analyzed agriculture casual labour remains as the main stay of sustenance for 37 per cent. Non-agricultural labour followed at 25 per cent. While 13 per cent reported self-employment in agriculture an equal number were participating in MGNREGS works for livelihood. A minute percent of 1.4 reported working as migrants.

In the net income of beneficiary households, income from MGNREGS constitutes only 13 per cent. The other major sources of income were wages from agriculture (36 per cent) and wages from non-agriculture (37 per cent). Only 6 per cent of the income comes from agriculture/livestock. They also derived 4 per cent of their income from self-employment in non-farming activities.

Most of the non-participants, in the MGNREGS sample hold some agricultural lands. So they received 60 per cent of their income from agriculture/livestock. About 17 per cent of income comes from

wages on non-agriculture. Relatively a smaller number of 8 per cent was receiving their income from agricultural wages. Almost the same proportion of income was accruing from wages as migrant labour. About 6 per cent of the income comes from self-employed non-farming activities.

Main sources of income on the aggregate were agriculture/livestock (28 per cent) followed by wages from non-agriculture (29 per cent) and wages from agriculture (27 per cent). About 8 per cent of the income was received from MGNREGS works. A minute, 3 per cent of income comes from work as migrant labour. Another 4 per cent comes from self-employment on non-farming activities. Workers participating in MGNREGS reported an average income of Rs. 36,433 per household. The non-participants reported roughly 3 times more, i.e., Rs. 102194. The aggregate per household income for the entire sample is Rs. 49,586.

The monthly consumption expenditure of non-participants of MGNREGS is twice as high when compared to the beneficiary group, where it was Rs. 553. The expenditure of non-beneficiaries was consistently higher, though small, on almost all food items except on Rice. This figure was much more significant when non-food expenditure was compared. It was almost more than double the beneficiary figure of 350 Rs.

In both the groups, i.e., the beneficiary and non-beneficiary, except for rice all other food expenditure was lower than the NSS 2004-05 data. Non-food expenditure had sharply risen in the sample when compared to NSS 2004-05 data. It is double in the beneficiary group and more than 4 times in non-beneficiary group. This increase was mostly noticed in education and clothing. Especially expenditure on education was four times higher in non-beneficiary group than in the beneficiary group.

#### **7.4. Work Profile under MGNREGS, Wage Structure and Migration issues:**

SC participation is highest (1.29) followed by OBCs (0.87) and STs (0.36) when per household family member participation in the scheme is considered. SC households reported 25.73 days, OBCs 23.24 and STs 8.72 days of employment in a year. But, these figures are nowhere near promised 100 days of work in a year. When project-wise employment is analyzed the highest number of 33 per cent is employed in rural road connectivity works followed by 30 per cent in provision of irrigation facility for SC farmers, 18 per cent in Water Conservation and Water Harvesting, 12 per cent in renovation of traditional water bodies and 8 per cent in flood control and protection.

Overall, half of the sample households felt the quality of the assets 'good' while a little more than a quarter (27 per cent) said 'very good'. Only 22 per cent were disappointed and said that the quality

was 'bad'. It may be noted that no un-employment allowance was paid under MGNREGS in the sample districts.

When wage rates of MGNREGS are analyzed workers in Khorda obtained high wage rates when compared to other districts. Workers in Scheduled Caste Community received a high wage rate of 104.35 Rs. followed by general category with 100.41 Rs. In Mayurbhanj workers in general category earned a high wage of Rs.100.69 when compared with other. Boudh reported a uniform wage rate of 90 Rs. across all communities. In fact this was the minimum wage rate for unskilled labour declared by the Government of Odisha for the year 2009. The picture of Bargarh with reference to wage rates is more or less same as of Boudh; Ganjam surprisingly reported lower wages across all communities with an aggregate of Rs 65.98 when compared with other districts. When the aggregate wage rate of selected districts is analyzed the figure comes to Rs 87.92 much lower than Rs 90., the minimum wage rate of Odisha. Respondents in the sample reported finding work nearer to the village under the scheme. They had to travel only one or two kilometers for work.

MGNREGS aims at providing employment near the residing villages so that workers need not migrate to distant places for work. Very few people had reported out- migration after registering for work MGNREGS. Even these people returned back to their villages once the works got underway. Among the migrants. 63 per cent could find work in the nearby town while 37 per cent had to go to little farther town in the same district.

#### **7.5.1.: Household Assets Holdings:**

Per household land is 12 times less to participants compared to non-beneficiary. Housing property is more than two times less to participants compared to non-beneficiary. In case of live stock, we cannot find much variation but it is three times less for beneficiary than that of non-beneficiary. The possession of agricultural implements is at very low ebb to the participants and it shows that they are not in the line of having agricultural apparatus which is useful for cultivation. Thus, the participants are very vulnerable from every aspect of asset estimation comparatively with non-beneficiary. In average per household total "Asset Holding" is six times low. It obviously exhibits how much the participants are poor when compared to non-participants of MGNREGS.

#### **7.5.2 Household Status on Borrowings and their Financial Vulnerability:**

It is very interesting fact that the beneficiaries of MGNREGS received institutional loan (Rs.1245/-) at 15 times low compared to their counterpart. They are in the shackles of traders-cum-money lenders and further they are compelled to be under landlord employment, as their exigencies might have led to

that extent of settlement of finances. The beneficiaries do not have good sources of loan either from friends or 'others'. The non-participants of MGNREGA are not in the clutches of traders-cum-money lenders and landlord employment. There is distinct deviation in the sources of loan between these two groups. The rate of interest is 24 per cent and the above for both groups as such the exorbitant interest rates are predominant.

