



Indo-Global  
Social Service Society

# Life and Livelihood Security

A Study on the effectiveness of Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act, 2005 (MGNREGA) in ensuring livelihood security and checking distress migration among the vulnerable section of the population in People's Empowerment for Accessing Rights to Livelihood (PEARL) Programme Areas.



*'I will give you a talisman. Whenever you are in doubt, or when the self becomes too much with you, apply the following test. Recall the face of the poorest and the weakest man whom you may have seen, and ask yourself, if the step you contemplate is going to be of any use to him. Will he gain anything by it? Will it restore him to a control over his own life and destiny? In other words, will it lead to Swaraj (i.e. self-rule/freedom) for the hungry and spiritually starving millions?'*

[ **MK Gandhi** ]

# Contents

6	<b>Preface</b>
7	<b>Acknowledgements</b>
11	<b>CHAPTER ONE</b>
	<b>Introduction</b>
	The Genesis and Background
	Salient Features of MGNREGA
	Glimpse of the Performance of MGNREGA at National Level
	Major Challenges Before Implementation of MGNREGA
	Vulnerability and Most Vulnerable (MV) Population of India
	Livelihood Security of MV Families/Population of India
	Role of PEARL Programme in Facilitating Implementation of MGNREGA for MV Families
	Relevance of the study
17	<b>CHAPTER TWO</b>
	<b>Study Objectives and Methodology</b>
	Research Objectives
	Research Questions
	Methodology
	Scope & Limitations
	Structure
21	<b>CHAPTER THREE</b>
	<b>Analysis and Findings</b>
	Effectiveness of MGNREGA Scheme
	Planning the Activities and Labour Management
	Process Adopted
	Implementation of the MGNREGA Scheme
	Facilities at Worksites
	Usefulness of the Assets Created
	Functioning of the Vigilance Committee
	Transparency and accountability
	Effects on Migration
	Gender Responsiveness
	Role of NGOs/CBOs
	Overall Observations
	Concluding Remarks
31	<b>CHAPTER FOUR</b>
	<b>Recommendations</b>
32	<b>Annexures</b>
	Selected References
	Research Tools
	Persons Interacted/Interviewed

# Research Team

Concept and Guidance	Dr. Joseph Sebastian
Overall Supervision and Research Guidance	Mr. K.C Sahu
Principal Researcher	Dr. Madan Chand Sarkar
Associate Researchers	Mr. Rajiv Ranjan Sinha
	Mr. P. S. C. Rao
Field Assistants	Mr Rajkamal Ajmeri
	Mr. Basant Kumar
Editing Support	Communication Team, IGSSS
Design	Mustard Tree

---

# Abbreviations

AP	Andhra Pradesh
CAG	Community Action Group
CBO	Community Based Organisation
CSP	Customer Service Provider
CSRE	Cash Scheme for Rural Employment
EAS	Employment Assurance Scheme
FFWP	Food for Work Program
FGD	Focus Group Discussion
GP	Gram Panchayat
GRAKOOS	Gramina Kuli Karmikara Sangham
GS	Gram Sabha
HH	Household
IGSSS	Indo-Global Social Service Society
JRY	Jawahar Rojgar Yojna
MGNREGA	Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act
MGNREGS	Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme
MV	Most Vulnerable
NREP	National Rural Employment Program
NRM	Natural Resource Management
NREGP	National Rural Employment Guarantee Programme
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
PEARL	People's Empowerment for Accessing Rights to Livelihood
PIA	Project Implementing Agency
PRI	Panchayati Raj Institution
NRLEGP	National and the Rural Labour Employment Guarantee Program
RWP	Rural Works Program
SGRY	Sampoorna Grameen Rozgar Yojana
SC	Scheduled Caste
ST	Scheduled Tribe
VC	Vigilance Committee
VDC	Village Development Council

# Preface

**I**t is a grim fact that a sizeable section of Indian population continues to remain most vulnerable (MV) for centuries in want of proper policies by the ruling political parties protecting them from various forms of deprivations in the mainstream socio-economic development process. However, the nature of their vulnerability has changed over the time. During Pre-Mughal regime, the caste-based social formation maintained by the Indian Kings forced the MV population to live either under subjugation/deprivation in the lowest stratum of the society (as untouchables) or did not allow them to be part of their governance (Tribes). Though some rights over the means of production (i.e. land, water and forests) were granted to the MV population during the Mughal period particularly to those who embraced Islam but the conditions of the majority of the MV population remained to be pitiable. The British-Indian Government's land and forest related policies affected the lives of the MV population most adversely which brought about polarization between landlords/ rich peasants on the one hand and tenants/landless agricultural labourers on the other (The Royal Commission on Agriculture, 1924-25).

Ever since independence of our country and especially after declaration of welfare policies, 'livelihood security' of the MV population of India has been one of the highly discussed issues. With the ongoing process of liberalization, the issue has become much more relevant due to the social conflict arising from the denial of people's access to the means of production like land, water, finance, etc. and various other plights of this population. There is no doubt that there has been a record increase in the production of food grains (and also in the form of buffer stock) in the country during post-liberalization period, but this alone cannot ensure the right to food of the MV population, if they are not included within mainstream development process. The issue also highlights the need to empower the MV communities to assert to realize their legitimate rights and entitlements in the ongoing livelihood security related safety net programmes, to acquire productive resources, challenge corrupt practices that deprive them to avail their rights/entitlements, ensure transparency in the delivery of services, and to pressurize the Government to enact/implement appropriate plans/policies enabling them to ensure livelihood/food security.

IGSSS PEARL Programme, which has been implemented in the last three and a half years (2009-2013) covering 39,860 socially and economically marginalised families, 2500 youths from 57 districts in 15 states in the country, was designed to ensure livelihood security of the MV population by mobilising and empowering them to access their rights and entitlements given in the ongoing livelihood security related direct or indirect programmes run by the Government. This intervention has widened IGSSS experience in dealing with the issues related to Livelihood and food security of the MV families with special reference to effects of MGNREGA schemes.

The present research study seeks to unfold those experiences so that we can share those experiences with different stakeholders including the MV population and Government to make the MGNREGA scheme more effective in mitigating the livelihood insecurity of the MV population.

I hope this research document would be highly useful for all those concerned with ensuring livelihood security of the MV families/population of the country through implementation of MGNREGA scheme not only in understanding the ground realities relating to its implementation but also to introspect and modify the programme to make it more effective in future.

**DR. JOSEPH SEBASTIAN**

# Acknowledgements

**I**GSSS' flagship programme 'People's Empowerment for Accessing Rights to Livelihood' (PEARL) was implemented through various partner organisations in 57 districts in 15 states of India covering thousands of MV families. The programme mobilized, motivated, spread awareness and empowered the targeted MV families to help them access their legitimate rights and entitlements related to 'Right to Food', 'Right to Work', 'Right to NRM', 'Right to Credit' etc. Besides, it had provisions for training, capacity building and student's mobilization initiatives for learning and exposure (SMILE). Activities undertaken during the initial two years of the project tenure included consolidation of functional, dynamic and community based democratic people's organisations aimed at supporting the targeted beneficiaries to act together using the Rights Based Approach for livelihood enhancement, ensure food security through increased access and opportunities of government run safety-net programmes and strengthening of forums and networks, sharing of experiences through workshops, consultation and advocacy meetings etc. As per the last data reported, around 58,248 families benefitted from the various social security schemes like Public Distribution System, Integrated Child Development Scheme, Mid Day Meal, Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme, Land entitlement under Forest Rights Act etc. Furthermore, it has generated a huge first hand database and experiences that need to be utilised for future actions.

However, ensuring right to work for the eligible members of the MV families through Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme was one of the prime objectives of the PEARL programme. The present study on 'Effectiveness of MGNREGA in ensuring Livelihood Security and Checking Distress Migration among the Vulnerable section of Population in PEARL Programme Areas has been planned to assess how far effective implementation of MGNREGA has been able to provide employment/livelihood security to the most vulnerable families, checking distress migration and also to determine a roadmap for the effective implementation of MGNREGA scheme in generating quality assets and best utilization of those assets in providing livelihood security of these MV families.

The study has been designed to collect primary and secondary data from different stakeholders involved in implementation of MGNREGA schemes in five sample districts by six partner organisations from the states of Rajasthan, Madhya Pradesh, Karnataka and Andhra Pradesh. Qualitative and Quantitative data, which was used for preparing this report, was collected by a team of experienced researchers. The government officials at the district/block and panchayat level, members of NGO partners and their field and organisational staff, respective PRI members and of course the sample beneficiaries belonging to the MV families extended all possible cooperation and support to the research team in collecting relevant data information for this study.

As this report is a product of a team comprising the researchers, IGSSS staff, NGO partners, PRI members, Government functionaries and the sample beneficiaries, I thankfully acknowledge the contribution of all of them. I express my deep sense of gratitude to our Director for his idea and encouragement in shaping this report. I am also thankful to all my colleagues and staff who helped me in different ways in preparing this study report.

**K.C. SAHU**

# Executive Summary

## **STUDY OBJECTIVES AND LOCATIONS**

The Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act, 2005 (MGNREGA) grants legal rights to the adult members of rural families who are willing to participate in unskilled manual work for getting minimum 100 days of wage employment in a financial year. Significance of the Act is that it recognises right to work and provides employment to the unemployed rural people during lean seasons with a view to check distress migration of rural households in search of employment and at the same time also seeks to support livelihood of the MV rural families on a sustained basis through generation and productive use of assets created through implementation. Yet, another aspect of the Act has been empowerment of the MV rural families, bringing about improvement in governance at the grass roots level and to ensure inclusive growth.

The present study on “Effectiveness of MGNREGA in Ensuring Livelihood Security and Checking Distress Migration among the Vulnerable Section of Population in Pearl Programme Areas” is aimed at assessing how the MGNREGA schemes implemented in PEARL project areas have been effective in providing livelihood support to the MV families on a sustained basis and checking distress migration. In the course of conducting field work, the research team tried to capture the opinion and feedback of various stakeholders involved in implementation of the MGNREGA schemes on different issues/aspects starting from grass root level planning in the PEARL project areas.

In view of achieving the above mentioned objective, field study was done in three districts spread across three states covering three blocks, eight gram panchayats, 16 villages and 80 MV families. The beneficiary MV families covered under the study belonged to varied geographical locations and social backgrounds. Investigations and queries revolved around mainly on the MGNREGA schemes for which data was already available in the study areas. However, in some places ongoing activities were also investigated to gather necessary information for this study. Key findings of the study have been presented in the following paragraphs.

## **KEY FINDINGS**

- Though MGNREGA scheme is implemented not as per the statutory norms mentioned in the guidelines of both Central and State Governments, yet, the study witnessed positive impact of the scheme in terms of providing additional employment (about 30 to 100 days) and income (about Rs. 3000 to Rs.12000) per annum to the MV families.
- Assets created through MGNREGA schemes have directly and indirectly benefitted the MV families (through job and asset creations) in increasing their income through better farm practices and wage earnings.
- Supplementary income of the MV families generated under MGNREGA along with other safety net programmes which enabled them to fight and eliminate absolute poverty and hunger situations.
- The improved situation of the MV families has led to gradual reduction in distress migration.
- After implementation of MGNREGA, local wage rate of the farm laborers has increased and it has become at par with the minimum wage rate prescribed by the State Governments for the agricultural wage laborers.



