



# PLAN MONITORING AND EVALUATION OF HAMIRPUR DISTRICT IN HIMACHAL PRADESH

**Dr. Vinod Kumar**

Assistant Professor. Sociology.

Vallabh Government College Mandi. Himachal Pradesh 175001. India.

Email: vinodkrmd@gmail.com

**Abstract:** Every development plan needs to be periodically reviewed for progress or regress, and prompt re-adjustment are necessary to achieve the plan targets. Continuous appraisal of the plan may be done at all the levels, overall sectors regional or local. "Its main purpose is to ascertain from time to time what ever the pace of progress is being maintained or not and to take steps, with in its resources and responsibilities, to correct the situation where it is not satisfactory" . Such appraisal would enable the government departments to decide the concrete steps it should take to achieve the desired objectives. "For the efficient implementation of a plan there should be purposeful control systems for individual projects and these should be appropriately linked up with budget control as well as with over all control of plan implementation. In the present research paper analyze plan monitoring and evaluation system of Hamirpur District in Himachal Pradesh.

**Key Words:** Reviewed, Appraisal, Achieve, Convening Monitoring and Evaluation.

## 1. INTRODUCTION:

Planning would be ineffective without proper implementation and this aspect is one of the weakest link in the India Planning system. Our plans stem from the national and state Capitals while it is to be implemented at the district, blocks and villages. There lower levels which are the operating ones and on which depends the ultimate success of failure of the experiment are only superficially involved in the process of planning. District level Review Committee constituted for each district under the chairmanship of the Deputy Commissioner. A mid-year review is also taken to effect diversion in outlays within and without the earmarked sector. For this purpose one statistical assistant and one computer have been provided to every district statistical officer expect in the district, who is also designated as Member Secretary of the District level review committee.

## 2. District Planning, Development and 20-point programme Review Committee:

This programme was introduced in the year 1993-94. Under this programme, united funds are allocated to the districts of non-tribal areas, on a formula of 60% on the basis of population and 40% percent on the basis of geographical area. The schemes of local importance and missing links in budget are identified by the local planners. The DC concerned is, required to get the works approved from the District Planning, Development and 20-point programme review committee.

### Plan Evaluation and Monitoring at the District level:

Every development plan needs to be periodically reviewed for progress or regress, and prompt re-adjustment are necessary to achieve the plan targets. Continuous appraisal of the plan may be done at all the levels, overall sectors regional or local. "Its main purpose is to ascertain from time to time what ever the pace of progress is being maintained or not and to take steps, with in its resources and responsibilities, to correct the situation where it is not satisfactory" . Such appraisal would enable the government departments to decide the concrete steps it should take to achieve the desired objectives. "For the efficient implementation of a plan there should be purposeful control systems for individual projects and these should be appropriately linked up with budget control as well as with over all control of plan implementation.



**District Level:**

The planning machinery at the district level is headed by the chief planning Officer. The ADC/ADM of the district has been exotica designated at the chief planning officer. He is assisted by a chief planning officer and the assistant researcher officers and the supporting staff. The district planning set up was created in the mid- eighties and has continued as such. The district planning cells are engaged in the preparation of shelf of scheme at the decentralized level, to maintain the record of all the plan need schemes of the department after approval of the budget for review, implementation and monitoring of funds provided and LDP MPLADS, SDP backward Area sub plan as well as convening the meeting of district planning development and 20 point programme review committees. In these meetings, the place of the expenditure. Level of development achieved through implementation of a scheme and decentralized are reviewed and thereafter the DCs and other exclusive agencies ensure taking up corrective measure from time to time.

**District planning development and twenty point programme review Committee:-**

These committees have been constituted to review the implementation of the twenty point programme and other development programme Viz. (DP VMJS, MPLADS and decentralized sectoral planning etc. the committee is headed by the minister from the district and has its member the MP representing the district all the MLAs, other prominent public men, representatives of various interest group like SCs, STs, women OBCs, all the district level officers and the additional DC/ ADM as its members, in his capacity as the chief planning officers of the district. These committees are required to meet once in every quarters and apart from the required role of review, it is also required to approve the scheme under the LDP VMJS and sectoral decentralized planning. Opinion of the political leaders and officers and non beneficiaries and beneficiaries regarding the monitoring and evaluation programme.

**Table- 1.1**  
**All the members effective participate in the discussion in DPDC**

<b>Response</b>	<b>Officers</b>	<b>Leaders</b>
Yes	7 (46.6%)	10 (50%)
No	8 (53.3%)	10 (50%)
Total	15 (100%)	20 (100%)

This table shows that 46.6% officers and 50% leaders replied that all members effectively participated in the discussion of the DPDC. 53.3% officers and 50% leaders opposed this. This table shows that majority of officers and leaders have the opinion that all members are not effectively participate in the discussion of the DPDC.