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

The household strength on borrowing and other household assets is given in the table 5.2B. There is no wage work to those whom the workers are indebted. The participants of scheme have low (66%) availability of co-operative credit compared to non-beneficiaries and they had very limited family membership in co-operative societies, while the availability of informal credit from other society/SHG in village is very high to the participants of scheme. All family members of both groups (100%) are members of such societies.

#### **7.5.3: Qualitative Functioning of MGNREGA from Sample Villages:**

There is no corruption (100%) for issuing job card to participant but some irregularities akin to job card maintenance are there. The entries (20%) even after working in the scheme did not take place. The fake information or incomplete information or missing information took place for all participants (100%). Overwritten entries and signature column are blank to all participants (100%), despite of these lapses, there one facility left with participants is the job card with the participants (100%). The payment was done in bank to participants (100%) and the bank account was in their names only. Gram Panchayat sanctioned the amount with proper details and the drinking water facility, period of rest, child care facility and first aid kit were available at work site. The monitoring is good by administration and no other complaint is lodged relating to work site to Gram Panchayat. All participants (100%) expressed that the work done was very useful to the villages. The respondents (100%) are fully aware of the scheme.

#### **7.5.4 Some Qualitative Aspects of Food security:**

The participants of the scheme reported that there was neither type of payment to get job card. There is no bribe for the procuring of job card by participants. The participants divulged that the migration of family members to town was there due to high wage in nearest towns. The migration is a selective one by the agricultural labour based on their physical fitness. They referred works like construction, moving cart loads, etc., were fit for the middle aged people. They express that the aged and women prefer MGNREGS, while others made commutation. There was no much back to village to work in MGNREGS, as these labour were work specific in the towns.

### **7.5.5 Potential Benefits of MGNERGA to Sample Villages:**

The protection from poverty and reduction of distress migration was reported at 90% and 92% respectively. There is economic independence to women who are participants of MGNREGS and the reduction to indebtedness took place. Thus there is potential accrual of benefits to the beneficiaries.

### **7.5.6 MGNREGS and Food Security of Sample Villages:**

The families of participants did not face insufficient food security or any other deprivations. They face protection in meeting expenditure for (44%) education and medical (56%). They encounter insufficient wage (56%) in other activities and the lack of work in time (44%). To achieve and develop the scheme implementation, as suggested by participants, there is need of increase of number of days of scheme (56%) and arranging availability of works nearer to village (44%). All the participants (100%) unanimously expressed that there should be compulsory work allocation particularly to landless agricultural labour.

### **7.6.1 Infrastructure Available in the Sample Villages:**

It is reported that no village has rail connectivity in this study but 90% of sample villages have nearest village connectivity and the average distance of 10 villages is 21.50 kms.

In the selected sample villages in Odisha, 20% villages have agricultural produce market and the other villages are at 6.75kms distance to the market. If the infrastructure availability to the village economy is observed, the rail connectivity (21.50 kms), Hospital (9.78 kms) and Commercial Bank (7.20 km) are much distant in Odisha. No other items under 'any other' are identified in the study villages in Odisha.

### **7.6.2 Occupational Structure in Sample villages:**

The dependence on agriculture has been declined during 2001-09, as the cultivators and agricultural labour show declining trend by 26.46 to 24.89 and 63.93 to 63.42 respectively. The non-farm activities have increased in the study villages. A new shift in 'other services' has reported towards non-farm activities. Significantly 'other services' demonstrates higher growth during the study period in Odisha.

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

Both wage rates of male and female have increased, while the wage rates of female are still lower than that of wage rates of male. The gap of wage rates for non-agricultural wages between male and female increased during 2005-09. This means that the wage curve has become much positive to male workers in non-agricultural sector. In case of 'other skilled' workers, the wage rates increased

much to electricians rather than plumber and workers of pump set boring. This indicates the skill set of electrician has led to higher wages in rural Odisha, particularly in study area.

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

There has been acceleration of costs for all agricultural operations in the study area during study period at overall/state. The per acre cultivation costs are estimated as per the farmer response. Out of costs/charges of agricultural operations, harvesting of paddy and transplanting are the highest charges out of all and ploughing and weeding have also shown much charges compared to others.

#### **7.6.5. Qualitative changes in Sample villages during Last One year in Odisha:**

There was no shortage of agriculture/wage labour at any point in last year as the participants answered 'no' by 80 per cent. But it could be inferred that after implementation of MGNREGS, the cost of cultivation has been increased enormously. All the participants by 100 per cent accepted the fact that the wage rate offered in town is higher than the wage rate of MGNREGS. All the participants by 100 per cent reported that some labour came back to work in MGNREGS, but some others were still moving to towns due to wage difference. No stagnancy in wages of labour took place after MGNREGS. The 60 per cent of the participants reported that more children from their villages attended for schools. It has enhanced the regularity in schooling of children of participants. MGNREGS has changed the situation of attached labour in agriculture in Odisha as expressed by 50% participants. The awareness of villages has increased in leaps and bounds.

#### **7.6.6 Qualitative Functioning of MGNREGS:**

There was a shortage of 20 per cent of agricultural wage labour during July and August months of agricultural seasons. The scheme has very positive impact on the existing wages of casual labour during the last five years. The standard of living has increased in the study villages at 20 per cent and their consumption of pulses and oils increased by 22 per cent. The regular attendance of children of participants of MGNREGS took place and these are able to increase purchases of books at 15 per cent compared to the previous level. The Gram Sabha has generated the awareness of villagers by 36 per cent over the government schemes. Further, they suggested stopping the scheme during agricultural peak season, since the wages are sufficient and it is useful for agricultural production.