## **KEY RECOMMENDATIONS**

### **Execution Level**

- Community/CBOs need to be sensitized and capacitated to enable them to demand for jobs applying the right based approach and catalyze the provision of MGNREGA as per its statutory norms.
- Community should be encouraged to visualise MGNREGA as a means for village development program and not merely as an employment generating/wage earning program.
- Schemes under MGNREGA need to be planned as per the labour demand calendar, which is to be prepared taking the seasonal activities of the labourers into consideration.
- Participation of the villagers need to be assured while preparing holistic Village Development Plan with an Integrated Area Approach (asset creation vis-à-vis labour plan).
- Leadership qualities should be developed among women members to create pressure on the implementing agencies to involve them in planning and monitoring of the programmes and also to maintain transparency and accountability.
- To ensure better service delivery, Customer Service Provider system (AP Model) should be introduced in all the states.

### **Policy Level**

There is need to develop strong institutional arrangement to ensure proper implementation of the provisions under MGNREGA in terms of:

- Adequate trained Human Resources including technical persons need to be deployed at all levels of the PRI system.
- Database management information systems at GP level to track the work processes should be developed.
- Action should be taken for introducing an effective grievance redressal mechanism.
- The MGNREGA scheme should be redesigned to cover at least harvesting activities in the farm fields of the marginal and small farmers.



# Introduction

## **BACKGROUND**

Emergence of the Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (MGNREGA) is a major development in the history of rural development in India. Among all the wage employment programmes planned and implemented so far for the livelihood security of the working population of rural India during post-independence period, MGNREGA is unique as it is community based and demand-driven programme which has a provision for legal entitlement and right to provide minimum 100 days of guaranteed wage employment in a financial year to each eligible family. A brief description on the background behind emergence of such a distinct programme is presented in the following paragraphs.

During the 1960s there was a genuine realization among the planners and the policy makers of the country that growth-led planned development process is not a judicious solution to the problem of unemployment, mass poverty and iniquitous distribution of income and wealth and more particularly towards safeguarding the interests of the most vulnerable sections of population. This realization paved the way of a nation-wide debate and discourse challenging the very concept of growth-led development of the nation. In the mid 1970s, there was a major policy shift from growth oriented development to welfare with social justice oriented development of the nation so as to enable all sections of population to enjoy the benefits of development.

In view of the above backdrop, there was an evolution of several employment generating programmes for the rural working population of the country like Rural Works Program (RWP) in 1961, Cash Scheme for Rural Employment (CSRE) and Food For Work Program (FFWP) in the 1970s, National Rural Employment Program (NREP) and the Rural Labour Employment Guarantee Program (RLEGP) in the 1980s, and the Jawahar Rojgar Yojna (JRY), the Employment Assurance Scheme (EAS), and the Sampoorna Grameen

Rozgar Yojana (SGRY) in the 1990s. Primary objective of these programmes was to provide livelihood security to the poor/vulnerable sections of population of the country, who for several historical reasons, were unable to get assimilated into the mainstream development process and/or ensure their access to legitimate rights and entitlements. Those ad-hoc based short-term programmes were not free from leakages and therefore impact of those programmes was far from the desired levels. Reviews of these programmes had shown that there was low programme coverage; participation of MV families and women were negligible, planning process was bureaucratic, no quality assets were created and corrupt practices prevailed in the whole process (ARC 2006, Indira Hirway, 2006).

Indian economy during post liberalisation period (after 1991) witnessed high annual average growth rate (seven to nine percentage) but at the same time the annual rate of growth of employment registered decline from 2.01 percent over 1983-1993/94 to 1.84 percent (1.45 percent in rural areas and 3.14 percent in urban areas) in 2004-05; which was much below the rate of growth of the labour force and growth of population (Pranati, 2009). This undesired trend of the Indian economy generated heat in the minds of the members of civil society organisations, social workers, academicians and some policy makers to force them to wage a social movement to pressurise the Central Government to adopt some policy measures to cope up with the evil consequences of liberalisation process that go against the interest of the working class especially the workers belonging to most vulnerable families in the rural areas. It was also realized in the emerging situation, that the previous income generating programmes were ineffective in solving the problems of unemployment in the rural areas. Thus, with a view to eliminate the weaknesses of the previous wage employment generating programmes, the Government of India launched the National Rural Employment Guarantee Program (NREGP) followed

by enactment of a Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (MGNREGA) by Indian Parliament in 2005.

### **SALIENT FEATURES OF MGNREGA**

Planning, execution, monitoring and up-keeping/use of assets under MGNREGA Scheme are distinctively different from the previous wage employment schemes. Salient features of the Act and the schemes under it are mentioned below:

- It provides a legal guarantee of minimum 100 days of wage employment to the MV families in a financial year;
- All households residing permanently in a hamlet/village are entitled to register for job cards;
- Job cards should be issued to the eligible families after scrutiny containing photographs of all entitled applicants within 15 days of application;
- Members of the families holding job card are entitled to demand/apply for wage employment either individually or in group, either verbally or in written form;
- Job card holders demanding/applying should be acknowledged and they should be allotted jobs within the radius of five kms within 15 days of demand/application;
- If employment is not provided within 15 days, a daily unemployment allowance in cash has to be paid. Liability of payment of Unemployment Allowance is on the States;
- If employment is not provided within five kms, the workers are entitled to travel expenses up to 10% of the wage;
- At least one-third of the jobs under the MGNREGA scheme should be allotted for women;
- PRIs at the district block and GP levels are the authorities responsible for planning and implementation of MGNREGA scheme;
- Gram Sabha is responsible for selection of projects/schemes in the respective villages/tolas;
- The shelf of projects for a village selected/recommended by the Gram Sabha is sent to GP and the GP forwards those projects/schemes for approval by the 'Zilla Panchayat' ;
- Labour and material components of the works done under MGNREGA schemes should be in the proportion of 60:40;
- Fifty percent of the MGNREGA works should be implemented through GPs and rest by Block and District Panchayats;
- Entire work under MGNREGA scheme should be done manually and no contractor and machinery should be used;
- Wage payment to the workers should be made within 15 days through nationalized banks or Post Offices;
- Wage rate should be at par with the minimum wage notified by the respective State Governments for agricultural labourers;
- Entire cost towards wage payment to the unskilled labourers and 75% of the material costs of the programme is borne by the Government of India;
- Transfer of resources from Government of India to States is based on the demand for employment in each of the States;
- Social audit is an essential feature of MGNREGA that helps maintaining transparency and accountability of all the stakeholders involved in implementation of the scheme;
- A Report on the outcome of MGNREGA is presented annually by the Government of India (GoI) to the Indian Parliament and by the State governments to the State Legislatures;
- Other than creation of manual jobs, the MGNREGA scheme also seek to create durable and sustainable asset to be managed by the community people.
- The Act has codified the following types of work for creation of durable assets:
  - Soil and water conservation and water harvesting
  - Activities related to draught proofing like afforestation and social forestry
  - Macro and minor irrigation work for irrigation purposes.
  - Land and irrigation development particularly the land owned by Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes and the beneficiaries of land reforms/Indira Aawas Yojana.
  - Renovation of traditional water bodies including de-silting of tanks.
  - Flood control and protection works including construction of drainage system in the waterlogged areas
  - Rural connectivity to provide all-weather road communication.
  - Any other works which may be notified by the central government in consultation with the state governments (presently employment generating rural development works by all the Government departments have been converged with MGNREGA scheme).

## **GLIMPSE OF THE PERFORMANCE/ACHIEVEMENT OF MGNREGA AT NATIONAL LEVEL**

In the first phase, the Act was implemented in 200 districts with effect from 2nd February, 2006; in the year 2006-07, its coverage was extended to 330 additional districts and from 1st April, 2008, the Act was extended to cover all 615 rural districts of the country. Glimpse of the performance (during 2006 to 2012) of MGNREGA is depicted in the following passages (MGNREGA Sameeksha 2012):

- On an average, five crore households have been provided employment every year since 2008;
- About eighty per cent of those households working under MGNREGA scheme are being paid directly through their bank/post office accounts;
- About ten crore new bank/post office accounts have been opened;
- The average wage per person, per day has gone up by 81 per cent since inception of MGNREGA, with state-level variations. The notified wage today varies from a minimum of Rs 122 in Bihar, Jharkhand to Rs 191 in Haryana;
- Employment in terms of person-days provided to the MGNREGA workers belonging to Scheduled Castes (SCs) and Scheduled Tribes (STs) have accounted for 51 per cent of the total person-days generated;
- Proportion of women workers comprised about 47 per cent of total workers involved so far in MGNREGA jobs, which is above the mandatory 33 per cent as mentioned in the Act;
- About 146 lakh work has been taken up since the beginning of the MGNREGA programme, of which about 60 per cent work have been completed;
- About 12 crore Job Cards (JCs) have been generated and along with it 9 crore muster rolls have been uploaded on the Management Information System (MIS), available for public scrutiny;
- Since 2010–11, all details with regard to the expenditure of the MGNREGA are available on the MIS in the public domain;
- Though, it has been reported that implementation remains uneven and patchy across States and districts, yet there is evidence to suggest that MGNREGA has contributed to:
  - Increased wage rate everywhere in rural India;
  - Reduced distress migration;
  - Brought a sizeable proportion of barren land under cultivation;
  - Empower the MV families including women and gave them a new sense of identity and bargaining power.

## **MAJOR CHALLENGES BEFORE IMPLEMENTATION OF MGNREGA**

It is obvious from the above that there have been remarkable achievements of MGNREGA in terms of creation of jobs and productive assets but several issues have emerged creating bottlenecks in smooth implementation of the programmes. The discussion paper entitled 'Reforms in MGNREGA Implementation' released by the Ministry of Rural Development on 1st September, 2011 identified these following nine major challenges in the MGNREGA implementation and suggested measures to deal with them effectively:

- Ensure demand-driven legal entitlements
- Reduce distress migration from rural areas
- Reduce delays in wage payments to workers
- Provide the requisite number of days of work as per demand
- Improve quality of assets created under MGNREGA
- Ensure full payment of wages stipulated under MGNREGA
- Anchor participatory grass-root planning
- Sustain regular flow of funds
- Strengthen grievance redressal mechanisms

To deal with the above stated challenges, the Central Government set up an expert committee under the chairmanship of Dr Mihir Shah, Member, Planning Commission. The committee recommended expansion of work under MGNREGA in March 2012 with a view to:

- Strengthen the synergy between MGNREGA and rural livelihood, particularly agriculture
- Respond to the demand of the states for greater location specific flexibility in permissible works
- Help improve the health and ecological situation in rural India, with a particular focus on sanitation

## **VULNERABILITY AND MOST VULNERABLE POPULATION OF INDIA**

Vulnerability connotes incapability of a system of governance to cope with adverse effects of its socio-economic policies upon a section of the population, who for several reasons, are denied of their legitimate rights and entitlements. Finding no livelihood opportunities within the system, the most vulnerable families/population are either forced to starve or are forced to migrate. In our country several policies and programmes have been adopted to provide livelihood security to the most vulnerable population. Provision of employment under MGNREGA, that guarantees minimum 100 days of wage employment in a year to each such family, has been the most ambitious as

well as gigantic step taken up by the Government so far towards granting livelihood security to the MV families/population.