**Table-1.2**  
**Plays significant role in DPDC**

Chairman DPDC	3 (20%)	0 0%
MLA's	5 (33%)	1 (5%)
Member Secretary of DPDC	2 (13.3%)	12 (60%)
All	5 (33.3%)	7 (35%)
Total	15 (100%)	20 (100%)

This table shows that outcome of the query regarding the members who plays a significant role in DPDC. Only 20% officer replied that an important role was played by the chairman of the DPDC. 33.3% officers and 5% leaders respondents that the MLAs of the DPDC and 13.3% officers and 60% leaders stated that the member Secretary of DPDC was important, 33.3% officers and 35% leaders responded that the chairman of DPDC, MLAs, member Secretary, meaning thereby had an important role in DPDC, the main reason gives for their important role of DPDC was that the members concerned evinced Knowledge, responsibility and interest in development matters.



**Table-1.3**

**The transfer of planning function to DPDC has adversely autonomy of Panchayati Raj**

Response	Officers	Leaders
Yes	5 (33.3%)	4 (20%)
No	9 (60%)	11 (55%)
Not improved	1 (6.67%)	5 (25%)
Total	15 (100%)	20 (100%)

The panchayati Raj institution had been created to facilities the planning function. With the transfer of planning cell to the collectorate we wanted to know whether the autonomy of the Panchayati raj institutions was adversely affected. As much as 60% officers 55% leaders said it had not affected, while only 33.3% officers and 20% leaders stated that it had been adversely affected. We may concluded that majority of respondents felt that the planning function of DPDC has not adversely affected autonomy of panchayati Raj

**Attitude of general public towards Poverty Alleviation programmes and Panchayati Raj institution**

The general public toward poverty alleviation programmers and Panchayati raj institution. The general public regarding the role of PRIs in the implementation of poverty alleviation programmers were collected by circulating a structured questionnaire to 200 respondents non beneficiaries and 200 respondents beneficiaries among the general public, the responses thus collected are presented in subsequent tables.

**Table-1.4**

Response	Hamirpur Block	Bhoranj Block
	Non-Beneficiaries	Non-Beneficiaries
Proper	53 (53%)	42 (42%)
Not proper	27 (27%)	40 (40%)
No opinion	20 (20%)	18 (18%)
Total	100 (100%)	100 (100%)

It is evident from the analysis of the table 1.4 that majority, 53% Hamirpur block and 42% Bhoranj Block of the respondents, that is a among general public were of the opinion that identification of the BPL families was proper, only 27% Hamirpur Block and 40% Bhoranj Block respondents were of the opinion that identification of the BPL families was not proper. However, 20% hamirpur and 18% Bhoranj Block respondents did not express their opinion. On the basis of the table, it can be concluded that the identification of BPL families is upto the mark.

**Asset creation by Gram Panchayats:**

The opinion respondents with regard to quality of assets created by gram panchayats is presented in table 1.5.

**Table -1.5**

Response	Hamirpur Block	Bhoranj Block
	Non-Beneficiaries	Non-Beneficiaries
Very Good	8 (8%)	12 (12%)
Good	42 (42%)	25 (25%)
Average	35 (35%)	51 (51%)
Poor	15 (15%)	12 (12%)



Total	100 (100%)	100 (100%)
-------	---------------	---------------

Regarding quality of assets creation by the Gram panchayats. Majority of the respondents 35% of Hamirpur Block and 51% of Bhoranj Block were of the opinion that the assets created by the Gram panchayats are of average quality, followed by 42% Hamirpur Block and 25% Bhoranj Block who considered the quality of these works as well. 15% Hamirpur Block and 12% Bhoranj Block respondents were of the opinion that quality of the works executed by Gram panchayats is very poor, while only 8% Hamirpur and 12% Bhoranj Block respondents said that the quality of work executed by Gram Panchayat is very good.

#### Utilization of Funds by PRIs

Respondent were asked whether the PRIs used the funds allocated to them properly or not. The opinion these collected is presented in table- 1.6.

**Table- 1.6**

	<b>Hamirpur Block Non-Beneficiaries</b>	<b>Bhoranj Block Non- Beneficiaries</b>
Yes	53 (50%)	62 (62%)
No	30 (30%)	17 (17%)
No opinion	17 (17%)	21 (21%)
Total	100 (100%)	100 (100%)

It can be inferred from the analyses of the table 1.6 the 53% Hamirpur Block and 62% bhoranj Block of respondents considers that funds are used properly by the PRIs, while 30% Hamirpur block and 17% Bhoranj Block of the respondents were of the opinion that PRIs have been not using the funds properly for rural development. 17% hamirpur and 21% Bhoranj of respondents did not express their opinion.