## **Policy Recommendations**

### **1) Need of Streamlining the Scheme Administration:**

As there is much reference of the participants, there is need for the fixing the responsibilities and liabilities to the staff who involve in the scheme regularly. There are certain requisites for the scheme: 1) maintaining proper record 2) proper response from concerned personnel 3) avoiding tampering existing record and other aspects in administration. Hence it is better to establish a proper responsible hierarchy in the scheme implementation at village and block levels.

### **2) Unemployment Allowance:**

There is no awareness of availability of unemployment allowance among participants and this allowance is not executed in the study villages. As there is limited days (below 100) of works by the scheme, there is dire entail for 'Unemployment Allowance' to the participants during slack season in Odisha. This will highly enable the 'more than middle aged' and the women to have employment in their vicinities and it generates much better financial conditions of the agricultural labour. Otherwise the works allotment should be sufficient to the participants during sagging days.

### **3) No Scheme Operation during Agricultural Season:**

Unanimously and absolutely the participants express that it is better to stop the scheme operation during agricultural season to avoid disturbance to agricultural activities and to make available labour to the cultivators. And there will not be any negative impact on the incomes and the demand for labour of the participants, since the similar or higher wages do exist in rural Odisha during the busy agricultural activity phase.

### **4) Mechanization of Agriculture and Rural Migration:**

The rural migration to urban area could not be withheld, since the higher wages and the good proximity of urban area are at the door of agricultural labour. It is the hour of mechanization of agriculture even at lower level landholding sizes, as the able bodied and best fit labour migrate to urban areas to earn higher wages. The farmers are unable to cope with this situation, as the threshing and harvesting operations of agriculture demand energetic labour. The peasants are given with less energetic labour and it costs them much time and higher wages to limited available labour in the vicinity. Further the gargantuan increase of non-farm activities like in 'Construction' and 'Other Services' has created scarcity for the required eligible/able bodied labour to the cultivator. Therefore it would be much better to operate a very good mechanization scheme which should differ from its present scheme by its

requirements of investment and its utility levels in agriculture across Odisha to cover successfully and properly marginal, small and medium farmers.

### **5) Implementation of 100 days Employment:**

Still it is not achieved the 100 days employment norm in Odisha in the study area in question. It would be much better to increase the number of days of scheme during slack agricultural season. It generates employment particularly to women and aged men in the villages where other avenues of employment to these particular groups becomes difficult. This will not upset the agricultural operations. Otherwise the required earth works in the fields like leveling of plot, lining of canals etc. of the farms of peasants may be permitted. This will be useful to both farmers and agricultural labour. In another way it accelerates the farm production and reduces the investment burden to the cultivator and at the same time the labour works could be generated to the labour of the village. Further it nullifies the payment of 'unemployment allowance'.

\*\*\*\*\*



# **IMPACT OF MGNREGA ON WAGE RATES, FOOD SECURITY AND RURAL URBAN MIGRATION IN ODISHA**

## **Introduction:**

Rural employment grew at the annual rate of 0.58 per cent between 1993-94 and 1999-2000. But, the rate of growth of the rural labour force was much higher. This has resulted in lot of stress on rural households. 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 consequence, the stress was laid on employment and poverty alleviation in the Sixth five Year Plan. This as a backdrop, National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (NREGA) came in to existence in September, 2005. It came into force on February 2, 2006 and was implemented in a phased manner. In phase I it was introduced in 200 of the most backward districts and was expanded in 2007-08 covering another 130 districts in phase II. By April 1<sup>st</sup> 2008 the remaining 274 rural districts were also brought into its fold. From October 2<sup>nd</sup> 2009 National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme (NREGS) has been renamed as Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme (MGNREGS).

MGNREGS seeks to provide at least 100 days of guaranteed wage employment in a financial year to every rural household whose adult members volunteer to do unskilled manual work. Further, it is different from other wage employment programmes as it bestows a legal right and guarantees to the rural population through an act of parliament and not just a scheme like other wage employment programmes. Viewed in a wider perspective, MGNREGA signals a possible reshaping of state priorities in India through a democratic determination to provide real livelihood opportunities for the rural poor. Thus, as a progressive legislation for hitherto excluded groups; women, scheduled castes, scheduled tribes, among others, MGNREGS can help to reclaim the lost faith in the possibility of pro-people governance.

## **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 by Central and State Governments are 75 per cent and 25 per cent respectively.

**The Problem:**

Keeping in view several success and failure cases of earlier employment programmes, the MGNREGS 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. As the scheme is in its initial stage, it is necessary 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 MGNREGS works and the impact on the rural incomes is to be brought to the sharp focus to formulate policies. 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 MGNREGS in their respective states. Therefore, the Agro-Economic Research Centre, Andhra University, Visakhapatnam has taken up the evaluation study in Odisha, with the following objectives.

**Objectives of the study:**

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

**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 Bargarh, Boudh, Ganjam, Khurda and Mayurbhanj are selected. 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 districts/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 MGNREGS 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 Odisha, 200 participants and 50 non-participants are surveyed to estimate the variations spacially and temporally. For selecting participant households, a list of all beneficiaries in the village are 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 for non-participants of MGNREGS is not available, the non-participating households are selected with analogous design of MGNREGS workers. To analyze the incomes and consumption aspects of the participants, Gini ratio's and to analyze the determinants of participation in MGNREGS, the Logit function are adopted to find the variations across selected groups of workers and villages.