Indian governance during the post independence period has largely been influenced by the governance of the erstwhile British-Indian regime that came into power in the seventeenth century with the defeat of the Mughal Empire, Marathas and conquest of local powers. It ended with the declaration of independence of India in the year 1947. The British almost entirely inherited the land-tenure system of the Mughals that was originally introduced by Raja Todarmal during the reign of Emperor Akbar. Three different land revenue systems introduced during the British India regime included Zamindari system, Ryotwari System and Mahalwari System. The Zamindari system was introduced during the early British-India regime with the promulgation of Permanent Settlement Act in the year 1792. Almost all parts of Northern India including the then Bihar and Orissa (except Awadh, Agra, Jaipur and Jodhpur), was under the Zamindari system that comprised about 57 per cent of the cultivated area in the country; wherein a zamindar was granted proprietorship of agrarian land against payments of fixed revenue to the then British-India Government. The peasants, who enjoyed land titles and other rights/privileges during the Mughal period, were turned into tenants and were subjected to deprivation (by the intermediate rent collecting class) of their shares in produce, compelling them to lead lives under abject poverty. The Ryotari system was introduced in the Presidency provinces of Madras in the year 1792 and in Bombay in the year 1817-18 covering nearly all the farmers of southern states and western states of India including the erstwhile Central Province (i.e. Madhya Pradesh) and the princely states of Jaipur and Jodhpur had this category of revenue system. However, the pockets of zamindari system prevailed within the Ryotwari regions, particularly in the princely states and the areas governed by the feudal lords. This system covered nearly 38 per cent of the cultivated area of the country and recognized the proprietary right of the peasants on land as it had existed during the Mughal period. The Mahalwari system was introduced by British in between 1840 and 1850. In this system the entire village constituted revenue settlement as collective unit. The peasants paid the revenue share of whole village in proportion according to their individual holdings. The system covered the erstwhile Punjab, parts of Orissa and Madhya Pradesh, and the princely states of Awadh and Agra in Uttar Pradesh. The system was not extensive and included only five per cent of the cultivated land

in India. Of those three systems, Ryotari system was considered to be most convenient and appropriate instrument for social development. However, the British legislation institutionalized the transfer of land which led to the abuse of land-market, which was almost absent in the Mughal period. The legislation enacted during 1850s in Ryotari and Mahalwari areas enabled moneylenders to recover debts from the mortgaged land holdings. It caused serious impact on transfer of land from the holding of cultivator to non-cultivator. "As a result, rural society in Ryotari and Mahalwari areas was polarized into landlords and rich peasants versus tenants and agricultural labourers, and the distribution of land became highly unequal". (The Royal Commission on Agriculture, 1924-25).

#### **LIVELIHOOD/FOOD SECURITY OF MV FAMILIES/POPULATION**

The concept of livelihood security was derived through a process of understanding food production/distribution systems and other factors that influence the food supply to the MV households over time. Food security approach to development was evolved in the late 1980s (after Africa plagued into deep food crisis in the mid-1980s); which emphasized both availability and stable access to food. Food availability at the national and regional level and stable/ sustainable access at the local level were considered essential to household food security. Creating livelihood security of the MV families includes working with partner NGOs, strengthening civil society organisations, preparation of long-range strategic planning, diagnosis leading to design, empowering the community, advocacy/ lobbying with the government functionaries to maintain transparency and also to redesign the existing rural development projects using a livelihood security framework, etc (Timothy R. Frankenberger, et. al. 2004).

#### **ROLE OF PEARL PROGRAMME IN FACILITATING IMPLEMENTATION OF MGNREGA FOR MV FAMILIES**

The project entitled 'People's Empowerment for Accessing Rights to Livelihood'- PEARL is one of the most ambitious ongoing projects of IGSSS. This project is being implemented through its (IGSSS) partner organisations covering 57 districts in 15 states of India. The programme focuses on building and strengthening Community Based Organisations and enables those

organisations to address issues confronting livelihood security of the MV families and improve their living status. The process has led to the emergence of large number of grassroot level women groups for facilitating development programmes favouring the MV families.

The domains of intervention during last two years include Right to Food, Right to Work, Right to NRM, Right to Credit, training and capacity building and Student's Mobilization Initiatives for Learning and Exposure (SMILE). Besides, the programme activities targeted in ensuring food security through increased access and opportunities of government programmes and strengthening of forums, networks, sharing, advocacy meets, lobbying etc.

#### **Major Achievements of PEARL Programme:**

During the project tenure of last two years, the partner organisations have mobilized the people belonging to MV families, facilitated formation of various community forums, developing perspective around the issues among the targeted beneficiary population, organised varieties of capacity building programs and undertook wide range of activities that targeted at livelihood enhancement of the targeted beneficiaries. Afterwards, focus of the programme was on empowering the CBOs in developing micro plans, networking and alliance building around the issue of livelihood with likeminded groups, developing a cadre of leaders who are taking up issues in the community and empowering the CBOs in doing social audit and filing RTI to ensure Right to Food, Right to Livelihood, Right to Credit and access to natural resources and their better management. Training programs, exposure visits etc were designed facilitating knowledge transfer with the help of local resource centre's (LRCs).

A few major achievement of the PEARL Programme include submission of number of fresh applications by the community for job cards under MGNREGA and also to avail facilities under various social security schemes (some of them availed those facilities), land pattas issued to tribal beneficiaries under Forest Rights Act (FRA), number of community based events were organised and members trained, number of farmers adopted new farm techniques to cope with climate changes. Village level micro-plans were developed in coordination with the CBOs and submitted to PRIs through Gram Sabha, regular monitoring on quality execution of government schemes, pressurized government functionaries for better execution of social security programmes, sensitization of PRI members on identification of real beneficiaries under MGNREGA and other social security schemes, conducting interface

meetings with the beneficiaries and the government officials, conducting social audits by CBOs and community members to pressurize government functionaries for the proper execution of the Government schemes. At a micro level, the community was engaged in monitoring the schemes and identifying gaps in the delivery process and at a regional state level, the alliances analysed and shared the findings with the State authorities. These helped the partner organisations to understand and critically analyse various aspects of social security schemes.

#### **Formation and Strengthening Strategic**

##### **State level Alliances:**

For sustainability of the programme, state level alliances were formed and strengthened. Several advocacy meetings involving different stakeholders were organised for better implementation of the social security programmes and also for policy change.

##### **Major Challenges faced during the implementation of PEARL project:**

Challenges confronted with implementation of PEARL programme :

- Establishing linkages with different government line departments concerned with social security programmes;
- Developing common understanding and equal competencies among all IGSSS partners;
- Networking with other organisation working in the state;
- Ensuring participation of the MV families.

#### **RELEVANCE OF THE STUDY**

Among the livelihood/social security programmes run by the State and Central governments, MGNREGA programme is most gigantic for its all India coverage and quantum of finance involved in it. If implemented properly, MGNREGA can prove to be a genuine safety net programme that can not only ensure livelihood security of the MV families but also help improve governance at the grass root level. The PEARL programme of IGSSS made a modest attempt to implement the MGNREGA programme in its project areas involving the beneficiaries through formation of CBOs. The PEARL programme has come out with learning and first hand experiences that could be helpful in better implementation of the programme in future.





## CHAPTER TWO

# Study Objectives and Methodology

This chapter is devoted to deal with the objectives and methodology of the present research study entitled 'Effectiveness of MGNREGA in Ensuring Livelihood Security and Checking Distress Migration among the Vulnerable Section of Population in Pearl Project Area'; details of which is narrated in the following pages.

### RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

The present research study aims at achieving these following objectives:

- To assess how far PEARL project, through effective implementation of MGNREGA, has been able to improve the employment/livelihood opportunities of the most vulnerable families and checking distress migration.
- To assess and document the process of involvement of CBOs including PRIs/ Gram Sabha, etc in the planning, implementation and monitoring of schemes implemented under MGNREGA in the PEARL project area.
- To identify the most vulnerable families in the PEARL Project areas, who are still not covered or have not been able to properly utilize the benefits of MGNREGA and/or other safety net programmes run by the Government and the reasons thereof.
- To explore how gender responsive planning can be embedded into MGNREGA schemes.
- To determine a roadmap for micro – macro level

for quality utilization of the provisions under MGNREGA for the livelihood security of the most vulnerable families in the PEARL project areas.

### RESEARCH QUESTIONS

- How far the CBOs (PRI/ Gram Sabha) have been capacitated to plan, identify the livelihood opportunities, implement and monitor the schemes under MGNREGA in order to increase/ensure the employability/livelihood opportunity/security of the MV families in the PEARL project areas?
- How far MGNREGA has helped mobilising opportunities for livelihood security of the most vulnerable families in PEARL project areas, reducing the incidence of distress migration and reducing their household level financial insecurity?

### PROCESS OF CONDUCTING OF THE RESEARCH STUDY

- The study is conducted by a Team of Researchers comprising of one Principal Researcher, two Associate Researchers and a few Research Investigators.
- Four states under PEARL programme were selected for this study which includes Andhra Pradesh, Karnataka, Madhya Pradesh and Rajasthan.

- Key stakeholders covered under this research study includes beneficiaries, representatives of the Partner NGOs/CBOs, site supervisors or 'mate', PRI representatives and service providers (Government functionaries), vulnerable families not included in MGNREGA (if any), were involved to get necessary data/information for the study.
- For this study, primary and secondary data were collected, compiled and analysed. Qualitative and Quantitative tools were developed for collecting relevant data from different stakeholders.
- Research study report is finalized after incorporation of the feedback received from the consultation meeting held with CSO partners and IGSSS officials.

### **SELECTION OF STUDY AREAS AND PEARL PARTNER ORGANISATIONS**

Three out of 15 states covered under PEARL project were selected purposively for the present study. The Table presented below depicts details of the study areas covered.

**State:** Karnataka, **NGO:** Reach, **District:** Bagalkot, **Gram Panchayat:** Hiramagi and Chittaragi, **Villages:** Kalgonal, Huliginal, Gangur and Hadagali.

**State:** Andhra Pradesh, **NGO:** SCD, **District:** Srikakulam, **Gram Panchayat:** Sethampeta and Peda Rama, **Villages:** Bonguduguda, Marriguda, Nowaguda and China Rama.