#### Annual Action Plan:

Respondents were asked to comment whether annual action plan is prepared by Gram panchayats are approved by Gram Sabha. The opinion thus collected is presented in table 1.7.

**Table- 1.7**  
**Preparation of annual Action plan by Gram panchayats for Gram Sabha's**

	<b>Hamirpur Block Non-Beneficiaries</b>	<b>Bhoranj Block Non- Beneficiaries</b>
Responses		
Yes	57 (57%)	46 (46%)
No	27 (27%)	38 (38%)
No opinion	16 (16%)	16 (16%)
Total	100 (100%)	100 (100%)

From the analysis of the table 1.7 it can be observed that 16% Hamirpur block and 16% Bhoranj Block were not having any knowledge whether annual plan is prepared in the Gram Sabha or 57% and 46% hamirpur and bhoranj Block of the respondents informed that annual action plan is prepared by their Gram Panchayats in the Gram sabha, while 27% hamirpur and 38% bhoranj block respondents said that annual action plan is not prepared by the gram panchayats in the meeting of Gram sabha.



Respondents were asked to name the most suitable agency for the execution of rural development programmes. The response in the regard is shown in table 1.8

**Table- 1.8**  
**Best agency for execution of development Programers**

Response	Hamirpur Block	Bhoranj Block
	Non-Beneficiaries	Non-Beneficiaries
Gram Panchayat	61 (61%)	42 (42%)
Department	10 (10%)	11 (11%)
Village development committee	20 (20%)	39 (39%)
Any other	9 (9%)	8 (8%)
Total	100 (100%)	100 (100%)

The respondents were asked to give their opinion regarding the suitable agency for the execution of development works. Opinion in the regard is presented in the table 1.8, which it can be inferred that the respondents 61% Hamirpur and 46% Bhoranj block, Gram panchayats are the best agency for the execution of development works, followed by departmental works followed by departmental execution Hamirpur Block 10% and bhoranj 11% and village development committee hamirpur Block 20% Bhoranj 20% any other only 9% Hamirpur Block and Bhoranj Block only 8%.

#### Programmes Awareness

The respondents were asked whether they have the knowledge of different anti- poverty programmes. The data is collected is depicted in table 1.9. awareness about various anti- poverty programme

**Table -1.9**

Response	Hamirpur Block	Bhoranj Block
	Beneficiaries	Beneficiaries
IRDP	10 (10%)	17 (17%)
SGSY	8 (8%)	15 (15%)
IAY	33 (33%)	11 (11%)
MGNREGA	49 (49%)	57 (57%)
Total	100 (100%)	100 (100%)

It's evident from the above table that 10% Hamirpur Block and 17% Bhoranj Block of the respondents have the knowledge of about IRDP programmes only. While 8% Hamirpur Block and 15% Bhoranj block were aware of only one programmes 49% Hamirpur block and 57% Bhoranj block were having information of about MGNREGA programme. It show that maximum people were aware of information regarding poverty alleviation programmes to rural poor.

**Table -1.10**  
**Sources of information**

Response	Hamirpur Block	Bhoranj Block
	Beneficiaries	Beneficiaries
GPVA	2 (2%)	13 (13%)



PRIs	53 (53%)	41 (41%)
Mass Media	45 (45%)	39 (39%)
Other sources	0 (0%)	7 (7%)
Total	100 (100%)	100 (100%)

It can be observed from the above table that majority of respondents, 53% Hamirpur Block and 41% Bhoranj Block got the information about the poverty alleviation programmes from panchayati Raj institutions, followed by only 2% Hamirpur and 13% Bhoranj, who got the information from the Gram panchayat Vikas Adhukaries. 45% of Hamirpur and 39% of the Bhoranj Block of the respondents got the information from news paper, radio, T.V. etc. while only 7% Bhoranj Block got the information from other sources friends, relatives, etc. It is concluded from the above table that PRIs and Mass Media members are the best source of information regarding poverty alleviation and other developmental programmes.

**Table-1.11**  
**Employment of the BPL family members in employment Generation Programmes**

	Hamirpur Block	Bhoranj Block
Response	Beneficiaries	Beneficiaries
Yes	79 (79%)	83 (83%)
No	21 (21%)	17 (17%)
Total	100 (100%)	100 (100%)

It is evident from the above table that majority of the beneficiaries respondents, 79% Hamirpur Block and 83% Bhoranj Block, either work or were provided and opportunity to work in the employment generation programmes executed by the gram panchayats. Only 21% Hamirpur block and 17% Bhoranj Block of the respondents did not work or were not provided an opportunity to work in these programmes.