### **Functioning of MGNREGS:**

Highest number (4.10 lakhs) of job cards were issued in Ganjam district in 2008-09 followed by Mayurbhanj (4.05), Balasore (2.72) Sundargarh (2.84), Kalahandi (2.64) and Koraput (2.62). Ganjam continued its lead in issuing job cards through 2009-10 and 2010-11 and reached 4.45 lakhs. Among the five selected districts Ganjam and Mayurbhanj led the other districts. Boudh figures last with 82281 job cards in 2010-11. In Mayurbhanj a high percentage of (54.34) job cards were issued to scheduled tribe households. In other selected districts other castes dominate among the job card holders. At the state level the total number of job cards issued has risen from 5267853 in 2008-09 to 6025230 by 2010-11.

### **Employment generated:**

The highest percentage of households who were provided employment for job card holders could be found Gajapati district (41.93) whereas the lowest percentage was recorded in Nayagarh (3.36) district in 2008-09. Among the selected districts Ganjam recorded the highest percentage of 39.62 and Khurda performed badly with 7.35 per cent of households who could get employment out of the job card holding households. In the later years, Kandhamal recorded highest percentage of employment among job card holders with 51 and 58 in 2009-10 and 2010-11 respectively. At the state level these figures have moved consistently upward from 23 to 33 in 2008-11.

Ganjam stood first among all districts in providing employment for 60 days per household and also recording the highest percentages of 14.36 households who could get more than 100 days of work in 2008-09. Mayurbhanj also performed well with 44 days of work per household and 6.23 per cent of households who could get more than 100 days of work. At the state level the average days of per household employment rose from 36 in 2008 to 49 in 2011.

Ganjam leads the state in Scheduled Caste population with 18 per cent and able to provide employment to around 25 per cent of total employed. This trend continued all through 2008-11. Sundargarh district with 50 per cent of population being tribals is doing well in taking care of the community by providing 75, 77 and 73 per cent of person days through 2008-11. Koraput and Mayurbhanj districts similarly have 50 per cent tribal population. They are also performing well in

tribal welfare by providing 50 to 65 per cent of person days to tribals in the reference period. There was also stress on provision of employment to women in MGNREGS. Ganjam led the other districts by providing proportionate share of 48, 49 and 50 per cent of person days to women through 2008-11. Overall at the state level Scheduled Caste got 19 per cent, Scheduled Tribes got 35 per cent and women formed 37 per cent share in total person days created during 2008-11. Among the employed households only 4 per cent could get 100 days of employment in 2008-09. But, in later years it has shown an increase as about 6 per cent in 2009-10 and 10 per cent in 2010-11 are benefited with 100 days of employment at state level.

### **Number of Projects completed and Total amount spent:**

Odisha has spent Rs. 1,17,456.3 lakhs on different projects till 2010-11 under MGNREGS. Out of this a lion's share of 51 per cent has gone for Rural Road Connectivity followed by other projects like Renovation of Traditional Water Bodies with 19 per cent and Water Conservation Projects with 12 per cent. At the state level only 30 per cent of projects could be completed by 2010-11 in Rural Road Connectivity Works. One of the components of MGNREGS works is Flood Controls and Protection. At the state level works completed were only 4 per cent in 2008-09 but subsequently it picked up in the next year and 22 per cent were completed. However, it could not maintain the tempo in 2010-11 and ended with only 14 per cent. Considerable focus was also laid on Water Conservation and Water Harvesting projects. In fact, this category of works occupied third rank in funds allocation. The overall picture looks very disappointing as most districts have shown a very bad performance. The position of Bargarh and Mayurbhanj is unenviable as each one has 97 to 100 per cent of works still unfinished. The position of other districts like Dhenkanal, Bolangir, Kandhamal, Rayagada and Baleswar is no better as around 95 per cent of works are still in progress. At the state level only 21 per cent of the projects got completed by 2010-11. Drought Proofing works do not need much technology and quite suitable for MGNREGS works. But, evidently no enthusiasm is shown in completing these works as no single work was completed in 8 of the 30 districts. In another 5 districts more than 95 per cent works are still being finished. At the state level 20 per cent of initiated works got completed by 2010-11. Micro-irrigation works got bogged down as one third of the districts reported no single project as completed. The state average of works completed in this category is only 16 per cent in 2010-11. Even this is four fold increase from 4 per cent in 2008-09. To help poor Scheduled Caste farmers reap better yields MGNREGS incorporated some irrigation schemes to benefit their lands. Puri was a bit late entrant as it initiated these schemes only in 2010-11. By this time Malkanagiri district could complete 80 per cent of these irrigation schemes. The state's average of completed works is only 4.32 per cent. In Renovation of Water Bodies like tanks, Gajapati with 68 per cent and Jajpur with 62 per cent of completed works performed well while Kendrapara with 2 per cent and Mayurbhanj with 4 per cent struggled to keep pace. Overall it is only 31 per cent at state/aggregate level. Yet, the pace has doubled from previous year of 2009-10. On the aggregate only 7 per cent works were completed in 2008-09.

But this climbed to 27 per cent by 2010-11. However, overall completion reflects a tardy progress of works under MGNREGS.