**State:** Rajasthan, **NGO:** Prayas and Srushti Seva Samiti, **District:** Pratapgarh and Dungarpur, **Gram Panchayat:** Gothra, Hazariguda, Kahila and OAD, **Villages:** Gothra Borimagri, Hazariguda, Ujarkhera, Babanpura Ben Gamra-Chamriya Hanela.

### **SAMPLE DESIGN AND DATA COLLECTION**

As mentioned in the above Table, Four PEARL partner organisations from three states were purposively selected. With the help of PEARL partners, two GPs were purposively selected and from each GPs two villages were selected purposively for the study.

Thus, the sample stakeholders selected for investigation during the field study includes 80 MV families, eight MV families not availing MGNREGS, eight Gram Sarpanchs, eight Gram Sachivs, eight mates and eight CBO representatives. Besides a few Block/Mandal level government officials (who were readily available) were also interviewed. District level government officials could not be contacted as they

were always found busy in their own routine work.

While selecting the sample families from the sample villages/GPs, vulnerability aspects (both social and economic) were taken into due consideration. Out of the five MV families selected for the study from each village, two were selected from Schedule Castes, two from Schedule Tribes and one from Other Backward Castes families. From among the selected interviewees, at least interview of two women were mandatory. This sampling criterion was followed for all the states covered under the study.

The research study used both quantitative as well as qualitative approaches for collecting relevant data/information. Answers of the research questions that required straightforward replies were obtained using quantitative approaches and the answers to the questions requiring descriptive discussions were obtained using qualitative approach. The study collected data/information from both primary and secondary sources. CBOs, PRI members, MV families and government functionaries were interviewed in the process of data collection. The table below depicts details of the samples drawn for detailed investigation using research tools.

### **STUDY TOOLS**

Tools used for data/information collection includes IDI, FGD & Onsite observations. The primary data at the household level were collected through specially designed semi-structured interview schedules; while the qualitative information related to the study were gathered through FGDs/ Gram Sabha meetings.

### **SCOPE AND LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY**

The PEARL program intends to address the problem of livelihood insecurity of the vulnerable communities and check migration in the project areas of four states – AP, MP, Rajasthan and Karnataka. The strategy was to empower the community and the beneficiaries enabling them to exercise their legitimate rights and entitlements through the right based approach. In view of this, MGNREGA as one of the components to ensure livelihood security was taken into account under the PEARL Project.

As a strategy, CBOs were formed, trained and capacitated to track the status of household entitlements. Through CBOs, various relevant data and information was collected, which helped to understand the current pattern of poor household's social security

Data collection Method	Respondents	Location/ level	Size/ no.
Personal interviews	MVA family	Villages – 16	80
	Mate		4
	Gram Sachiv	Gram panchayat	8
	Sarpanch	Gram panchayat	8
	NGO representatives	District	4
	MVF not using NREGA	Village	8
FGD	CBOs/ Community / Gram Sabha	Village/ GP	8
Field observations	Asset	GP	4
	Gram Sabha meeting	GP	4
	NREGA worksites	Village	4

net. This data will further help NGO partners to set village-wise targets and action plans to achieve the targets.

Schemes under MGNREGA are planned to be strategically used to seek job during the period of migration. For this it requires preparation of seasonal job requirement calendar of communities. The planning processes of NGO partners need to be geared up to address the problem of migration among the vulnerable families.

Further, MGNREGS has the scope to provide wage employment to the wage labourers belonging to vulnerable families during the lean period when they invariably migrate to other places in search of jobs. For this, it is required to prepare seasonal job requirement calendar of communities. Had the planning processes of partner organisations followed this pattern the issue of distress migration could have been better addressed

Unlike any other sample based empirical research study, this study is not free from certain obvious limitations. Some of those limitations of the study are mentioned below:

- The study is based on analysis of sample-based data collected from three out of 15 states, viz., Andhra Pradesh, Rajasthan and Karnataka, covered under PEARL project. Findings of the study may not be representative for all the project areas or the state as a whole.
- In Rajasthan, the job cards were mostly not available with the respondent families and even if some of the respondents had job cards, not a single job card was found updated. So it was difficult to capture genuine data/information from the beneficiary respondents. But the study was based on whatever information provided by the respondents on the basis of their memory (which are subject to exaggerations or discrepancies).
- Due to time constraint, it was a difficult task to get

appointment to meet and interact personally (face to face) with the concerned officials/PRI and NGO representatives at the sample districts/blocks/GPs.

- Again due to time constraint, government officials at the district level, the local resource persons, social and political activists etc. could not be interviewed properly to ascertain their exhaustive views and opinions.
- The visit of ongoing MGNREGA work sites in each sample GPs was not possible due to rigidity of the time fixed for field study
- Last but not the least, data collected from the official records is not always free from exaggerations or manipulations. Conclusions drawn in this report on the basis of such data may not reflect the true picture of the situations prevailing in the study areas.

### **STRUCTURE OF THE REPORT**

The report is structured in four chapters. First chapter presents introductory descriptions on genesis and background of theme (wage employment programmes including MGNREGA) of the research including justification for the study. Research objectives, methodology and limitations of the research study have been covered in the second chapter. Third chapter presents findings of the study based on the analysis of data collected for the purpose of the study. The last chapter contains the recommendations of the study.



# Analysis and Findings

This chapter presents an investigation on effectiveness of the MGNREGA schemes implemented or being implemented in some of the states viz., Karnataka, Andhra Pradesh and Rajasthan, covered under IGSSS sponsored PEARL project. The presentation is based on the analysis of relevant data/ information collected by the research teams during field survey through observations of ongoing and completed works under MGNREGA and interactions with key stakeholders (Sarpanch, NGO representatives, CBOs, Community/GS members, MV families, Mates, Gram Sachivs, local Government officials, etc) involved in the implementation of the schemes. Detailed analysis is presented in the following pages under different sub-headings:

## **EFFECTIVENESS OF MGNREGA SCHEME**

This study has attempted to examine the effectiveness of MGNREGA scheme in terms of ensuring livelihood security to the MV families especially during lean agriculture seasons and towards checking distress migration of those families. In view of assessing effectiveness, the research team investigated several important aspects of MGNREGA scheme, like process of involvement /planning, process of selection of beneficiaries, execution, monitoring through Vigilance Committee (VC), evaluation of the programmes through Social Audit, generation of quality assets, productive use and maintenance of assets, etc; which are considered to have direct bearings on effectiveness of the schemes. Other factors that affect effectiveness of MGNREGA scheme include availability of jobs on

demand/in time, maintenance of actual Muster Roll, payment of wages in time as per actual work done by the workers, payment of unemployment allowances in case of failure of the PIA in providing jobs within 15 days from the date of job application, etc along with sincerity, accountability and transparency maintained by the government functionaries and other service providers. Head-wise analyses of the factors affecting effectiveness of the MGNREGA scheme are presented in the following paragraphs:

## **Planning the Activities and Labour Management**

As mentioned earlier, MGNREGA guarantees 100 days of wage employment in a financial year to the rural families whose adult members demand to do unskilled manual work at minimum wage rate prescribed by the state government. Idea behind the provisions of the Act is to complement the earning of the MV rural families and at the same time create some productive community and/or individual assets that again might supplement income of those families. Effective implementation of MGNREGA demands generation of sufficient wage employment to match supply of employment with demand for employment within 15 days and at the same time maintain creation of good quality assets that would be useful to the community or the individual beneficiary families in terms of developing their land based resources to improve agriculture production and productivity and leads towards inclusive/sustainable development. This requires a rigorous bottom-up planning in advance. The MGNREGA mandates preparation of five years perspective plan for the district as a whole

*“I used to migrate on regular basis in search of livelihood particularly to meet the critical financial needs of my family, but now I am ill, I cannot move outside for jobs, so I take care of my children, look after goats and run a very small grocery shop (that was established with the financial support from my wife) in my house whereas my wife works in MGNREGA to meet the basic financial needs of the family”*

**Bhagwatlal Hanela**, Gamra Charaniya, Oad, Dungarpur, Rajasthan

and annual development plan for a Gram Panchayat. The former plan aims at facilitating advance planning so as to provide a development perspective for the District development Plan; while the later plan aims at assessing labour demand, identification of work to meet the estimated labour demand and estimation of cost of work and wages.

Panchayati Raj Institutions, sole authorized agency for implementation of MGNREGA, have principal role in planning, monitoring and implementation of MGNREGA scheme. Surprisingly, the study observed that MGNREGA scheme is implemented in the study areas haphazardly without following any planning process as mentioned in the guidelines of the Act.

However, in the study areas of Karnataka, two types of planning processes were reported. In one sample Gram Panchayat (Kalgona), planning for MGNREGA scheme was done by the Ward Members along with the job card holders up to 2011 and after that schemes were selected as per the micro plan done under the initiation of a NGO; whereas in rest other sample Gram Panchayats, schemes under MGNREGA were selected by the block and district level Government officials and later it was informed to the job card holders through Mates and Field Assistants. Although the micro planning was done in the said GP, yet it was reported that schemes were selected on the basis of nomination from diction of the Government officials and the Sarpanch and not as per the needs and priorities of the villagers.

In Andhra Pradesh, the Government officials responsible for implementation of MGNREGS visit the

villages, discuss with the people along with the Ward Members and Sarpanch to identify the scheme. Based on the feedback from them, the PIAs (respective GPs) prepare plan of actions and inform the mates through field assistants for implementation. Though Micro Plans were done at the village/GP levels by the NGO in the sample areas in 2011, but actual implementation was not done with the approach of integrated development of the GP.

In Rajasthan, MGNREGA schemes implementation at GP level were found to be conducted by the PRI representatives in meetings. In these meetings, only those male members of the village took part who did not migrate for lucrative employment to the nearby state of Gujarat. Surprisingly not a single respondent family could recall of any process adopted in selecting the MGNREGA scheme wherein micro – plan was done by the Gram Panchayat or any NGO authorised to do so.

In the southern states of Karnataka and Andhra Pradesh, it was reported that three to four Gram Sabha meetings were organised yearly wherein discussions were held on issues concerning the villages along with MGNREGS at Gram Panchayat level; but no specific Gram Sabha meeting was held for the selection of MGNREGS. Normally, Gram Sabha meetings were held in the presence of women beneficiaries, Sarpanch, Sachivs, Government officials. The women participation was relatively more in Karnataka than in Andhra Pradesh, possibly due to tribal domination. Though, nowhere Gram Sabha meetings were held in Rajasthan following the MGNREGA guidelines, yet in some places CBOs were active in ensuring people's

participation in the GS meetings organised by the GP in planning the activities under MGNREGA.

The Gram Sachivs in almost all the study areas were found aware about the planning process to be followed in selection of the schemes and managing the activities taken up under MGNREGA. However, they expressed their inability to execute the programmes as per the Guidelines of MGNREGA because they had to work within the existing bureaucratic style of functioning of the state Government that is still inclined towards top down approach.