**Income Supplementation:**

Poverty alleviation programmes have been initiated with a view to increase the income of the BPL families. Whether employment generation programme have supplemented the income of BPL families or not, the opinion of respondents in this regard is presented in table 1.12.

**Table-1.12**

	Hamirpur Block	Bhoranj Block
Response	Beneficiaries	Beneficiaries
Sufficient	58 (58%)	39 (39%)
Not sufficient	42 (42%)	61 (61%)
Total	100 (100%)	100 (100%)

It is clear from the table 1.12. 58% Hamirpur 39% of Bhoranj block of the respondents considered that the income they earned from the employment generation programmes was sufficient while for 42% Hamirpur and 61% Bhoranj, it was not sufficient.

**Credit facilities Availed:**

BPL beneficiaries are provided credit on subsidized interest rate for the creation of productive assets. The response of the beneficiaries whether they aviated this credit facility is shown in table 1.13.



**Table- 1.13**

	<b>Hamirpur Block</b>	<b>Bhoranj Block</b>
<b>Response</b>	<b>Beneficiaries</b>	<b>Beneficiaries</b>
Yes	19 (19%)	12 (12%)
No	81 (81%)	88 (88%)
Total	100 (100%)	100 (100%)

Table shows that out of 100-10 sampled total 200 respondents majority that is 81 percent Hamirpur and 88% Bhoranj Block did not avail the facilities of loan under IRDP/BPL schemes, one of major poverty alleviation pogrammes only 19% Hamirpur and 12% Bhoranj of the respondents had availed the facility of loan credit under IRDP/ DWCRA.

**Actual Beneficiaries:**

Poverty alleviation are meant for the upliftment of the down trodden among the rural masses. The respondents were asked as to who has actually have been benefited by these programmes. Opinions in this regard are indicated in table 1.14.

**Table- 1.14**

	<b>Hamirpur Block</b>	<b>Bhoranj Block</b>
<b>Response</b>	<b>Beneficiaries</b>	<b>Beneficiaries</b>
Actually poor	50 (50%)	63 (63%)
Those close to PRI's office bearers & govt. officials.	25 (25%)	19 (19%)
Other influential people	21 (21%)	10 (10%)
Any other	4 (4%)	8 (8%)
Total	100 (100%)	100 (100%)

It can be concluded from the above table that majority of the respondents 50% Hamirpur block and 63% Bhoranj block considered that the benefits of poverty alleviation programme actually reached the poor, while 25% Hamirpur and 19% bhoranj Block considered that the people who are close to PRIs members or Govt. officials actually got the benefits of the poverty alleviation programmes. 21% Hamirpur and 10% Bhoranj Hamirpur respondents felt that only influential people got the benefits of the anti- poverty programmes, while only 4% Hamirpur and 8% Bhoranj Block respondents considered that any other has derived any benefit from anti-poverty Programmes.

**3. CONCLUSION:**

The government has launched number of different development programmes for the purpose of socio economic upliftment of rural people. The observation has revealed that majority of the respondents were aware of about the different kind of rural development programmes. Most of them opined that they get information from the number of Panchayat and GPVA regarding the rural development programme. The study reveals that majority of the respondents expressed their views that efforts made by the voluntary agencies in this regard were not sufficient. The analysis of present data has revealed that majority of respondents showed their satisfaction towards performance of rural development programme. The fact about non-recovery of loan /credit given to IRDP beneficiaries came to light. In some cases, the beneficiaries had disposed off the assests and in others, the beneficiaries did not repay the loan. In some cases, the loan sanctioned in the name of IRDP beneficiaries was used by some other influential persons of the area. In the opinion of respondents the identification of BPL families was not proper. People felt that in most of the cases, undeserving people were identified and included in the BPL survey list.

Assests created by panchayats were of average quality. Although they meet the requirements of the community, yet their maintenance was very poor. Majority of the respondents, felt that the works should got executed through village development committee. Mostly the PRIs members were affiliated to one or the other political party. Therefore, they faced discrimination in the sanction of development schemes when the political party to which they were affiliated was not in power. Majority of the sampled respondents did not know whether Annual Action plan, a vital document, was



prepared by Gram Panchayats and had to get approval from gram sabha. Gram sabha meetings were also not held regularly for want of quorum.

**REFERENCES :**

1. Draft Annual Plan (2008-09) Planning Department Op. cit. p. 100-1013.
2. Economic Bulletin for Asia and the Far East, Vol. XII. No. 3 Dec. 1961, P-32-33.
3. Ibid; p-50
4. Idem.
5. Sources (district Planning Officer Hamirpur 2014-2015).
6. Sources (District Planning Office 2014-15 Op. citi,