### **Expenditure on different projects:**

In the total funds allocated under Road connectivity projects in 2008-11, 17 to 25 per cent is spent on finishing the pending projects and the remaining balance is spent on the on-going in the year at the state level. Smaller proportion of funds under Flood control and protection scheme, 9 per cent in 2008-09 to 15 per cent in 2009-10 were spent for completion of projects while major amounts 85 to 91 per cent are deployed in running projects in 2008-11. In one third of the districts no amounts were spent to complete the projects and the projects were still on-going. Under water conservation and water harvesting scheme 9 to 18 per cent of funds were spent to complete the projects while 82 to 91 per cent got allocated and spent for on-going projects in 2008-11 at state level. In 9 districts in 2008-09 nothing was spent to complete the projects and total funds were spent on on-going projects. Funds for Drought proofing scheme were doubled from 2009-10 and stands at Rs. 3,762 lakhs. As state level only 4 per cent was spent in 2008-09 for completion of projects. It improved to 24 in 2009-10 but fell again to 15 per cent in the next year 2010-11. Funds for Micro-irrigation scheme increased from 1450 lakhs in 2008-09 to 2,464 lakhs by 2010-11. In 11 districts no projects was completed in 2008-11 and hence no money was spent to complete projects. A fair amount of 23 per cent was spent on completed projects while large amounts were spent in on-going projects in 2008-09 and 2010-11. A large amount of Rs. 7,282 lakhs were spent under Irrigation for SC and ST farmers and other Weaker Sections' programme in 2010-11 in the state. This was almost 5 fold increase from 2008-09. The programme has shown steady progress in 2008-11 as amount spent on completed projects increased from 9 per cent to 32 per cent. Amount spent under Renovation of Traditional Water Bodies in 2010-11 was 22014 lakhs. This is 50 per cent increase from previous year at the state level. Only 20 per cent of the fund was spent to complete the pending projects while the balance amount was spent on on-going projects in 2010-11. The exception being Gajapati district where 75 per cent of the fund was spent on completed projects. Only 21 per cent of the amount for Land development was spent for completion where as 79 per cent of money was gone for on-going works at the state level. But, number of districts who have spent 100 per cent of fund on on-going works decreased from 17 in 2008-09 to 9 in 2010-11. Only Malkanagiri could spend 81 per cent of allocated money to complete the programmes.

### **Performance of MGNREGS:**

Muster roll verification is periodically taken up to bring transparency and to see that the needy are really given employment when needed. In 2008-09 only 5 districts could carry out 100 per cent verification. In the following year, 2009-10 eight districts could verify all the muster rolls. In 2010-11, 12 out of 30 districts successfully completed verification of all the muster rolls. At the state level the tally increased from 72 per cent in 2008-09 to 84 by 2010-11.

In 2008-09 only 3900 Gram Panchayats (GP) out of 6474 reported social auditing in their villages, only 11 districts could complete social audit in all the villages. But, as many as 10 districts could conduct the process in less than 2 per cent of the villages. In the following year 2009-10, 16 districts carried out social auditing in all the villages. But the dismal performance is confined to only 3 districts i.e., Naupada, Sambalpur and Kendujhar. In the latest year, 2010-11, many districts realized the necessity and 27 districts fully complied with social auditing. Even the remaining three districts have reported more than 97 per cent compliance. At the state level 97 per cent of all GPs conducted social audit by 2010-11.

In 2008-09 a total number of 84374 works were taken up at the state level. Out of these 60 per cent were inspected at block and 19 per cent were inspected at district level. In 2009-10, 72 per cent at block level and 19 per cent at district level were inspected. But 2010-11, the total number of works taken up increased to 255970. Majority of these works i.e., 60 per cent were inspected at block level where as only 11 per cent of works were examined at district level. In 2008-09 a total number of 768 complaints were received at state level. Out of this ninety per cent were disposed. In the following year 2009-10, out of 631 total complaints 83 per cent were resolved. The number of complaints increased to 1452 by 2010-11 in proportion to increased number of works. But, percentage of resolved cases dropped to 37 per cent on the overall. Bolangir, Ganjam, Sonapur and Kendrapara districts have succeeded in disposing all pending complaints in that year.

Wages are paid to the labourers through bank and post office accounts to avoid corruption. Workers are asked to open accounts either with a bank or a post office in their village. No minimum balance is required and the credited amount is immediately allowed to be withdrawn. In 2008-09 a total amount of Rs. 22929 lakhs of rupees were paid as wages. Out of this 80 per cent is paid through Bank accounts and remaining 20 per cent was paid through post office accounts. A vast majority of these accounts are individual and yet, some joint accounts are also held. The phenomenon is dominant among post office accounts as 20 per cent of the accounts are jointly held. However, at the state level 88 per cent are individual and 12 per cent are jointly held. In the following year 2009-10, post office accounts have increased and formed 46 per cent of total accounts. Again, the proportion of joint accounts are lesser at 9 per cent when compared with post office accounts, where it is 21 per cent. On an average only 15 per cent are joint accounts in the year. Overall 54 per cent of wages are paid through banks and the remaining amount through post offices. By 2010-11 the proportion of joint accounts decreased to 8 per cent at the state level. The post offices also geared up to the occasion and are taking considerable work load in disbursing the wages. About 43 per cent of the amount is paid through this channel.

In MGNREGS, if a worker demanded work and if it is not provided within 15 days he is eligible to receive un-employment allowance in 15 days. Though there were many such instances where employment could not be provided in stipulated time, no un-employment allowance was paid in any

district. Navrangpur reported 5613 days where allowance should be paid. Jagatsinghpur reported very low incidence of 49 days in 2010-11. Overall, no un-employment allowance is paid.

For the reference year 2010-11, Ganjam district seems to be lagging behind with 16 per cent of the total works in the state falling under the category of spill over works from previous year. Gajapati district took the lead in new works with 56 per cent of total works. No other district reported even 5 per cent of new works in the reference year. Some of the works taken up in 2010-11 are likely to spill over in to the next financial year i.e., 2011-12. Under this category a higher number of 11 per cent is reported from Ganjam and Kendujhar districts. Though 56 per cent of works are reported to be taken up in Gajapati district, only 0.86 per cent are likely to spill over to next financial year.