Overall observations of the study is that, in the initial years, the village communities participation and involvement in decision making especially in planning for promotion of their livelihood options through wage employment and assets creation under MGNREGA scheme was negligible, but over the years, people's involvement in the planning process has been gradually increasing with the formation and strengthening of CBOs in villages.

Thus, in places where CBOs were not active, planning process was largely influenced by the Government/PRI functionaries. Interestingly, in places like Pratapgarh (Rajasthan) and Karnataka, CBOs were found influencing the planning process by participating regularly in the Gram Sabha / Panchayat meetings.

So far as women participation was concerned, the study observed that despite overcoming several socio-economic hurdles due to influence of cultural practises of the then traditional/feudal and patriarch social formation, distance of GS meetings from the Tolas, high rate of migration of male members and heavy pressure of household activities obstructed the participation of women in planning process in all the states. However, compared to Rajasthan, women participation in planning process was found to be high in Karnataka and AP due to higher level of education and awareness. It was further observed that the community is aware of some of the provisions of the planning process, like dates of Gram Sabha meetings, process of selection of schemes, number of days of job creation in a calendar year, etc.

Although micro planning processes done in some of the areas under PEARL project areas, especially in Karnataka and Andhra Pradesh, the labour management (availability and demand vis a vis the resource creation at individual and community level, assessment of labour calendar, lean and distress period, etc) were not properly visualized/planned.

#### **Process Adopted**

Once the job card is given to a particular family, the

adult members of that family (whose names are mentioned in the job card) are eligible for demanding jobs under MGNREGA scheme by putting an application (verbal or written) individually or in groups at Gram Panchayat or any authorized government official working at the GP/Block levels. With the demand of jobs by the job card holders, the Gram Panchayat is bound to provide employment within 15 days from the date of application; or else they would be entitled for unemployment allowances at a prescribed rate.

The study witnessed that every state has its own format for job application/demand. In the southern Indian states of Karnataka and Andhra Pradesh, beneficiaries reported getting employment under MGNREGA scheme within 10-15 days in general after their demand. The job card holders reported that they are made aware about the MGNREGS processes through the PEARL partner NGOs working in the area; reflection of which was seen in the Bagalkot area in Karnataka where some of the labour group members (especially women) who applied but did not get jobs even after a month, demanded for unemployment allowances before the block and district authorities using RTI. But, it was unfortunate to report that no such process was found applicable in Rajasthan to provide jobs to the job card holders. Normal practice followed in Rajasthan was that Mates come and inform the job card holders about the operationalisation of the schemes in particular project site and seek applications from the desired persons who would like to avail jobs under the scheme and/or fulfill other formalities on the spot.

Overall observations of the study about the process indicate that the community people have developed understanding / awareness about MGNREGA scheme but due to certain inhibitions (lack of confidence, fear complex, docile nature, influence of feudal culture where they were forced to bear all the pains of exploitative social system silently without protest and/or remained under subjugation for centuries), they still find themselves shaky in demanding jobs applying right based approach. However, in Karnataka and AP situation has been gradually changing, due to active presence of CBOs, and the job card holders, the community were found gradually coming out from the impasse of the feudal social formation and have been demanding jobs. Those who demanded got jobs within 15 to 20 days.

The study found that only in Karnataka, unemployment allowance was claimed by a few workers. It was also seen that cases of non-receipt of jobs within 15 days from the date of application have

been filed before “Ombudsmen” to get unemployment allowances. Unemployment allowances were given to the wage seekers from Kalgona in Karnataka as the women members demanded unemployment allowances; however, the payment is through cash unofficially and not by other modes of cash transfer. Due to better processes adopted in the southern states, the average number of days of employment provided under NREGS comprised between 60 and 100 days compared to 50-60 days in Rajasthan.

### Implementation of the MGNREGA Schemes

Effective implementation of MGNREGA means more number of wage employment created for the MV rural families as it provides supplementary income to the MV rural families to meet their financial needs, ensure better physical, economic and social environment in rural areas, assets development at individual and community level, etc. All these have direct bearing on leading our nation towards inclusive growth and provide sustainable livelihood opportunities to the rural poor. Effective implementation of MGNREGA schemes is conditioned by free play of the demand (job card holder families) and supply (the PIA including the Government functionaries) side of the schemes within the broad framework of the MGNREGA Guidelines. In view of understanding the situation and effectiveness of MGNREGA schemes in providing livelihood security of the MV families, the present study attempts to assess implementation of MGNREGA scheme in the project areas.

As per the MGNREGA norms, the job card holder's names are to be displayed publicly in any common public place or in the walls of the GP building. During investigation, it was found that except in the study areas of Rajasthan, in no other study areas, names of the job card holders were displayed in public places or in Panchayat Bhavan.

In Andhra Pradesh and Rajasthan, cent per cent/ (100%) families demanding job cards were able to get them. On the contrary in the state of Karnataka some very poor families were debarred from getting job cards for unknown reasons. In the southern states, job cards were found under the custody of the individuals, but in Rajasthan, job cards were under the disposal of the Mates. On inspection of the job cards, it was found that in Andhra Pradesh, there were no photographs pasted on the job cards. No such omissions were observed in the states of Rajasthan and Karnataka.

The PIAs in all the states were found casual in implementing the constitutionally framed demand-driven scheme that they dared to leave job cards without making updated entries and thereby

maintaining records of employment provided and wage paid to the job card holding families. Due to this, the individual beneficiaries expressed their inability to recall the exact number of days they worked and the respective payments against the work done. In Rajasthan, job cards were issued to the families in the name of male members; but in Andhra Pradesh and Karnataka, these cards were issued in the name of both men and women (even though the family head is male, just because of migration of the male members in Karnataka).

The study found that with PEARL project interventions, adequate number of functional CBOs was established by the NGO partners. Women representation in the CBOs ranged from 35 to 60% in southern states and 20 to 43% in Rajasthan. However, women participation rate in the MGNREGA scheme in Rajasthan was seen to be relatively higher in comparison to those of the Southern states. This is simply because the study areas of Rajasthan being adjacent to Gujarat, the rural workers (mostly youths) preferred migrating to nearby state to fetch more remunerative jobs than what is offered under MGNREGA. As the male members remain away from their villages, women are left to work under MGNREGS. It was also noticed that due to unavailability of male workers “beldars”, the MGNREGS work got delayed or could not be started in some places.

Generally, the job card entries were made at GP level by the Gram Sachiv after receiving the job measurement report from the Junior Engineer. Wage payment to the workers was normally delayed by 1 to 2 months; sometimes it is more than that. The delay in payment was reported to be more common in Rajasthan and Karnataka comparative to Andhra Pradesh.

Only in one sample village in Karnataka (Kalgona), the study found job seekers getting unemployment allowances after making genuine claims. Taking this as an example, new cases were also being filed for compensation by women groups. In Andhra Pradesh and Rajasthan, most of the stakeholders including the Sarpanch were found unaware about the provision of unemployment allowances for the workers who were not provided jobs within 15 days of their job applications. In AP, all the details of MGNREGS were written on the rear side of the job cards except the mention about claiming the unemployment allowances.

The study did not find any discrimination in wage rate between men and women. The wage rate was found to be higher outside the state of Karnataka and



Rajasthan unlike in Andhra Pradesh.

As mentioned earlier, there were gaps in entry of records in job cards in the three states of Karnataka, Andhra Pradesh and Rajasthan. Interestingly, in some places of Andhra Pradesh, job card entries for one year (2011) were made only for the social audit purpose mainly for specific works. The social audit must have the necessary teeth to handle such situations. Payments of wages were made through bank cash transfer in Karnataka and Rajasthan, while in AP; it was through biometric system for which the NGOs were hired to pay the payment through their community service provider at GP level.

#### Facilities at Worksites

As per the MGNREGA guidelines, the worksites should be provided with some basic facilities like drinking water, crèche (in case of five women workers having children below 6 years of age), first-aid box and shade. Except crèche, all other facilities (shed, drinking water, first aid kit) were being provided at work sites in Rajasthan. In Andhra Pradesh and Karnataka no such facilities were provided in the MGNREGA worksites. However, earlier there was a provision to depute a person in each worksite to provide drinking water to the MGNREGA workers in these two southern states for which the person got wage for one day. The workers, who seldom received per day wage equivalent to minimum wage rate for their work done on piece meal basis, objected on such arrangement and in course of time such practice was withdrawn. As against, present practice has been that each individual worker would bring drinking water on their own for which they would be eligible to claim one rupee per day. This claimed amount would be added in the wage rate.

#### Usefulness of the Assets Created

The assets through MGNREGA scheme were created

at two levels i.e. (i) at community level and (ii) at individual level. In cases where schemes were for individual benefits, the job card holders got wages against the work done in their own field and at the same time their lands or other assets like farm ponds and sanitary latrines were developed. The land development works had brought barren lands under cultivation, improved the soil moisture, crop production and reduced soil erosion. Creation of community level assets like drought proofing, provision of irrigation facilities, rural connectivity roads, water conservation and water harvesting, renovation of traditional water bodies, plantation, trenches along foot hills, etc had benefited not only the job card holders but also benefitted the entire village.

#### Functioning of the Vigilance Committee

Although there is a provision for constitution of Vigilance Committee (VC) at the GP/village level so as to keep constant vigil on the implementation of the MGNREGA work, there was conspicuous absence of any such VC in all the project areas of Karnataka, Andhra Pradesh and Rajasthan. The CAGs, labour unions/ VDCs / groups promoted by the NGOs monitor the MGNREGA scheme implementation. In Karnataka and Rajasthan, even the Government officials were not aware about such committee; whereas in Andhra Pradesh, VCs were formed but those remained on paper only and the individual beneficiaries were never made aware about these committees.

The NGO partners of the PEARL project areas in all the sample states could successfully promote Community Based Organisations (CBOs) to mobilize the beneficiaries for planning, work demand, measurement of work done, follow up for payments using RTI Act, participating in social audits, etc. In Karnataka, Labour Unions (Gramina Kuli Karmikara Sangham - GRAKOOS) as CBOs were formed in each

State	Individual assets	Community assets
Karnataka	Land Development owned by SC/ ST/OBC, Farm Ponds	Drought Proofing, Flood Control and Protection, Provision Of Irrigation Facilities, Rural Connectivity, Water Conservation and Water Harvesting, Renovation Of Traditional Water Bodies, Plantation, etc.
Andhra Pradesh	Land development, vermin-compost making, latrines, etc	Water harvesting structures like Check dams, ponds, Drainage lines, trenches along foot hills, etc
Rajasthan	Land levelling, irrigation wells, farm pond etc	Within and inter village road connectivity, check dam, trenches etc.



village. Each Sangha comprises 15-20 members from the Job Card holders with an Executive Body and functions like SHGs. Women members have equal participation in the Sanghas. The process includes regular meetings on the MGNREGS related issues (work demand, unemployment compensation, payments, etc.), noting down the discussions in the form of minutes, redressal of conflicts related to measurement of jobs, due payment of wages, etc. These CBOs were found active and their members were found to be assertive or vocal in raising their demands. The sanghas/groups at village/GP level formed a bigger platform called Federation at the PEARL Project area level. The minutes recorded states that they conduct regular meetings at village and federation levels. Recently one of the GRAKOOS made a case against the PIA in the Ombudsmen at district level about their delayed wage payment and 6 women members in the labour union filed a complaint under RTI Act about the delay in wage payment. The federation is in the initial stage and need handholding support for some time by the NGOs to make it self-reliant.