In the total person days to be generated in 2011-12, Ganjam leads other districts by reporting 33 per cent of the share. It is followed by Mayurbhanj district with 11 per cent.

### **Household profile of the sample:**

As 97 per cent of the respondents in beneficiary category are heads of the household, it is 100 per cent in non-beneficiaries. Overall 98 per cent of the sample respondents are heads of the household.

In an indication that MGNRGS is really nearer to the target, the percentage of illiterates, which is an outcome of poverty and backwardness, is high in beneficiaries at 35 per cent. Non-participants of MGNRGS have only 19 per cent illiterates among the family. Overall figure is 32 per cent. Other backward castes dominate the overall sample at 45 per cent followed by 38 per cent scheduled castes and 13 per cent scheduled tribes. Only 3 per cent belong to General Category. In non-beneficiaries other backward castes overwhelmingly dominate at 70 per cent. Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes are lower in number in non-participants. But, in beneficiary group scheduled castes represent at 44 per cent followed by other backward castes at 39 per cent. Scheduled Tribes share is 14.5 per cent. These numbers reflect that MGNRGS has reached the targeted groups as desired.

Among the beneficiaries, 11.5 per cent are also beneficiaries under Indira Awas Yojana. Non-participants of MGNRGS do not have any benefits under the IAY. Seventy two per cent of participant sample fall under Below Poverty Line category, where as the non-participants are only 24 per cent. As a consequence more non-participants (46 per cent) fall under above poverty line group. In the participants the corresponding figure is 9 per cent. Overall 62 per cent are under BPL group and 16 per cent are APL group. As elsewhere, 87 per cent of decision makers in beneficiary and 94 per cent non-beneficiary sample are males. Overall it is 88 per cent. Workers dependent on farming are more in non-beneficiary group at 44 per cent followed by 10 per cent of workers engaged in self-business.

In the beneficiary sample, though the main occupation is farming with 36 per cent engaged in it, 19 per cent are also deriving their income from daily wages. On the overall, 37 per cent depend on farming and 16 per cent on daily wages. Migration for work is more at 8 per cent in non-beneficiaries and only 3 per cent of beneficiaries report the same. Overall it is 4 per cent.

In contrast to non-participants of MGNREGS, where they also cultivate some land, workers in MGNREGS are mostly landless poor. Hence, 45 per cent of them have Agricultural Casual Labour as main occupation. 27 per cent are engaged in non-agricultural casual labour. A small percentage of 5 are employed on their own farms. Only 4 per cent of beneficiaries are self-employed in non-farming activities. About 19 per cent of the beneficiaries have reported MGNREGS as their main occupation.

When the total sample is analyzed agriculture casual labour remains as the main stay of sustenance for 37 per cent of people. Non-agricultural labour follows at 25 per cent. When 13 per cent reported self-employment in agriculture an equal number are participating in MGNREGS works for livelihood. A minute percent of 1.4 reported working as migrants.

In the net income of beneficiary households, income from MGNREGS constitutes only 13 per cent. The other major sources of income are wages from agriculture (36 per cent) and wages from non-agriculture (37 per cent). Only 6 per cent of the income comes from agriculture/livestock. They also derive 4 per cent of their income from self-employment in non-farming activities.

Most of the non-participants, in the MGNREGS sample hold some agricultural lands. So they receive 60 per cent of their income from agriculture/livestock. About 17 per cent of income comes from wages on non-agriculture. Relatively a smaller number of 8 per cent is receiving their income from agricultural wages. Almost the same proportion of income is accruing from wages as migrant labour. About 6 per cent of the income comes from self-employed non-farming activities.

Main sources of income on the aggregate are agriculture/livestock (28 per cent) followed by wages from non-agriculture (29 per cent) and wages from agriculture (27 per cent). About 8 per cent of the income is received from MGNREGS works. A minute, 3 per cent of income comes from work as migrant labour. Another 4 per cent comes from self-employment on non-farming activities. Workers participating in MGNREGS reported an average income of Rs. 36,433 per household. The non-participants reported roughly 3 times more, i.e., Rs. 102194. The aggregate per household income for the entire sample is Rs. 49,586.

The monthly consumption expenditure of non-participants of MGNREGS is twice as high when compared to the beneficiary group, where it is Rs. 553. The expenditure of non-beneficiaries is consistently higher, though small, as almost all food items except on Rice. This figure is much more



significant when non-food expenditure is compared. It is almost more than double the beneficiary figure of 350 Rs.

In both the groups, i.e., the beneficiary and non-beneficiary, except for rice all other food expenditure is lower than the NSS 2004-05 data. Non-food expenditure has sharply risen in the sample when compared to NSS 2004-05 data. It is double in the beneficiary group and more than 4 times in non-beneficiary group. The details are presented in Table 3.5. This increase is mostly noticed in education and clothing. Especially expenditure on education is four times higher in non-beneficiary group than in the beneficiary group.

### **Work Profile under MGNREGS, Wage Structure and Migration issues:**

SC participation is highest (1.29) followed by OBCs (0.87) and STs (0.36) when per household family member participation in the scheme is considered. SC households reported 25.73 days, OBCs 23.24 and STs 8.72 days of employment in a year. But, these figures are nowhere near promised 100 days of work in a year. When project-wise employment is analyzed the highest number of 33 per cent is employed in rural road connectivity works followed by 30 per cent in provision of irrigation facility for SC farmers, 18 per cent in Water Conservation and Water Harvesting, 12 per cent in renovation of traditional water bodies and 8 per cent in flood control and protection.