In Andhra Pradesh, the Adivasi Gram Abhivrudhi

Sangham were formed at village level and later formed as a federation at the PEARL project area in 2011 by the NGO partner. The village level CBOs were formed in the similar way followed in the state of Karnataka, but their meetings were not held regularly. There is a need to empower these CBOs to ensure their due roles and responsibilities to enable them to put their opinions in the Gram Sabha meetings on issues like planning for the generation of jobs, demand for work, correct payment for their work, update of job cards regularly and timely payment of wages.

No such V C was found functional in the state of Rajasthan. The PRI members and the government functionaries at the GP and block level said that each GP has Nigrani Samiti (VC) but the community was completely ignorant about this.

#### **Transparency and accountability**

The study found that in all the study areas of Karnataka, Andhra Pradesh and Rajasthan, transparency and accountability aspects were grossly ignored in implementation of MGNREGA schemes. As per the norm, the MGNREGA project sites should have

signboards/ Citizen Information Boards displaying details of the scheme. But, nowhere such signboards were found. Besides, transparency was not maintained anywhere through display of beneficiary names in any public places with number of working days of each beneficiary, updated job card entries, maintenance and display of muster rolls at GP level, etc. Regular monitoring of work executed by the Field Assistant and the concerned Engineer was never done by the PIA or its authorized agency. The mate and Junior Engineer, responsible for measuring the work done by the job card holders did measure the works in absence of workers who worked under the schemes, resulting into manipulations affecting the actual wage calculations. As per norm, muster rolls are to be maintained and kept open for inspection by the GS but it is not in practice anywhere.

Social audits are done on yearly basis for a specific scheme and not for all the schemes executed or being executed under MGNREGA in all the project states. The persons involved in the social audits were not qualified persons to gauge the progress and review the systems maintained under MGNREGA scheme implementation, monitoring, up-keeping of assets, etc. Such social audits conducted so far were taken up as casual routine tasks by the PIA and not as a genuine process to make the programme implementation transparent and accountable as mandated in the Act. To conduct social audit, the Gram Sabha is mandatory but it was found that the social audits were done with the presence of some job card holders, some concerned Government officials, Sarpanch and Gram Sachiv. In Rajasthan, the Government officials and PRI members reported that the social audits are done at an interval of 6 months but the communities are not aware of this. The existing procedure followed in conducting of social audit did not generate enough confidence among the community people to ensure their participation in making the MGNREGA scheme implementation transparent and accountable. It is evident from the inspection of job cards in AP that the job card entries were done just for maintaining formalities of conducting SAs for some particular schemes and not for the entire scheme being executed during a particular financial year.

### **Effects on Migration**

Migration of labour from one area to another within a region, state, country is always a welcome feature as long as it is not distress migration, i.e. migration under compulsion. However such distress migration is possible when there is food insecurity and non availability of employment locally, in such case the victim families opt for migration as solution for better

economic opportunities in a new area. One of the primary objectives of the MGNREGA has been to put a check on distress migration of rural poor that upset their socio-economic conditions and make them most vulnerable.

Interestingly, the study witnessed a decreasing trend in the migration of workers in the study areas especially after the work initiated under MGNREGA. However, the pace of decrease in the incidence of distress migration among the adult and youth members of MV families has been relatively less in Rajasthan than the states of Karnataka and Andhra Pradesh. It was noticed that in Andhra Pradesh, migration of MV families is prominent as they (mostly tribal families) supplement their income from forest resources unlike Karnataka and Rajasthan where migration of the adult members of the MV families has been an ongoing phenomenon. While the workers of Karnataka mostly migrate to Mangalore or Goa, the workers of Rajasthan migrate to neighboring Gujarat state. Change in the feature of migration was noticed during the study. In earlier times i.e. before execution of MGNREGA, the entire MV family used to migrate under compulsion, while now only a small number of youth/adult male members migrate for a few months to get better economic opportunities. Migration also has bearing on effective decentralized planning in the area.

On food security question, the study found that MV families are food secured for at least three to four months in a year with the help of locally available resources and after that they need to look for additional labour work to ensure food security for rest of the months. Food insecurity of the MV families in Karnataka and Rajasthan was found to be more severe for having very limited or no farm landholdings (most of such lands were either barren or infertile) compared to those in Andhra Pradesh who owned more quantum of productive farmlands.

Overall, observation of the study has been that distress migration has been gradually declining and improvement in general economic conditions of the family has been gradually improving. Earlier, during lean seasons, more than one family member or the entire family had to migrate. After introduction of MGNREGA, only one/two member/s of the MV families was seen migrating for gainful employment. Migration of the MV families can be checked further if it is ensured that jobs and payments are available in right time.

### **Gender Responsiveness**

MGNREGA scheme is unique for its gender responsiveness as it mandates participation of women workers to be at least one-third of the workers who

are provided jobs under the MGNREGS. The Act also provide some explicit entitlements for women to realise wages equal to men for equal work done, to participate in management and monitoring of the programme, participate in social audit, etc. Undoubtedly, the scheme has been able to mobilise women in large numbers, as they find the scheme to earn supplementary income directly and support their families in meeting critical financial needs.

In the study areas, although it was reported that the women also took part in developing the micro plans nevertheless their numbers were limited. In most of the villages, the female work participation was found to be above 60%. The study found that in the CBOs promoted under PEARL project for effective implementation of MGNREGSs, the women participation and their lead role in work demand, raising voice for delay payment, etc was noticeable.

The study noticed that in the states of Rajasthan and Karnataka, jobs under MGNREGA were preferred by women because jobs were available within their reach, besides they could perform those jobs managing their household works. However, women's involvement in MGNREGA was found to be more as workers and not as executors. In Karnataka and Andhra Pradesh, some women were found working in the capacity of "mates". The study further observed that income through MGNREGA has lessened their economic dependency upon their male counterparts; and it has improved their saving capacity (eg. Kesaria SHG – Ujarkhera, Rajasthan). Moreover, it has helped developing a sense of security among the women whose male members migrate to other places.

#### **Role of NGOs/CBOs**

The study found that the CBOs promoted by the partner NGOs have excellently performed in mobilizing communities and doing vigilance activity of the MGNREGA scheme. All the NGOs have done micro-plans, however, follow up actions for their applications at the ground level and synergies with Government line departments were limited. Awareness generation programmes of the NGO partners through CBOs have created enabling environment for implementation of MGNREGA scheme. There is still a need for handholding support to the CBOs created under PEARL programme which enable the individuals/groups to access their rights and entitlements under MGNREGS.

#### **OVERALL OBSERVATIONS**

- There has been a visible impact of MGNREGA scheme implementation in terms of enhancement of livelihood opportunities (through job and asset creations) of the MV families/population.
- There has been a positive trend towards decline of the incidence of distress migration, although very slowly.
- There has been a drastic improvement in the rural society in terms of eliminating absolute poverty and hunger situations. Government's safety net (social and livelihood security) programmes have greater role in removing hunger situations from our rural scene
- With the implementation of MGNREGA, minimum wage rate for the agriculture wage labourers even in private jobs has increased everywhere
- Traditional land-man relation that was against the interests of the vulnerable population has been transforming in favour of the vulnerable population.
- Sense of dignity of labour as well as living standards of the poor have been gradually elevating and/or improving.
- Agriculture wage labourers are gradually coming out from the evil influences of the big land owners and mahajans (who had been maintaining their dominance in rural society and economy until recently)
- The poor agriculture labourers have started rejoicing the essence of freedom (in terms of bargaining for their wages, time of work, etc), value of democratic rights by registering their unwillingness/grievances before the exploitative forces operating in the rural areas
- Women participation in development activities in rural areas has been gradually increasing. Income through MGNREGA has lessened women's economic dependency upon their male counterparts. Besides, it has improved their saving capacity (eg. Kesaria SHG – Ujarkhera).
- Sense of security among the migrant families as even in the absence of male members, women could manage the family with the help of earnings through MGNREGA jobs.

#### **CONCLUDING REMARKS**

On the basis of the above analysis, following concluding remarks have been made:

Schemes under MGNREGA are really beneficial for the MV families (especially for the adult women members) in improving their livelihood status by



providing them opportunities to earn subsidiary income to meet critical financial needs for which they were kept under bondage of the landlord-mahajan (traditional moneylenders) nexus. Effective implementation of the Act can be more fruitful in improving the living conditions of the MV families.

For effective implementation of MGNREGA schemes, there is need to have a fair play between the stakeholders acting in the demand and supply side. CBOs (formed under any responsible NGO) have a very positive role in empowering the adult/youth members of the job card holding families, especially the women members (through various sensitization programmes), ensuring their participation in the MGNREGA schemes, effective monitoring through conducting of social audit, producing quality assets and their uses and maintenance, sensitizing the service providers (PRI representatives, Government functionaries, etc) as well as pressurising them (through CBOs) to maintain

transparency and accountability.

Role of sincere NGOs is inevitable not only for effective implementation of the MGNREGA scheme which is demand driven, but also in creating and enabling an environment for the same.

The MV families could support their living for about three months through locally available means. For the rest nine months, they required livelihood support. If, MGNREGA scheme is planned/arranged in such a way that each family would get at least 10-15 days of employment in a month for nine months on a regular basis (from August to April) that means a supplementary income of about Rs.1500 per family per month. If these families are supported by food and social security programmes, then there would be no reason why the rural society would not be able to witness transformation towards an equitable and just society.



## CHAPTER FOUR

# Way Forward

Based on the field studies and interaction with different players under MGNREGS, the recommendations would be envisioned at two levels which include:

### EXECUTION LEVEL

Community / CBOs need to be sensitized and capacitated to enable them to demand for jobs applying right based approach and catalyze the provision of MGNREGA as per its statutory norms.

- Community should envision MGNREGA as a means for village development program and not merely as an employment generating/wage earning program
- Schemes under MGNREGA need to be planned as per the labour demand calendar, which is to be prepared taking the seasonal activities of the labourers into consideration. Yearly labour management plan need to be developed by the wage seekers/CBOs and it should be integrated and verified with the decentralized plans about the labour demand.
- Participation of the community villagers need to be assured in preparing holistic Village Development Plan with an Integrated Area Approach (asset creation vis-à-vis labour plan). These approaches would be different from tribal to coastal and other plain areas.
- Leadership qualities should be developed among the women members to create pressure on the implementing agencies to involve them in planning and monitoring of the programmes and also to maintain transparency and accountability.
- Wage payment is done through Biometric system through deploying NGO services as Customer

Service Provider (CSP) which is in practice in Andhra Pradesh. The same system should be introduced in all the states for quick and transparent service delivery.

### POLICY LEVEL

There is an urgent need to develop strong institutional arrangement to ensure proper implementation of the provisions under MGNREGA especially on the following issues:

- Adequate trained human resources need to be deployed at all the PRI levels.
- Data base management information systems at GP level to track the job work and the labour management process should be developed.
- Actions should be taken for introducing an effective grievance redressal mechanism for immediate mitigation related to job measurement, wage payment, claims of unemployment allowances, etc.
- Last but not least, the MGNREGA scheme should be redesigned to cover at least harvesting activities in the farm fields of the marginal and small farmers.

# Selected References

- Birner, R. k. Gayathridevi, k.G, Raabe, E. Schiffer, and M. Sekhar, 'how to Overcome the Governance Challenges of Implementing NREGA', Discussion Paper 00963, International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI), 2010.
- Dreze, J. R. khera, and Siddhartha, 'Orissa: Ten Loopholes and the Silver Lining', in *The Battle for Employment Guarantee*, ed. R. khera, New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2011, pp. 187–201.
- Dutta, P. R. Murgai, M. Ravallion, and W. V. Dominique, 'Does India's Employment Guarantee Scheme Guarantee Employment?', Policy Research Paper, Washington DC: World Bank, 2012.
- Indira Hirway, "Enhancing Livelihood Security through the National Employment Guarantee Act Toward Effective Implementation of the Act", Working Paper No. 437; Center For Development Alternatives, Ahmedabad, India and The Levy Economics Institute, Annandale-on-Hudson, NY 12504-5000, 2006
- Indira Hirway, M. R. Saluja, and B. Yadav, 'Analysing Multiplier Impact of NREGA Works through Village SAM Modeling', in *National Rural Employment Guarantee Act: Design, Process and Impact*, New Delhi: Ministry of Rural Development, 2009.
- Indumatib S. and P. M. Srikantha, 'Economic Analysis of MGNREGA in the Drought-prone States of Karnataka, Rajasthan and Irrigation-dominated State', *Agricultural Economics Research Review*, vol. 24, 2011, pp. 531–6.
- Johnson, D. 'Can Workfare Serve as a Substitute for Weather Insurance? The Case of NREGA in Andhra Pradesh', Working Paper 32, Chennai: Institute of Financial Management and Research (IFMC), 2009.
- Ministry of Rural Development, Government of India, 'MGNREGA Sameeksha, An Anthology of Research Studies on the Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act, 2005, 2006–2012', edited and compiled by Mihir Shah, Neelakshi Mann and Varad Pande, New Delhi: Orient BlackSwan, 2012.
- Nair K. N., T. P. Sreedharan, and M. Anoopkumar, 'A Study of National Rural Employment Guarantee Programme in Three Gram Panchayats of kasargod District', Thiruvananthapuram: Centre for Development Studies, 2009.
- Pranati Gogoi Hazarika, 'Promoting Women Empowerment and Gender Equality through the Right To Decent Work: Implementation of National Rural Employment Guarantee Program (NREGP) in Assam State (India) – A Case Study', Graduate School of Development Studies (in partial fulfilment of the requirements for obtaining the degree of master of Arts in Development Studies), The Hague, The Netherlands, 2009
- Shah M., et al., *India's Drylands: Tribal Societies and Development through Environmental Regeneration*, New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1998.
- Shah T. S. Verma, R. Indu, and P. Hemant, 'Asset Creation through Employment Guarantee?: Synthesis of Student Case Studies in Nine states of India', International Water Management Institute (IWMI), 2010.
- Sudarshan R. M., 'Examining India's National Regional Employment Guarantee Act: Its Impact and Women's Participation', New Delhi: Institute of Social Studies Trust (ISST), 2009.
- Timothy R. Frankenberger, et.al. 'Operationalizing Household Livelihood Security: A Holistic Approach for Addressing Poverty and Vulnerability', 2004.
- Vaidya C. S., and R. Singh, 'Impact of NREGA on Wage Rate, Food Security and Rural Urban Migration in Himachal. Shimla: Agro-economic Research Centre. Report submitted to the Ministry of Agriculture, 2011.
- Vatta K., D. K. Grover and T. Grover, 'Impact of NREGA on Wage Rates, Food Security and Rural Urban Migration in Punjab', Report submitted to Ministry of Agriculture, Ludhiana: Agro-Economic Research Centre, Punjab Agriculture University, 2011.



# Research Tools

## LANDLESS FAMILY IN-DEPTH INTERVIEW

Name  
Address  
No of family  
Education  
Caste / religion  
Family size  
House type  
Family Occupation

### Planning

- How the schemes under the MGNREGA are selected?
- Did you participate in that selection process, if not why?
- If yes, besides you, who else attended the meeting?
- Was your voice heard in that meeting?

### Process

- Have you got employment under MGNREGA Scheme?
- What did you do in getting the employment?
- Who mobilized / informed you about the process of getting employment?
- Have you demanded jobs individually or with a group?
- What was the time period between getting job/ employment and the work demanded?

### Implementation

- How many women members got job cards
- How did you receive your job card?
- Does your job card include all the eligible members of your family? If no why?
- Who keeps your job card?
- Do you ever check the job card – No. of days worked and Payment for the work performed?
- How many times/days have you actually worked under MGNREGA during the last/current year?

- Who make the entries in the job card and when?
- How the payment is made?
- Was the payment done on time?
- If delayed, how much time generally taken?
- Do you see any difference in the wage rate in MGNREGA and outside locally available unskilled jobs?
- How many times claimed unemployment allowances?

### Facilities at site

- What are the facilities you avail/availed in the work site during your work (drinking water, crèches for children, shelter, first aid etc)?
- Is there any facility for women?

### Usefulness of the asset

- What are the various types of assets created through MGNREGA scheme in your GP/village?
- Do you think the assets created are of good qualities and are of any use to you?
- Or are you able to use those assets? If not who else are using, and why you are not using?

### Vigilance Committee

- Who looks after / monitor the work under MGNREGA?
- If there is any Vigilance Committee to monitor the MGNREGA scheme?
- Who are the members of that Vigilance Committee?
- What is the role of the Vigilance Committee in monitoring the MGNREGA scheme?

### Transparency and accountability

- How the progress / quality of the work under MGNREGA is reviewed?
- Have you participated in any such review process?
- Do women also participate in such review meeting?

**Food Security**

- What is your main source of livelihood?
- What are the difficult period/months in terms of food availability in your family?
- What are the coping mechanisms to address this difficulty?
- Has it changed after the MGNREGA program?
- Is the work under MGNREGA available during the food crisis period/lean season?

**Migration**

- Have you ever migrated?
- For what duration?
- Is there any change in the migration pattern like duration, place or number of people migrating, etc?
- Is continuity with regard to providing work enough to check migration?

**SARPANCH IN-DEPTH INTERVIEW****Planning**

- How the scheme under the MGNREGA are identified/decided/chosen in your Gram Panchayat?– What process is followed in identification of the scheme, like Gram Sabha/Ward Sabha Meetings/ group meeting, micro plan, scheme suiting vulnerable family need etc?
- Do you participate in that process, if not why?
- Who are the people (other than the prospective beneficiaries) who attend the meeting (SHG, youth Club, Farmers Club, PRI representatives, block officials, women, person with disability etc)?
- How frequent is the Gram Sabha meeting held in the GP?

**Process**

- What are the processes adopted to generate the work under MGNREGA?
- Who mobilize / inform the beneficiaries about the process of generating employment?
- Is the work demanded by the beneficiaries individually or in group or in both ways?
- What is the time lag between the jobs demanded and jobs actually provided?

**Implementation**

- What proportions of eligible beneficiaries have job cards in your GP?
- Whether the lists of job card holders are displayed in public place/ Panchayat Bhavan?
- Have you ever observed any discrepancy in job card entries?
- How is the wage payment made?

- What proportion of eligible women members get job cards?
- Is there any difference in wage rate between men and women?
- What proportion of women members are there in different CBOs?
- Is the wage payment done on time?
- If delayed, how much time is generally taken?
- Do you see any difference in the wage rate between jobs under MGNREGA and locally available jobs outside MGNREGA? If so, why?
- How many times have unemployment allowances been claimed/paid?
- Is everyone having job cards getting work under MGNREGA?
- If not – why (not interested or complicated, or not available or any other reason)?

**Facilities at site**

- What are the facilities provided to the workers in the project sites (drinking water, crèches for children, shade, first aid etc)?
- Is there any facility for women?

**Usefulness of the asset**

- What are the various types of assets created in the GP under MGNREGA?
- Do you think the assets created are quality assets and are these of any use to the community?
- Who are the people (section/category/women) actually using the assets?

**Vigilance Committee**

- Who looks after/monitors the work under MGNREGA?
- Is there any vigilance committee formed for monitoring the work?
- Who are the members of the vigilance committee (women, PWDs)?
- What is the role of the VC in monitoring the work?
- What is your role in facilitating the task of monitoring the MGNREGA work through Vigilance Committee?

**Transparency and accountability**

- How is the progress / quality of the work under MGNREGA reviewed?
- Who participates in the review process?
- Do women also participate?
- Have you ever attended the review meetings?
- Is social audit conducted? For what purpose?
- Have you ever used the RTI for getting any information?

### **Migration**

- Do people migrate from your GP?
- Who migrates? How many families/individual workers migrate and for what duration?
- Is there any change in the migration pattern, like; duration, place or number of people who migrates etc after MGNREGS are implemented?
- Is continuity of the work under MNREGS enough to check migration?

### **CBOs/ COMMUNITY / GRAM SABHA - FOCUSED GROUP DISCUSSION**

- Introduction of the participants/resource persons.
- Composition of the participants- age, sex, caste, education, etc.
- Venue of the meeting- complete address.
- Name and designation of the resource persons.
- Type of CBO - Name, members, objective, etc.
- Testing of conceptual clarity/understanding of PEARL and MGNREGA- objective, planning, implementation, monitoring/review process, entitlements of beneficiaries, responsibilities of different stakeholders, etc; whether demand drove participatory approach?

### **Planning**

- How the scheme under the MGNREGA are planned/ identified/ selected/chosen – what process is followed in identification of the scheme, like Gram Sabha/Ward Sabha Meetings/ group meeting, micro plan, scheme suiting to vulnerable family need etc?
- Was there any involvement of the NGOs/CBOs in the process?
- What steps were adopted to mobilize to ensure participation of the excluded and most vulnerable section of the community in the planning process of MGNREGA in the PEARL project area?
- Who, other than beneficiaries, attend the MGNREGA scheme selection meeting (SHG, youth Club, Farmers Club, PRI representatives, block officials, women, person with disability etc)?
- How frequently the Gram Sabha meetings are held in the GP?