Overall, half of the sample households felt the quality of the assets 'good' while a little more than a quarter (27 per cent) said 'very good'. Only 22 per cent were disappointed and said that the quality was 'bad'. It may be noted that no un-employment allowance was paid under MGNREGS in the sample districts.

When wage rates of MGNREGS are analyzed workers in Khorda obtained high wage rates when compared to other districts. Workers in Scheduled Caste Community received a high wage rate of 104.35 Rs. followed by general category with 100.41 Rs. In Mayurbhanj workers in general category earned a high wage of Rs.100.69 when compared with other. Boudh reported a uniform wage rate of 90 Rs. across all communities. In fact this is the minimum wage rate for unskilled labour declared by the Government of Odisha for the year 2009. The picture of Bargarh with reference to wage rates is more or less same as of Boudh; Ganjam surprisingly reported lower wages across all communities with an aggregate of Rs 65.98 when compared with other districts. When the aggregate wage rate of selected districts is analyzed the figure comes to Rs 87.92 much lower than Rs 90., the minimum wage rate of Odisha. Respondents in the sample reported finding work nearer to the village under the scheme. They had to travel only one or two kilometers for work.

MGNREGS aims at providing employment near the residing villages so that workers need not migrate to distant places for work. Very few people have reported out migration after registering for

work MGNREGS. Even these people returned back to their villages once the works got underway. Among those migrants, 63 per cent could find work in the nearby town while 37 per cent had to go to little farther town in the same district.

### **Qualitative aspects:**

#### **Household Assets Holdings:**

The per household land is 12 times less to participations compared to non-beneficiary. Housing property is more than two times less to participant compared to non-beneficiary. In case of live stock, we cannot find much variation but it is three times less for beneficiary than that of non-beneficiary. The possession of agricultural implements is at very low ebb to the participants and it shows that they are not in the line of having agricultural apparatus which is useful for cultivation. Thus, the participants are very vulnerable from every aspect of asset estimation comparatively with non-beneficiary. In average per household total "Asset Holding" is six times low. It obviously exhibits how much the participants are poor when compared to non-participants of MGNREGS.

#### **Household Status on Borrowings and their Financial Vulnerability:**

It is very interesting fact that the beneficiaries of MGNREGS received institutional loan (Rs.1245/-) at 15 times low compared to their counterpart. They are in the shackles of traders-cum-money lenders and further they are compelled to be under landlord employment, as their exigencies might have led to that extent of settlement of finances. The beneficiaries do not have good sources of loan either from friends or 'others'. The non-participants of MGNREGS are not in the clutches of traders-cum-money lenders and landlord employment. There is distinct deviation in the sources of loan between these two groups. The rate of interest is 24 per cent and the above for both groups as such the exorbitant interest rates are predominant.

#### **Household Strength on Borrowing and other Household Assets of Sample Villages:**

The household strength on borrowing and other household assets is given in the table 5.2B. There is no wage work to those whom the workers are indebted. The participants of scheme have low (66%) availability of co-operative credit compared to non-beneficiaries and they had very limited family membership in co-operative societies, while the availability of informal credit from other society/SHG in village is very high to the participants of scheme. All family members of both groups (100 %) are members of such societies.

#### **Qualitative Functioning of MGNREGS from Sample Villages:**

There is no corruption (100 %) for issuing job card to participant but some irregularities akin to job card maintenance are there. The entries (20%) even after working in the scheme did not take place. The fake information or incomplete information or missing information took place for all participants (100 %). Overwritten entries and signature column are blank to all participants (100%),

despite of these lapses, there one facility left with participants is the job card with the participants (100 %). The payment was done in bank to participants (100%) and the bank account was in their names only. Gram Panchayat sanctioned the amount with proper details and the drinking water facility, period of rest, child care facility and first aid kit were available at work site. The monitoring is good by administration and no other complaint is lodged relating to work site to Gram Panchayat. All participants (100%) expressed that the work done was very useful to the villages. The respondents (100%) are fully aware of the scheme.

#### **Some Qualitative Aspects of Food security:**

The participants of the scheme reported that there was neither type of payment to get job card. There is no bribe for the procuring of job card by participants. . The participants divulged that the migration of family members to town was there due to high wage in nearest towns. The migration is a selective one by the agricultural labour based on their physical fitness. They referred works like construction, moving cart loads, etc., Which were fit for the middle aged people. They express that the aged and women prefer MGNREGS, while others made commutation. There was no much back to village to work in MGNREGS, as these labour were work specific in the towns.

#### **Potential Benefits of MGNERGA to Sample Villages:**

The protection from poverty and reduction of distress migration was reported at 90% and 92% respectively. There is economic independence to women who are participants of MGNREGS and the reduction to indebtedness took place. Thus there is potential accrual of benefits to the beneficiaries.

#### **MGNREGS and Food Security of Sample Villages:**

The families of participants did not face insufficient food security or any other deprivations. They face protection in meeting expenditure for (44%) education and medical (56%). They encounter in-sufficient wage (56%) in other activities and the lack of work in time (44%). To achieve and develop the scheme implementation, as suggested by participants, there is need of increase of number of days of scheme (56%) and arranging availability of works nearer to village (44%). All the participants (100%) unanimously expressed that there should be compulsory work allocation particularly to landless agricultural labour.

#### **Infrastructure Available in the Sample Villages:**

It is reported that no village has rail connectivity in this study but 90% of sample villages have nearest village connectivity and the average distance of 10 villages is 21.50 kms.

In the selected sample villages in Odisha, 20% villages have agricultural produce market and the other villages are at 6.75kms distance to the market. If the infrastructure availability to the village

economy is observed, the rail connectivity (21.50 kms), Hospital (9.78 kms) and Commercial Bank (7.20 km) are much distant in Odisha. No other items under 'any other' are identified in the study villages in Odisha.