### **Process**

- What process is adopted in ensuring community participation in executing the schemes under MGNREGA at all stages?
- Who mobilize/inform the beneficiaries about the process of generating employment?
- Is the work demanded by the beneficiaries individually or in group or in both ways?
- What is the time lag between the jobs demanded and

jobs actually provided under?

- Implementation
- What various interventions have been made to ensure quality execution of MGNREGA scheme/ programs (building capacity of the Community, micro plan development, demand generation, quality of work, participation of vulnerable groups, payment mode and time, work site arrangements / facilities, social audit, etc)?
- How do you track the regular participation of the MVFs/women in the MGNREGA implementation?
- What are the common problems/issues observed in the implementation of MGNREGA in your area?
- What actions were/are being taken at your end/or through the CBOs to address those problems?
- Is there any discrimination in the wage rate for women?
- What proportion of women members are there in different CBOs?
- Do you see any difference in the wage rate between jobs under MGNREGA and locally available jobs outside MGNREGA? If so, why?

### **Usefulness of the asset**

- What are the various types of assets created in the GP under MGNREGA?
- Do you think the assets created are of good qualities? Are these assets of any use to the most vulnerable community?
- Who are the people (section/category/women) actually using the assets?
- Vigilance Committee
- Who looks after/ monitor the works under MGNREGA?
- If their any Vigilance Committee to look after the MGNREGA schemes implementation?
- Who are the members of the Vigilance Committee (women, PWDs)?
- What is the role of the Vigilance Committee?
- What is your role in monitoring the work under Vigilance Committee?

### **Transparency and accountability**

- How is the progress / quality of the work under MGNREGA reviewed?
- Who participate in the review process?
- Do women/members of MVC also participate?
- How many of you attended the review meeting? Show by raising your hands.
- Is social audit conducted? What is the purpose of SA?

### **Migration**

- Do people belonging to vulnerable section of community migrate from the GP?

- Who migrate? What proportion of MV families/ workers migrate and for what duration?
- Is there any change in the migration pattern, like duration, place or number of migrant people etc after MGNREGSs are implemented in PEARL project area?
- Is continuity of work under MGNREGS is enough to check migration?

### Capacity building

- What inputs did you receive from the NGOs in getting conceptual clarity, developing understanding, planning, implementation, monitoring and review the MGNREGA Scheme?
- How frequently the NGO organises meetings of the CBOs for effective implementation of MGNREGA?
- Have you identified any most vulnerable family/ families in your locality that are not yet covered or not able to avail the benefits of MGNREGA?
- What efforts are being taken at your end to mobilize these families to link them with MGNREGA scheme?
- What are the main factors responsible for these MVFs for not availing/linking with the MGNREGA scheme?
- As per your opinion, what are the common problems/challenges faced by the beneficiaries in accessing the benefits of MGNREGA?
- What are the major challenges faced by the CBO in executing MGNREGA scheme?
- Any suggestions to improve the quality of implementation of MGNREGA with particular reference to generation of various types of assets, their qualities and utilisation of those assets by the MVFs?

### Information from Partner NGOs:

Name and address of the Partner NGO

Project Location of the NGO- Name of district/ block, villages/Panchayats covered, etc

Name of GP covered (April, 2011 – March, 2012 and April, 2012 – Dec, 2012) under PEARL

1. Total households in the GPs
2. BPL & APL Families in the GPs
3. Total number of families in the GPs eligible for job cards
4. Actual number of Job cards issued to the families / registered
5. Male and female job card status (gaps between eligible households and job card holders)
6. Social category wise Job Card holding families – SC/ ST/OBC/Others
7. Number of man-days work generated from 2009 to 2012 year wise

8. Social category wise employment generated – SC/ ST/OBC/Others from 2009 to 2012 year wise
9. Funds received during 2009 to 2012 year wise
10. Fund utilized (man-days + materials) 2009 to 2012 year wise
11. Types of assets created
12. Number of social audits conducted year and activity wise
13. Any facilitation for application of RTI in securing better implementation, transparency, maintaining accountability, etc
14. Any successful/unsuccessful story
15. How PEARL project has helped facilitating the MGNREGA implementation in the area?

### MATE IN-DEPTH INTERVIEW

- What are the various tasks you performed under MGNREGA?
- How are the job cards updated?
- What is your role in updating the job cards and other necessary records?
- How frequently is the job card updated?
- What are the various documents you maintain?

### MVF NOT USING MGNREGA IN-DEPTH INTERVIEW

- Location – village/tola/mohalla/GP/Block/District/ State, etc.
- Introduction – family members, education, caste/ religion, family occupation, etc.
- Are you or anybody of your family a member of the CBOs formed under PEARL project? If yes, then do you attend the CBO meetings? If not, why?
- What is your main source of livelihood?
- Do you get employment in that occupation/ livelihood all through the year or you opt for other occupations also? If yes, then what are those occupations?
- Do you migrate? Whole family or individually? Migrate for what period?
- Have you ever heard about MGNREGA scheme? (From whom?)
- If yes, have you ever participated in any PEARL programme meeting or capacity building program on MGNREGA? If attended, were you been invited or you attended just by chance?
- Do you have job card? If no, why?
- If no, who keeps your job card?
- Have you ever worked under MGNREGA? If yes, then for what period and which year? If never then

why – explore?

- Why did you discontinue working under MGNREGA? Explore on the reason.
- Do you find any difficulty in procuring jobs under MGNREGA?
- Can MGNREGA provide you solution to the job and livelihood insecurity of your family? If no, why?

## **NGO REPRESENTATIVES IN-DEPTH INTERVIEW**

### **Capacity building**

- What inputs/interventions have you provided to the community/CBOs under PEARL programme with regard to planning, implementation, monitoring and review of MGNREGA scheme?
- How frequently were the meetings of different stakeholders organised for effective implementation of MGNREGA?
- Have you identified any most vulnerable family/ies not availing benefits of MGNREGA in your locality?
- If yes, what efforts were/are being taken at your end to mobilize these families to link them with MGNREGA scheme?
- What are the main factors responsible for these MVFs for not availing/linking with the MGNREGA scheme?
- What are the various types of documents you could develop that carries evidences of effective implementation of MGNREGA scheme in PEARL project areas?

### **Planning**

- How are the schemes under the MGNREGA identified/decided/chosen in your Gram Panchayat?– What process is followed in identification of the scheme, like Gram Sabha/Ward Sabha Meetings/ group meeting, micro plan, schemes suiting vulnerable family need etc?
- What kind of involvement of the NGOs/ CBOs was there in the process?
- What measures were adopted to mobilize the excluded and most vulnerable section of the community to ensure their participation in MGNREGA scheme selection process?
- Who, other than the beneficiaries, attended the scheme selection meeting (SHG, youth Club, Farmers Club, PRI representatives, block officials, women, person with disability etc)?
- How frequently the Gram Sabha meeting is held in the GP.

### **Process**

- Who mobilized / informed the beneficiary families to involve them into the process of getting employment under MGNREGA?
- Was the work demanded by the beneficiary families individually or in group/s or mobilized through NGO?
- What was the normal time gap between the period of job application and job procurement?

### **Implementation**

- What are the various interventions made by the NGO to ensure quality execution of MGNREGA scheme (building capacity of the CBO, Micro plan development, demand generation, quality of work, participation of vulnerable groups, payment mode and time, work site arrangements / facilities, social audit, etc)?
- What are the common problems/issues observed in the implementation of MGNREGA in your area?
- What action is being taken at your end/or through the CBOs to address those problems?
- Is there any difference in wage rate between men and women under MGNREGS?
- What proportion of women members are there in different CBOs?
- Do you see any difference in the wage rate in between jobs under MGNREGA and locally available Jobs outside MGNREGA? If so why?

### **Usefulness of the asset**

- What are the various types of assets created in the GP under MGNREGA?
- Do you think the assets created are quality assets and these are of any use to the most vulnerable community?
- Who are the people (section/category/women) actually using the assets?

### **Vigilance Committee**

- Who looks after/monitor the progress of work under MGNREGA?
- If there are any Vigilance Committee to look after/ monitor the progress of work under MGNREGA?
- Who are the members of that Vigilance Committee (women, PWDs)?
- What is the role of the VC?
- What is your role in organizing Vigilance Committee meetings and monitoring the MGNREGA work?

### **Transparency and accountability**

- How the progress/quality of the work under MGNREGA reviewed?

- Who participates in that review process?
- Do women also participate?
- Have you ever attended that process?
- Is social audit conducted? If yes, how frequently?

#### Migration

- Do the labour class people migrate from the GP?
- Who migrate? How many families/individual workers migrate and for what duration?
- Is there any change in the migration pattern, like; duration, place or number of people who migrate etc

- after MGNREGS are implemented?
- Is continuity of the work provided under MGNREGS enough to check migration?
- What are the common problems/challenges you have faced in course of implementation of MGNREGA?
- Any suggestions to improve the quality of implementation of MGNREGA, particularly with regard to the type of scheme selection and participation of MVE.

## ANNEXURES

# Persons Interacted/ Interviewed

### (I) KARNATAKA STATE

#### MV Families

#### Hiramagi GP

1. Chennava Hanumappa
2. Mrs. Kenchmma w/o Basan Gouda
3. Mautappa Huligavya Chelewada- Devadasi
4. Mrs. Ellava Holuyva Madar
5. Savitramma Parsappa Karannawar

#### Chittaragi GP

1. Mr. Hanumappa Buddappa Gonal
2. Mrs. Rekha Bhimappa Talavara
3. Mrs. Renuka Sangappa Chilwadi
4. Mrs. Dyamavva Yamunavva Madar
5. Mrs. Laxmi

#### Grakoos

1. Sree Beeralingeswara Union.
2. Annadaneswara
3. Marteswara
4. Federation of GRAKOOS

#### Mates

1. Mr.Durgappa Yamunavva (Pujari)
2. Mr. Sivappa Kariappa Balagoud.
3. Mrs. Prema Basappa Lagali
4. Mrs. Nagamma Sangappa Vaddaru

#### Others

1. Mr.Ramanna Prakasappa Gotur - Hiramagi GP - Gram sachivs
2. Mr.Sivanand M Kotennar - Panchayat Development Officer
3. Mrs. Renuka Balappa Chilwadi – Sarpanch
4. Mr. V.B. Hiremath, Assistant Director, (Rural Employment) – Block Level

### (II) ANDHRA PRADESH

#### Seethampeta GP

1. Mrs. Savara Mangamma
2. Mr.Savara Ananda Rao
3. Mr. Biddaka Balaji
4. Mr.Biddika Laxmana Rao

#### Peda Rama GP

1. Mrs. Savara Appalamma
2. Mr. Savara Venkata Rao
3. Savara Samburu
4. Mrs. Tadangi Pentamma
5. Mr. Kurangi Appanna

#### Others

1. Mr. Savara Bhaskara Rao – Ex Sarpanch, Peda Rama
2. Mrs. Damayanti Naidu, Ex- Sarpanch, Seethampeta
3. Mr. Vijaya Venkata Rao, EO, P& RD, Seethampeta Mandalam