### **Occupational Structure in Sample villages:**

The dependence on agriculture has been declined during 2001-09, as the cultivators and agricultural labour show declining trend by 26.46 to 24.89 and 63.93 to 63.42 respectively. The non-farm activities have increased in the study villages. A new shift in 'other services' has reported towards non-farm activities. Significantly 'other services' demonstrates higher growth during the study period in Odisha.

### **Wage Rates of Labour in all Sample Villages: (State level/Overall):**

Both wage rates of male and female have increased, while the wage rates of female are still lower than that of wage rates of male. The gap of wage rates for non-agricultural wages between male and female increased during 2005-09. This means that the wage curve has become much positive to male workers in non-agricultural sector. In case of 'other skilled' workers, the wage rates increased much to electricians rather than plumber and workers of pump set boring. This indicates the skill set of electrician has led to higher wages in rural Odisha, particularly in study area.

### **Average Prevailing Labour charges for Agricultural Operations in Sample Villages by Overall/State:**

There has been acceleration of costs for all agricultural operations in the study area during study period at overall/state. The per acre cultivation costs are estimated as per the farmer response. Out of costs/charges of agricultural operations, harvesting of paddy and transplanting are the highest charges out of all and ploughing and weeding have also shown much charges compared to others.

### **Qualitative changes in Sample villages during Last One year in Odisha:**

There was no shortage of agriculture/wage labour at any point in last year as the participants answered 'no' by 80 per cent. But it could be inferred that after implementation of MGNREGS, the cost of cultivation has been increased enormously. All the participants by 100 per cent accepted the fact that the wage rate offered in town is higher than the wage rate of MGNREGS. All the participants by 100 per cent reported that some labour came back to work in MGNREGS, but some others were still moving to towns due to wage difference. No stagnancy in wages of labour took place after MGNREGS. The 60 per cent of the participants reported that more children from their villages attended for schools. It has enhanced the regularity in schooling of children of participants. MGNREGS has changed the situation of attached labour in agriculture in Odisha as expressed by 50% participants. The awareness of villages has increased in leaps and bounds.

### **Qualitative Functioning of MGNREGS:**

There was a shortage of 20 per cent of agricultural wage labour during July and August months of agricultural seasons. The scheme has very positive impact on the existing wages of casual labour during the last five years. The standard of living has increased in the study villages at 20 per cent and their consumption of pulses and oils increased by 22 per cent. The regular attendance of children of participants of MGNREGS took place and these are able to increase purchases of books at 15 per cent compared to the previous level. The Gram Sabha has generated the awareness of villagers by 36 per cent over the government schemes. Further, they suggested stopping the scheme during agricultural peak season, since the wages are sufficient and it is useful for agricultural production.

### **Policy Recommendations**

#### **1) Need of Streamlining the Scheme Administration:**

As there is much reference of the participants, there is need for the fixing the responsibilities and liabilities to the staff who involve in the scheme regularly. There are certain requisites for the scheme: 1) maintaining proper record 2) proper response from concerned personnel 3) avoiding tampering existing record and other aspects in administration. Hence it is better to establish a proper responsible hierarchy in the scheme implementation at village and block levels.

#### **2) Unemployment Allowance:**

There is no awareness of availability of unemployment allowance among participants and this allowance is not executed in the study villages. As there is limited days ( below 100) of works by the scheme, there is dire entail for 'Unemployment Allowance' to the participants during slack season in Odisha. This will highly enable the 'more than middle aged' and the women to have employment in their vicinities and it generates much better financial conditions of the agricultural labour. Otherwise the works allotment should be sufficient to the participants during sagging days.

#### **3) No Scheme Operation during Agricultural Season:**

Unanimously and absolutely the participants express that it is better to stop the scheme operation during agricultural season to avoid disturbance to agricultural activities and to make available labour to the cultivators. And there will not be any negative impact on the incomes and the demand for labour of the participants, since the similar or higher wages do exist in rural Odisha during the busy agricultural activity phase.

#### **4) Mechanization of Agriculture and Rural Migration:**

The rural migration to urban area could not be withheld, since the higher wages and the good proximity of urban area are at the door of agricultural labour. It is the hour of mechanization of

agriculture even at lower level landholding sizes, as the able bodied and best fit labour migrate to urban areas to earn higher wages. The farmers are unable to cope with this situation, as the threshing and harvesting operations of agriculture demand energetic labour. The peasants are given with less energetic labour and it costs them much time and higher wages to limited available labour in the vicinity. Further the gargantuan increase of non-farm activities like in 'Construction' and 'Other Services' has created scarcity for the required eligible/able bodied labour to the cultivator. Therefore it would be much better to operate a very good mechanization scheme which should differ from its present scheme by its requirements of investment and its utility levels in agriculture across Odisha to cover successfully and properly marginal, small and medium farmers.

### **5) Implementation of 100 days Employment:**

Still it is not achieved the 100 days employment norm in Odisha in the study area in question. It would be much better to increase the number of days of scheme during slack agricultural season. It generates employment particularly to women and aged men in the villages where other avenues of employment to these particular groups becomes difficult. This will not upset the agricultural operations. Otherwise the required earth works in the fields like leveling of plot, lining of canals etc. of the farms of peasants may be permitted. This will be useful to both farmers and agricultural labour. In another way it accelerates the farm production and reduces the investment burden to the cultivator and at the same time the labour works could be generated to the labour of the village. Further it nullifies the payment of 'unemployment allowance'.

\*\*\*\*\*

